

MALE FEMINISTS: OXYMORON OR THE NEXT STEP? AN EXPLORATION OF
ATTITUDES ASSOCIATED WITH MALE FEMINISTS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Psychology

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Clinical Psychology

by

Abigail K. Slowik

August 2015

© Abigail K. Slowik 2015

Keywords: male feminists, attitudes, sexuality, gender self-esteem

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Veanne Anderson, Ph.D.

Professor of Psychology

Indiana State University

Committee Member: June Sprock, Ph.D.

Professor of Psychology

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Kevin Bolinsky, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Psychology

Indiana State University

ABSTRACT

Although many studies have examined attitudes toward feminism and feminists, very few have been devoted to the study of attitudes toward male feminists. The existing body of literature has shown mixed results; with feminist men being rated more positively in some regards, and more negative in others. In the current study, Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 2004) is used as a framework for understanding factors associated with attitudes towards male feminists, male feminist identification, and gender-self-esteem.

Attitudes associated with male feminists were examined in a sample of 466 male and female undergraduate students from Indiana State University. Participants were randomly assigned to one of six vignette conditions in which the sexual orientation and feminist orientation of a male character were manipulated, resulting in two non-feminist (heterosexual-homosexual), two feminist (heterosexual-homosexual), and two anti-feminist (heterosexual-homosexual) conditions. After reading the vignette, the participants were asked to rate the character on the Warmth and Competence scales, which correspond to traditional female and male traits, respectively. Participants then completed several self-report measures, including the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (assesses self-esteem related to gender), Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale (assesses liberal feminist attitudes), and Demographic questionnaire. Participants also completed a measure of social desirability and a measure assessing current sexual orientation. Contrary to hypotheses, results indicated that regardless of sexual orientation, feminist and non-feminist men received the highest Warmth and Competence ratings, while anti-

feminists received the lowest. Additionally, gender self-esteem was found to be a sufficient predictor of attitudes toward feminism in women, but not in men. Consistent with other research, participants who were more politically liberal had more positive attitudes toward feminism than those who were more conservative. Finally, higher levels of religiosity were correlated with less positive attitudes toward feminism in women, but not in men.

This research will contribute to knowledge and awareness of what factors predict feminist identification in men and what factors affect attitudes toward male feminists. This current research suggests that male feminists are perceived to possess both masculine and feminine traits, regardless of their sexual orientation. Additionally, the results suggest that SIT can be a useful framework to begin to understand both attitudes toward feminism and feminist identification. Furthermore, although there are some similarities in the predictors of attitudes toward feminism and feminist identification in women, there is much less consensus on these predictors in men. Finally, greater awareness regarding the impact of rigid gender roles and stigma against feminism can lead to more effective interventions to reduce gender role strain and potentially harmful compensatory strategies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank my parents for their unfailing support and unconditional love. You have been my biggest cheerleaders and taught me the meaning of quiet determination and hard work. I owe all my success to you. To my sister Mandy, you have pushed me to excel and never cease to impress me with your poise and dedication. I cannot wait to continue to take the world by storm with you. To my dear friends who are too numerous to name: Thanks for sticking with me through this incredible journey.

To Betty Bayer, Leah Himmelhoch, Rebecca Murray, and Julie Kingery, who have always encouraged me to follow my passion: You all have helped shape me into the woman that I am today. Your support, laughter, friendship, and activism continue to inspire me long after your classes have ended.

To my committee members, Dr. Sprock and Dr. Bolinsky: Thank you for your guidance, patience, and feedback throughout this process. As a token of my gratitude, I promise to shower you with an unlimited supply of plums and Coke-Zero once I have a real paycheck.

To my kindred spirit, Dr. Anderson: Thank you for taking me under your wing and helping me to develop this idea over the past four years. I am exceedingly grateful for your aptitude with statistics, your passion for our research, your levelheadedness, and your ability to manage my neuroticism. You have been a wonderful mentor, an excellent role-model, and more importantly, a dear friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMITTEE MEMBERS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
INTRODUCTION	1
THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT: A BRIEF HISTORY	6
An Overview of the Waves	6
Men’s Role in the Feminist Movement	8
POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO MALE FEMINIST IDENTIFICATION	9
Stereotypes about Female Feminists	10
Stereotypes about Male Feminists	12
Assumptions That May Impede Male Feminist Identification	14
Assumption #1: Men Cannot be Feminists	14
Assumption #2: Feminist Men Are Not “Real” Men	15
WHEN FEMINIST ATTITUDES ARE NOT ENOUGH: THE IMPORTANCE OF SELF-LABELING	16
Feminist Attitudes and Feminist Identity	16
Importance of Self-Labeling	17
MEDIATORS OF MALE FEMINIST IDENTIFICATION	19

Conceptual Framework.....	19
Social Identity Theory.....	19
Gender Self-Esteem.....	22
Collective Self-Esteem.....	23
Essentialist Notions of Masculinity.....	24
Sexual Orientation.....	25
Race.....	27
Socioeconomic Status.....	30
Religion and Politics.....	32
Age.....	34
Recognition of Power and Guilt.....	36
I'M A FEMINIST...SO, NOW WHAT?.....	38
Hostile vs. Benevolent Sexism.....	38
Gender Role Strain-Compensatory Strategies.....	40
PRESENT STUDY.....	42
METHODOLOGY.....	43
Design.....	43
Participants.....	44
Power Analysis.....	45
Materials.....	45
Procedure.....	50
RESULTS OF THE STUDY.....	51
Descriptive Analyses.....	51

Attributions of Warmth and Competence to Vignette Character	52
Gender Self-Esteem, Attitudes Toward Feminism, and Feminist Orientation.....	53
Political Affiliation, Religiosity, and Attitudes Toward Feminism	54
Feminist Orientation and Character Ratings	55
Gender, Feminist Attitudes, and Character Ratings	56
Race, Gender, Religion, Attitudes Toward Feminism, and Feminist Orientation	57
DISCUSSION	59
Sexual Orientation and Feminist Orientation	59
Gender Self-Esteem and Attitudes Toward Feminism.....	63
Political Affiliation, Religiosity, and Attitudes Toward Feminism	65
Gender, Race, Feminist Attitudes, and Feminist Orientation.....	68
Limitations and Future Directions.....	71
Social Implications	74
Clinical Implications	75
REFERENCES	78
APPENDIX A: Informed Consent.....	109
APPENDIX B: Vignettes.....	111
APPENDIX C: Warmth and Competence Scales.....	113
APPENDIX D: Manipulation Check	114
APPENDIX E: Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale (LFAIS), Short Form ..	115
APPENDIX F: Collective Self-Esteem Scale.....	118
APPENDIX G: Social Desirability Scale-17	119
APPENDIX H: Demographics Questionnaire	120

APPENDIX I: Written Debriefing..... 122

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Zero-Order Correlations Between the Warmth, Competence, LFAIS, SDS-17, and GSE for Men and Women.....	98
Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Warmth, Competence, LFAIS, SDS-17, and CSE Scales by Gender of Participant.....	99
Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for the Warmth and Competence Ratings for Men and Women as a Function of Vignette Feminist Orientation and Vignette Sexual Orientation.....	100
Table 4. Multivariate Results for the Character Ratings on Warmth and Competence Scales	101
Table 5. Univariate Results for the Character Ratings on the Warmth and Competence Scales	102
Table 6. Multivariate Results for the Effects of Participant Feminist Orientation and Vignette Feminist Orientation of Women’s Ratings of Warmth and Competence	103
Table 7. Univariate Results for the Effects of Participant Feminist Orientation and Vignette Feminist Orientation on Women’s Ratings of Warmth and Competence.....	104
Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for Warmth and Competence Ratings by Participant Feminist Orientation and Vignette Feminist Orientation	105

Table 9. Partial Correlations Between LFAIS Scores and Warmth and Competence Ratings for Men and Women	106
Table 10. Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for Attitudes Toward Feminism and Religiosity by Gender and Race.....	107
Table 11. Frequencies (in Parentheses) and Percentages of Participant Feminist Orientation by Race and Gender.....	108

Male Feminists: Oxymoron or the Next Step? An Exploration of Attitudes Associated With Male Feminists

Feminism has played an integral role in the development of American society. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, the American feminist movement has attracted a diverse group of members, and maintains a considerable presence in modern society. Despite some of the social, political, and economic benefits that have been gained as a result of the movement, which include the passage of the 19th Amendment and the Equal Rights Amendment, many women and men are unwilling to identify as feminists. This is particularly noteworthy considering that research has consistently shown that adoption of a feminist identity in women is associated with higher self-esteem, greater self-acceptance, and increased social support (Carter & Spitzack, 1990; deMan & Benoit, 1982; Follingstad, Robinson, & Pugh, 1977; Hurt et al., 2007; Leavy & Adams, 1986; McNamara & Rickard, 1989; Morley, 1993; Ossana, Helms, & Leonard, 1992).

The simplest explanation for this phenomenon is a lack of understanding about feminism. Indeed, there is little agreement amongst feminists about what feminism means, what the goals of the movement are, and what significance gender differences holds (Herbert, 2007). This lack of cohesion and the presence of widely varied goals have significantly contributed to the misconceptions about feminism and the negative assumptions made about feminists. Due to the general uncertainty about the term “feminist,” people rely heavily on stereotypes in order to inform their opinions. Research has demonstrated relatively consistent, albeit somewhat contradictory, attitudes towards feminist women. Anderson (2009) summarized much of the literature on stereotyped attitudes towards feminist women, proposing that although many stereotypes depict feminists as physically and sexually unattractive man-hating extremists or

“femi-nazis,” feminist women are also perceived to be more powerful, competent, and intelligent than more traditional women.

Although there is a considerable body of research investigating attitudes of men and women towards feminism and feminists, there is much less literature devoted to the study of attitudes towards male feminists (Anderson, 2009; Breen & Karpinski, 2008; Gourley & Anderson, 2007; Tarrant, 2009). What little research has been done has shown mixed results, with feminist men being rated more positively in some regards, and more negatively in others. Indeed, feminist men have been perceived as less heterosexual and as less masculine than non-feminist men, but ratings have varied depending on rater characteristics, particularly gender (Anderson, 2009; Gourley & Anderson, 2007; Pierce, Sydnie, Stratkotter, & Krull, 2003).

These vastly different findings may be better conceptualized through several theoretical frameworks. Tajfel and Turner (2004) proposed the Social Identity Theory, in which members of a particular group derive their self-esteem from their membership to that group, as well as from comparisons made to in-groups and out-groups. Because self-esteem is based upon the group's distinctiveness, members must be on constant lookout for groups that threaten their distinctiveness. Should such a group appear, in-group members respond by increasing discrimination and negative evaluations of this group and its members.

Reluctance to identify as a feminist can be explained through Social Identity Theory by exploring the development of masculine identity. Men are taught, from a very young age, to reject feminine characteristics within themselves (Kimmel, 1998; Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009). Indeed, young boys are encouraged to participate in a sort of “antifemininity,” whereby feminine interests, behaviors, and traits are systematically devalued and punished when expressed (Lytton & Romney, 1991; McCreary, 1994). Primary among these

are emotional expression and vulnerability, weakness (physical, emotional, or psychological), and sexual attraction to other men (Kilmartin, 2007). Men who transgress these implicit rules of masculine conduct violate social norms and therefore represent a very real threat to traditional masculine identity. Given that feminist men have been perceived as less heterosexual and less masculine than men who do not claim this label, identifying oneself as a feminist means identifying with a deviant group (Jenen, Winqvist, Arkkelin, & Schuster, 2009; Smith, 1999). This deviant group membership likely informs the existing stereotypes about self-identified male feminists.

Social Identity Theory led to the creation of collective self-esteem and gender self-esteem constructs, both of which likely influence the act of feminist self-labeling in men. Broadly speaking, gender self-esteem is concerned with the degree to which one's gender impacts a person's self-esteem. In other words, if a person's gender is central to their sense of identity, then it is likely that in-group membership to that gender group will be of paramount importance to that individual. Taken in the context of Social Identity Theory, gender self-esteem (Falomir-Pichastor & Mungy, 2009) can be understood as complex interactions between gender in-group and out-group members. Heterosexual men who have higher gender self-esteem may express more overtly hostile attitudes towards male feminists as a means of distancing themselves from this stigmatized group. Consistent with this hypothesis, men with low gender self-esteem have been found to be more likely to support feminism (Burns, Aboud, & Moyles, 2000), though not necessarily more likely to identify as feminists. Therefore, the stigma associated with the term feminist, in addition to the stereotype that male feminists are homosexual, may make men with higher levels of gender self-esteem less likely to identify as feminists.

Similarly, Collective Self-Esteem (CSE; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) reflects an individual's attitudes towards their membership in a particular group, such as gender. Not only does it indicate how representative an individual is of their group, but CSE also reflects how that group membership is perceived, both by the individual and by society. Given that feminist identity is seen as a violation of masculinity, some men may be less likely to endorse a feminist label because they perceive it to be in opposition to a masculine identity (Anderson, 2009; Jackson, Fleury, & Lewandowski, 1996; Toller, Suter, & Trautman, 2004; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Additionally, men who agree with the ideals of the movement, but do not identify as feminists, may believe that feminist membership is perceived negatively by society, and therefore may reject the feminist label (Anderson, 2009; Baird, Szymanski & Ruebelt, 2007; Helgeson, 1994; Tarrant, 2009).

The goal of the current research is to contribute to knowledge regarding attitudes towards male feminists, in addition to exploring the factors mediating male feminist self-identification. In doing so, researchers will gain a greater understanding of the underlying motivations for feminist self-identification, as well as be able to develop more effective strategies for targeting men who may identify with the goals of the feminist movement and who are willing to participate in feminist action, but may not label themselves as feminists. Feminist identification (self-labeling) in women has been shown to correlate to participation in the feminist movement. Indeed, research has consistently shown that women who identify as feminists engage in significantly more feminist activism than those who embrace feminist attitudes, but reject the label (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Thus, it is plausible to suggest that feminist identification in men might result in a similar pattern of increased involvement in the feminist movement and therefore its significance cannot

be overstated (Anderson, 2009; Liss, Crawford, & Popp, 2004; Nelson et al., 2008; White, 2006). Although male participation in the feminist movement has been heavily contested by some feminists (Dowd, 2010; Herbert, 2007; Tarrant, 2009), the author of this study argues that the inclusion of men will not only enhance the movement by lending legitimacy to its goals and raising awareness of inequities for both genders, it will also help to dispel some of the negative and potentially inaccurate stereotypes associated with feminists.

In order to examine this topic, sexual orientation and feminist identification will be manipulated in a hypothetical male character. For the purposes of this study, three terms will be used to describe feminist orientation. Non-feminists are men that support the goals of the feminist movement, but do not identify as feminists. Anti-feminists are men who are strongly opposed to the goals of the feminist movement and do not identify as feminists. Feminist men support the goals of the feminist movement and identify as feminists. Based on the literature, several hypotheses will be explored: 1) Heterosexual men and women will attribute fewer masculine (competent) traits toward men identified as gay, feminist, or both. 1a) A man identified as heterosexual and non-feminist will be rated as more competent and less warm by both men and women compared to a man identified as homosexual and feminist. 1b) Heterosexual men will rate the feminist man as less competent and more warm than heterosexual women. 2) Heterosexual men, but not heterosexual women, who endorse high levels of gender self-esteem will endorse less positive attitudes toward feminism. 3) Negative attitudes towards feminism will be correlated with more conservative political affiliation and higher levels of religiosity.

The Feminist Movement: A Brief History

An Overview of the Waves

In order to fully comprehend the current reactions to feminists, particularly self-identified male feminists, one must first have an understanding of the feminist movement. The American feminist movement initially began in the late-nineteenth/early-twentieth century and was primarily concerned with the issue of suffrage (Acker, 2008). Early women's rights activists were also interested in securing women's rights to have personal freedom, to acquire an education, to earn a living and claim associated wages, to own property, to testify in court, to obtain a divorce in just cases (Anthony & Harper, 1902). Abolition, public education, and "moral uplift" were notable goals of first wave feminists, as well (Renzetti & Curran, 1989). This push for social and political rights became known as the first wave of feminism.

After suffrage was won with the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920, a shift in the feminist movement began to take place. Historically, the feminist movement has been a white, middle-class woman's movement. These were the women who had the expendable time and income to devote to issues of gender equality and social justice. In fact, one of the greatest criticisms of first wave feminism is related to the largely homogenous population of women who were working towards achieving relatively narrowly defined political goals, most notably, suffrage (Thompson, 2010). Additionally, as was customary of the period, white women of the first wave often held essentialist beliefs about gender. It was commonly believed that all women had very much the same experience simply by way of being women, suggesting the existence of a "universal" female identity (Herbert, 2007). As a result, white women developed a discourse that unconsciously denied the existence and importance of women of color, as well as their unique experiences (hooks, 1984). Public acknowledgement of varying experiences as a result

of racial identity was virtually non-existent, as was the identification of any interactions between racial and gender identities (Renzetti & Curran, 1989). Recognition of this racial oversight eventually led to development of the second wave of feminism in the 1960's, which sought to be a more inclusive women's movement (Thompson, 2010).

Indeed, much of the second wave of feminism was devoted to correcting the problems of the first wave. Gaining popularity during the 1960's and 1970's, the feminist movement, or Women's Liberation movement as it was known during this period, remained largely divided into two groups, white women and women of color. Reproductive rights and racial inclusion were a major focus of the second wave, as were combating sexual harassment in the workplace and unequal pay. In recognition of the interaction between multiple identities, Black feminists introduced the concept of intersectionality, which emphasizes the interrelation of identities like social class, sexual orientation, gender, and racial identity. It was also during this time that the idea that 'the personal is political' became commonplace. Feminists, thus, began to view their personal lives as deeply politicized and inextricably linked to the social, political, and economic climate of the time (Tarrant, 2009; Thompson, 2010).

Today, in what some consider to be the contemporary or third wave of feminism, the movement has taken a much more global approach towards equality. Beginning in the 1990's, the third wave continues the social and political changes begun in the previous two waves and represents a far more inclusive, transformative movement (Fernandes, 2010). Of particular concern to contemporary feminists are questions of normalcy and oppression in the global politics of gender, sexuality, social class, imperialism, language, and race (Mack-Canty & Wright, 2004; Tarrant, 2009). Aronson (2003) argues that third wave feminism is a significant departure from the previous waves, particularly with regard to the extent to which women

recognize existing gender inequality, appear willing to publicly endorse the feminist movement, and take action to influence social change. In general, the goals of third wave feminists are far more diverse and wide-ranging, reflecting the growing diversity of feminists, themselves.

Feminism, then, is a multifaceted movement; one whose members and goals have changed dramatically over the past two centuries and one that continues to adapt in response to the ever-changing social climate.

Men's role in the feminist movement. Although the feminist movement has largely been focused on attaining rights for women, it was by no means a movement composed entirely of women. Both in the United States and abroad, many men throughout history have stood in support of women's rights. Most notable among these men are intellectuals and social critics like John Stuart Mill, who supported women's rights in Britain, Friedrich Engels, representing German socialists' support for equality, Ancient Greece's Plato (Tarrant, 2009), and William Lloyd Garrison, Henry Blackwell, and Frederick Douglass, all of whom championed both the abolition and women's movements (McMillen, 2008). These men, among countless others, provided reformers with inspiration and invaluable support. In addition to offering financial backing for the cause, the aforementioned men actively campaigned for women's rights, both in the political arena and on the lecture circuit.

Tarrant (2009) highlighted some of the important contributions that men, as a group, have made to the American feminist movement. American male support for first wave goals was represented by the Men's League for Woman Suffrage, the first feminist-allied men's group in the U.S. Organized largely by Max Eastman in 1910, editor of *The Masses*, the group lent invaluable public support to the suffrage movement. In addition to supporting the first wave issues of suffrage and women's rights to own property and businesses, feminist-allied men have

worked in favor of equal pay, birth control, and women's rights to regulate their bodies. Still others spoke in favor of women's sexual liberation, education, and the essential right to free expression. Indeed, feminist men organized the National Organization of Men Against Sexism (NOMAS) in 1975, as an offshoot of women's liberation groups. Concerned with broadening the prevailing perspectives on masculinity and femininity, NOMAS members campaigned in support of the Equal Rights Amendment and organized workshops about ending rape and sexual harassment.

Modern day feminist or antisexist men are concerned with issues of social equality, like pornography, sexual and physical abuse, as well as the role of women in religion. Indeed, contemporary society has seen the emergence of the Profeminist Men's Movement, which emphasizes the need to change the various aspects of masculinity that limit the freedom of choice for both men and women. The Profeminist men's movement makes the assumption that all human beings share a need for self-expression, a need that ought not be limited by destructive, limiting social conventions like gender roles. To date, the largest and longest organized profeminist men's group is NOMAS (Kilmartin, 2007).

Potential Barriers to Male Feminist Identification and Self-Labeling

Considering the significant role that men have always played in feminist movement, it is noteworthy that the majority of men are hesitant to identify as feminists. Perhaps the simplest explanation for this phenomenon is a lack of understanding about what feminism or even being a feminist entails. As previously noted, the feminist movement is constantly shifting in order to address the ever-changing needs of women and minority groups. As a result of these new demands, new feminist groups have been created. Indeed, there has been a veritable explosion of feminist groups, ranging from Black feminists, radical feminists, liberal feminists, womanists,

separatists, postcolonial feminists, third world feminists, as well as a host of other distinct perspectives within this movement.

This lack of cohesion and presence of widely varied goals has significantly contributed to the misconceptions about feminism and the negative assumptions made about feminists. “A central problem within feminist discourse has been our inability to either arrive at a consensus of opinion about what feminism is or accept definition(s) that could serve as points of unification” (hooks, 1984, p. 17). Indeed, there is little agreement amongst feminists about what feminism means, what the goals of the movement are, and what significance sexual differences holds (Herbert, 2007). So debilitating has this internal dissension been, that some feminist scholars have argued that the growth of the feminist movement has been effectively stunted (Fernandes, 2010).

Stereotypes About Female Feminists

Due to the general uncertainty about the term “feminist,” people may rely heavily on stereotypes in order to inform their opinions. Given some of the disagreement among feminists about feminism, it is not surprising that some of stereotypes associated with feminists reflect a general lack of understanding about what feminism entails (Anderson, Kanner, & Elsayegh, 2009; Farnham, 1996; Yoder, 2003). Research has demonstrated relatively consistent, albeit somewhat contradictory, attitudes towards feminist women.

Edley and Wetherell (2001) used the analogy of Jekyll and Hyde, whereby men’s perceptions of feminism both vilify and applaud the efforts made by feminists. Feminist women have often been viewed negatively, commonly being described as “butch,” “dyke,” “militant,” and “man-hating” (Herbert, 2007, p. 31), despite the fact that research suggests that feminists actually report lower levels of hostility towards men than nonfeminists (Anderson et al., 2009).

In addition to often being viewed as man-hating extremists (Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Aronson, 2003; Herbert, 2007; Smith, 1999), or “femi-nazis” (Suter & Toller, 2006; Tarrant, 2009), feminist women are also perceived to be physically and sexually unattractive (Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Edley & Wetherell, 2001; Goldberg, Gottesdiener, & Abramson, 1975; Rubin, 1994; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999).

Feminists have also been perceived as radical, overly political, and unscientific (Brown & Brodsky, 1992). To label oneself as a feminist, then, is to risk being perceived as militant, strident, or even uppity (Tarrant, 2009). Even among psychologists, the word “feminist,” carries a negative connotation. So negative, in fact, that the Society for Feminist Psychology changed its name to the Society for the Psychology of Women, as a result of concerns within the psychological community about how they would be viewed (Brown, 2006). These negative stereotypes are so ingrained that they even operate without conscious awareness. Indeed, in a study examining implicit attitudes towards feminism, researchers found that participants had faster reaction times to “feminist-bad” pairings than to “feminist-good” pairings (Jenen et al., 2009). Such findings indicate the presence of a negativity bias inherent in perceptions of feminism and feminists.

There have been several studies that have attempted to compare attitudes towards feminists to characteristics traditionally associated with either men or women. Pierce et al., (2003) investigated how social roles, and their accompanying stereotypes, impacted judgments. College students were asked to rate the social categories of *woman*, *man*, and *feminist* on 63 separate semantic differential terms. The terms corresponded to five dimensions: evaluative, potency, activity, expressiveness, and sexuality. Factor analysis revealed that *feminist* was rated more negatively on the evaluative and sexuality dimensions, suggesting that this category was

viewed less positively and was more likely to be associated with homosexuality. However, participants' gender significantly affected ratings, with female participants rating *feminist* more positively than male participants on both the evaluative and sexuality dimensions. *Feminist* was also rated lower on expressiveness than *woman*, but higher on this dimension than *man*. Interestingly, the concept of *feminist* received higher scores on potency than *man* or *woman*, suggesting that participants viewed this social category as more masculine, and less feminine than the other categories.

However, studies have also demonstrated that the term "feminist" is associated with positive attitudes, as well. Tipton, Bailey, and Obenchain (1975) reported that feminists were perceived to be stronger, more potent, more powerful, and more comfortable approaching men than more traditional women. Similarly, feminists have also been perceived to be competent, independent, and intelligent (DeWall, Altermatt, & Thompson, 2005; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Suter & Toller, 2006), as well as knowledgeable (Berryman-Fink & Vanderber, 1985; Twenge & Zucker, 1999), caring (Berryman-Fink & Verderber, 1985), and career oriented (Twenge & Zucker, 1999).

Stereotypes about Male Feminists

Studies investigating attitudes towards feminist men, however, are few. Research has shown that feminist men are often perceived to be less assertive (Twenge & Zucker, 1999), less favorable (Breen & Karpinski, 2008), and more likely to be bisexual or homosexual (Gourley & Anderson, 2007) than women who identified as feminists, as well as those who did not self-identify as feminists. Anderson (2009) sought to examine stereotypes about feminist men in greater detail and was interested in determining whether *feminist man* would be perceived as having more stereotypically masculine or feminine characteristics. Using the same procedures as

Pierce et al., (2003), participants were asked to rate four terms: *man*, *woman*, *feminist man*, and *feminist woman*. Results demonstrated that compared to *feminist woman*, participants rated *feminist man* as less potent (i.e., fewer stereotypically masculine traits), less heterosexual, but more positively, overall. Indeed, of all four terms, *feminist man* had the highest evaluative ratings, and received comparable ratings to *man* and *woman* in confidence. Anderson (2009) suggested that these results indicated a feminist man's masculinity might be called into question on some dimensions, which may explain some of the reluctance to openly identify as a feminist.

Although less is known about the effects of stereotypes on men's behavior, stereotypes about feminists have been shown to make women reluctant to adopt the feminist label (Anderson, 2009; Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Burns et al., 2000; Buschman & Lenart, 1996; Jackson et al., 1996; McCabe, 2005; Twenge & Zucker, 1999; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Women who do identify as feminists have been shown to be far more likely to participate in the feminist movement or associated forms of collective action than those who disavow the label identities (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Fitz, Zucker, & Bay-Cheng, 2012; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Liss et al., 2004; Liss, O'Connor, Morosky, & Crawford, 2001; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Nelson et al. 2008; Szymanski, 2004; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Given the aforementioned trends with feminist women, it is possible that similar patterns may emerge with regard to male feminists. Therefore, stereotypes about male feminists may impede self-labeling among men and may limit male participation in the movement (Anderson, 2009; Breen & Karpinski, 2008; Gourley & Anderson, 1007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999).

Stereotypes regarding feminism remain a major impediment to self-labeling in both men and women. They have immense social, economic, and political power, and they are heavily resistant to change. Thus, negative stereotypes associated with feminism represent a real threat

to feminist goals. In addition to the detrimental impact that various feminist stereotypes have had, there are several major assumptions associated with feminism that may explain why many men are unwilling to identify as feminists. These assumptions, which will be discussed in the following section are rooted in, and supported by, the aforementioned stereotypes.

Assumptions That May Impede Male Feminist Identification

Assumption #1: Men cannot be feminists. There are a number of reasons why men reject the feminist label that may not be the result of a lesser commitment to the goals of the feminist movement. Perhaps the greatest assumption that is made about feminists is that they are all women. Given its goals and the gender of the majority of its members, the feminist movement has come to be associated with women (Berryman-Fink & Verderber, 1985; Williams & Wittig, 1997). In fact, many men and women have argued that men cannot identify as feminists because they lack the first hand experience of being a woman in a society that privileges men (Herbert, 2007). This rationale can be found both in the general population, and in the psychological community, as well. Indeed, prolific feminist psychologist, Laura Brown argues that only feminist women can practice feminist therapy (Brown, 1994). Such positions reflect the essentialism that has been present in the feminist movement since its beginnings. This stereotype may prevent men who sympathize with feminist goals from adopting the feminist label because they believe that it *cannot* refer to them (Suter & Toller, 2006; Williams & Wittig, 1997).

Other researchers, however, have challenged the validity of this assumption. Tarrant (2009, p. 15) argues, “Being a feminist doesn’t require certain plumbing. It requires a certain consciousness.” Although men do not know the realities of being a woman first hand, it is overly reductionistic to assume that they cannot meaningfully contribute to the movement, that

they lack the sensitivity or willingness to recognize gender inequalities when they occur, or that they have no interest in feminism. Biological sex does not guarantee that all women will identify as feminists; in fact, the majority of women reject the feminist label, despite holding feminist attitudes (Aronson, 2003; Burns et al., 2000; Buschman & Lenart, 1996; Cowan, Mestlin, & Masek, 1992; Liss et al., 2001; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Renzetti, 1987; Williams & Wittig, 1997). Given the integral role that men have always, and continue, to play in the feminist movement, it seems highly illogical to say that men cannot be effective feminists. As such, this assumption may warrant further examination.

Assumption #2: Feminist men are not “real” men. Research has shown that, to a certain degree, male feminists are not considered “real” men (Kilmartin, 2007; Kimmel, 1998). Indeed, Anderson (2009) found that the term *feminist man*, when compared to *feminist woman*, *man*, and *woman*, was rated by participants as less attractive and lower in stereotypically masculine characteristics. This assumption is pervasive outside of the research setting, as well. The profeminist men’s movement has taken a good deal of criticism from various men’s groups, as well as from women. Profeminist men reject essentialism and support androgyny, which has caused some men’s groups to view them as “soft males who deny their natural masculine energy—they are nice guys, but not real men” (Kilmartin, 2007, p. 292). Such beliefs may be bolstered by research findings that suggest that profeminist men are more likely to engage in more feminine behaviors (Twenge, 1999). In essence, feminist identity is perceived to be ideologically incompatible with hegemonic masculine identity. Due to the fact that highly masculine men are described as the “ideal” by both feminist and non-feminist men and women (Mezydlo & Betz, 1980), feminist men may inadvertently call their masculinity into question by adopting this label (Anderson, 2009).

Taught to reject the feminine within themselves, men may demonstrate their dislike for those who embody femininity and feminine ideals: women, gay men, and male feminists. Moreover, men may exhibit prejudice or discriminatory behavior towards men who are feminine or perceived to be feminine. Undeniably, one of the most pervasive stereotypes about feminist men is related to their sexuality, as individuals who transgress gender roles are often perceived to be gay (Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009). Anderson (2009), for example, found that feminist men were perceived to be less heterosexual, a finding reflected in other studies, as well (Breen & Karpinski, 2008; Gourley & Anderson, 2007). Both McCreary (1994) and Blumenfeld (1992) found that people often assume that men who act in a stereotypically feminine fashion are gay. Assuming that men who identify as feminists must also be homosexual conflates sexual orientation with personal politics (Tarrant, 2009). Thus, it stands to reason that identifying as a feminist poses an even more significant risk for men than it does for women. Consequently, the threat of being perceived as homosexual has potential to act as a powerful deterrent to prevent men from identifying as feminists.

When Feminist Attitudes Are Not Enough: The Importance of Self-Labeling Feminist Attitudes and Feminist Identity

Often correlated and used interchangeably throughout the literature, feminist attitudes and feminist identity have come to be understood as two distinct constructs (Cowan et al., 1992; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Szymanski, 2004). Although the majority of individuals endorse at least some of the ideals of the feminist movement, only a subset of those individuals are willing to adopt a feminist identity label (Anderson, 2009; Zucker, 2004). Indeed, despite neutral or even positive evaluations of feminists and feminist values, respondents tend to view their own identities as dissonant or somehow incompatible with a feminist identity (Suter & Toller, 2006;

Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Therefore, disavowal or endorsement of the feminist identity label has enormous implications for the individual's psychological health (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Hurt et al., 2007; Szymanski, 2004) and behavior (Zucker, 2004). Therefore, it is important to appreciate the subtle differences between these two constructs.

Feminist attitudes are beliefs in the feminist goal of gender equality, both in societal structure and practices (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Feminist identity, in contrast, has been conceptualized as a social or collective identity (Burns et al., 2000). This identity is twofold, comprising both the adoption of feminist attitudes and the self-identification as a feminist (Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Thus, feminist identity necessitates explicit feminist self-identification (Eisele & Stake, 2008).

Importance of Self-Labeling

Social identities emphasize characteristics that individuals share with other people who are members of a particular group, like feminists. Previous research has demonstrated that individuals with salient social identities are likely to engage in behaviors related to those identities (Zucker, 2004). As such, self-labeling may reflect a commitment to social change. In support of this hypothesis, feminist identification in women consistently predicts participation in the feminist movement (Fitz et al., 2012). Indeed, research has consistently shown that self-labeled feminist women engage in significantly more feminist activism than those who embrace feminist attitudes, but reject the label (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Szymanski, 2004; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004).

Explicit feminist identification and self-labeling may also be important in terms of gaining psychological benefits for lesbian and bisexual women, as well. Not only did Szymanski (2004) find higher correlations between feminist self-identification and engagement in feminist

activism (+ .76), with lower correlations found between various feminist attitudes and engagement in activism (ranging from +.03 to +.62), but this study also found that internalized homophobia was negatively correlated with explicit feminist self-identification in lesbian and bisexual women. The authors suggested that lesbian and bisexual women who self-label as feminists benefit from greater self-acceptance and higher levels of self-esteem than those who disavow the label. These findings suggest that for lesbian and bisexual women, there is a positive association between labeling as feminist and self-esteem. Similarly, Eisele and Stake (2008) found that feminist attitudes, without feminist identification, were only weakly related to feelings of self-efficacy in women.

As discussed previously, supporters of feminism are often targeted with negative stereotypes. As such, a willingness to endorse this identity, even in the midst of backlash and negative perceptions, may not only represent great dedication to the goals of the movement, but may actually *elicit* greater collective action from self-identified feminists (Zucker, 2004). Men who publicly endorse a feminist identity label may be particularly influential as their participation in the movement challenges many of the stereotypes and assumptions associated with feminists. Exposure to feminism, whether through education or contact with a self-identified feminist friend or family member, is directly related to the willingness to endorse a feminist identity (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). As such, self-identified male feminists occupy a unique position in the feminist movement in which they are able to lend legitimacy to its goals, to raise awareness of sociopolitical inequities for both genders, and to potentially recruit other men who share feminist attitudes but who have been reluctant to identify as feminists. Thus, the identification of factors mediating or impeding male feminist self-labeling has enormous implications for the feminist movement.

Mediators of Male Feminist Identification

Conceptual Framework

The degree to which men reject femininity (and gender role transgressors like gay men and male feminists), may be mediated by how much of their identity is informed by their gender. Among men whose gender is important to their overall sense of identity or self-esteem, one may find lower rates of feminist self-identification. Burns et al., (2000) found that highly masculine men supported neither covert, nor overt feminism. Suter and Toller (2006) suggested that highly masculine men would be less inclined to adopt a feminist label due to the perceived conflict with traditional gender roles, as well as the benefits they derive from maintaining traditional conceptualizations of masculinity. These findings can be conceptualized through the Social Identity Theory.

Social identity theory. Tajfel and Turner (2004) proposed the Social Identity Theory, in which members of a particular group derive their self-esteem from their membership in a particular group, as well as from comparisons made to in-groups and out-groups. Self-esteem is based upon the group's distinctiveness; therefore, members must be on constant lookout for groups that threaten their distinctiveness. Should such a group appear, in-group members respond by increasing discrimination and negative evaluations of this group and its members. The term "threat" is conceptualized by the authors simply as a challenge to the in-group's distinctiveness. In order to preserve the group identity and maintain a sense of cohesion, in-group members must exclude and distance themselves from those who do not share their identity and those that violate group norms. Group identity has been assessed by measures of collective self-esteem, which comes from the idea of social identity preservation (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Collective self-esteem refers to an individual's attitude towards their membership in a

particular social group. One of the social groups that have been frequently studied is gender. Gender self-esteem and collective self-esteem likely mediate the act of feminist self-labeling in men.

Reluctance to identify as a feminist can be explained through Social Identity Theory by exploring the development of masculine identity. Men are taught, from a very young age, to reject the feminine within themselves (Kilmartin, 2007; Kimmel, 1998; Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009). Lytton and Romney (1991) and McCreary (1994) argued that young boys are encouraged to participate in a sort of “antifemininity,” whereby feminine interests, behaviors, and traits are systematically devalued and punished when expressed. Primary among these are emotional expression and vulnerability, weakness (physical, emotional, or psychological), and sexual attraction to other men (Kilmartin, 2007). For a man to be perceived as feminine is viewed as a form of “contamination” (Lipman-Blumen, 1984, p. 86). Thus, a masculine culture of inexpressiveness, aggression, emotional aloofness, and independence is cultivated (Kilmartin, 2007; Tarrant, 2009). In this way, antifemininity becomes both the defining factor of masculinity and the masculine gender role (Dowd, 2010; Kilmartin, 2007; Kimmel, 1998).

Men who transgress these implicit rules of masculine conduct violate social norms and therefore represent a very real threat to traditional masculine identity. According to Blashill and Powlishta (2008, 2009), male gender role violations frequently elicit negative reactions from others. Not only are such men imbued with negative personality traits like “boring” or “unintelligent” (Blashill & Powlishta, 2008, 2009), they are confronted with social disapproval (Blashill & Powlishta, 2008, 2009; Kilmartin, 2007; Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009), and are also reprimanded even more strongly than are women who transgress gender norm behaviors

(Blashill & Powlishta, 2008, 2009; Lytton & Romney, 1991; McCreary, 1994). Such findings have been consistently demonstrated regardless of the male's age, as gender non-traditional boys have been perceived as less attractive, less popular, and more isolated than gender non-traditional girls (Dunkle & Francis, 1990; Jackson & Sullivan, 1990; Martin, 1990). These findings may reflect the higher value that is placed on traditional, hegemonic male behavior.

For a man, there is no greater transgression or expression of femininity than expressing sexual attraction to a man (Kilmartin, 2007). Interestingly, research has shown that gay males are automatically assumed to possess lower levels of masculinity and higher levels of femininity in comparison to their heterosexual counterparts (Blashill & Powlishta, 2008, 2009; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Lehavot & Lambert, 2007). These findings suggest that there is a close connection between gender role violation and presumed homosexuality. Indeed, Herek (1988) suggested that the traditional male gender role is predicated on heterosexuality. As such, heterosexual men are more concerned about not appearing feminine or homosexual than are heterosexual women appearing masculine or homosexual (Herek, 1988; Maccoby, 1987). Moreover, they also tend to demonstrate greater degrees of discomfort during gender role violation (Bosson, Prewitt-Freilino, & Taylor, 2005). Research also consistently indicates that men tend to hold more negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men than women (Haslam & Levy, 2006; Herek, 2000a; Kite, 1984; LaMar & Kite, 1998; Nagoshi, et al., 2008; Ratcliff, Lassiter, Markam, & Snyder, 2006). It has been suggested that such attitudes reveal a culture of fear that reinforces the misogyny and homophobia that have dominated the construction of masculinities (Hamilton, 2007). As such, men who openly identify as homosexual violate the male gender role, and are thus, cognitively aligned with women. Acceptable behavior, then, is regulated through homophobia and antifemininity (Kilmartin, 2007). Terms like “faggot” or “pussy” are used by other men to

encourage more traditional displays of masculinity, like aggression (Tarrant, 2009). In summary, performances of masculinity influence men's willingness to identify as feminists (Bullock & Fernald, 2003; Suter & Toller, 2006).

Gender self-esteem. Broadly speaking, gender self-esteem (Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009) is concerned with the degree to which one's gender impacts a person's self-esteem. In other words, if a person's gender is central to their sense of identity, then it is likely that in-group membership to that gender group will be of paramount importance. Taken in the context of Social Identity Theory, gender self-esteem can be understood as complex interactions between gender in-group and out-group members.

Numerous studies have indicated that heterosexuality, as well as an opposition to femininity, are inherent in hegemonic masculinity (Hegarty, Pratto, & Lemieux, 2004; Herek, 2000b; Kite & Whitley, 1998). Therefore, homosexual men are viewed as a threat to masculinity and the subsequent self-esteem that heterosexual men derive from their male group membership (Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009). According to the social identity theory, heterosexual men would be motivated to separate themselves from homosexual men as a way to preserve their own group distinctiveness. This is accomplished through the derogation of and discrimination against gay men. Research supports this hypothesis, and has consistently shown that heterosexual men hold far more negative attitudes towards homosexual men, than do women (Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009).

Male feminists, too, could be viewed as a threat to traditional masculinity. Heterosexual men who have higher gender self-esteem may express more overtly hostile attitudes towards male feminists as a means of distancing themselves from this stigmatized group. Consistent with this hypothesis, men with low gender self-esteem have been found to be more likely to support

feminism (Burns et al., 2000), though not necessarily more likely to identify as feminists.

Because of the stigma associated with the term feminist, in addition to the stereotype that male feminists are homosexual, men with higher levels of gender self-esteem may be less likely to identify as feminists.

Collective self-esteem. Similarly, Collective Self-Esteem (CSE; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) reflects an individual's attitudes toward their membership in a particular group, such as a gender group. Collective self-esteem indicates how representative an individual is of their group, as well as reflects how that group membership is perceived, both by the individual and by society. Some men may be less likely to endorse a feminist label because they perceive it to be in opposition to a masculine identity (Anderson, 2009; Jackson et al., 1996; Toller et al., 2004; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). More broadly speaking, men who agree with the ideals of the movement, but do not identify as feminists, may reject the feminist label because they believe that feminist membership is perceived negatively by society (Anderson, 2009; Baird et al., 2007; Helgeson, 1994; Tarrant, 2009).

Smith (1999) explored the relationship between female feminist identity and Collective Self-Esteem. As measured by the Collective Self-Esteem Scale, feminists and anti-feminists have similar scores with regard to their belief that they were worthy members of their gender group (Membership subscale). Anti-feminists scored higher on the Public subscale, indicating that they felt others respected their group more than feminists. In turn, feminists were more likely to see membership in their gender group as an important part of their identity (Identity subscale).

Given these findings, hypotheses can be formed about feminist men. It is possible that feminist men, like their female counterparts, will score similarly on the Membership subscale of

CSE. However, because feminist identity is seen as a violation of masculinity, male feminists may endorse fewer items on the Public subscale, reflecting the stigma attached to the feminist label. It is also possible that both feminist men and men will respond similarly on the Identity subscale. Men who score highly on this subscale might be less likely to endorse a feminist label because they perceive it to be in opposition with masculinity. On the other hand, feminist men might be more attuned to the issues of power and privilege associated with their male gender; thus, they might also feel that their gender is an integral part of their identity. Those who identify neither as feminists nor antifeminists may find gender less salient to their overall identity. Smith (1999) found that women who identify as having “mixed” beliefs (neither identifying as feminist or anti-feminist) had lower levels of overall CSE than women who identified as feminists or antifeminists. However, contrary to the author’s prediction, results demonstrated that this mixed group did not have significantly different scores on the Identity subscale, suggesting that all three groups of women found gender to be an equally salient component of their identity. Given that the aforementioned study did not examine collective self-esteem in men, it is difficult to predict the degree to which CSE will be an important mediator of feminist identification in men. Based on the findings of Smith (1999), it is possible that a similar pattern would emerge, with nonfeminist men scoring lower on measures of CSE than feminist or anti-feminist identified men.

Essentialist Notions of Masculinity

Another major barrier to male feminist identification is the narrow conceptualization of masculinity. As mentioned previously, essentialist notions about gender were prominent in the first wave of feminism (hooks, 1984; Herbert, 2007; Renzetti & Curran, 1989). Ironically, although the later waves of feminism rebelled against the notion of a universal female identity or

experience, essentialism runs rampant in both male and female conceptualizations of masculinity (Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009; Herbert, 2007; Kilmartin, 2007; Kimmel, 1998; Twenge, 1999). Although some academics and researchers have begun to argue that masculinity is socially constructed, rather than being biologically defined, the idea that masculinity refers to a singular identity has persisted (Dowd, 2010). Indeed, masculinity has been suggested to refer to a very limited subset of men, all of whom are “white, heterosexual, American, able-bodied, and middle-class” (Tarrant, 2009, p. 62). Hegemonic masculinity, which celebrates traditional male gender roles and is typically understood in opposition to women and subordinate men (Gough, 2001), is often conceptualized as the ideal masculinity.

Despite the predominance of hegemonic masculinity, scholars have begun to argue that multiple masculinities exist. The existence of multiple masculinities, however, does not mean that these masculinities are equally valued by society. According to Dowd (2010), subordinate and subversive masculinities are defined by identities like race, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation. Thus, men, as a group, do not benefit equally from patriarchy (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). Consequently, men who fail to conform to this ideal masculinity as a result of their sexual orientation, race, or other identities, are thereby oppressed by those who do. The following identities have been shown to impact an individual’s masculinity and are therefore likely to mediate male feminist identification.

Sexual Orientation

If hegemonic masculinity is predicated upon heterosexuality and strives to reject the feminine through the domination of women and homophobia (Kimmel, 2000), then sexual orientation can be expected to have a major impact on whether or not a man identifies as a feminist. Numerous studies have demonstrated that negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians

are correlated with high levels of social dominance (Morrison, Kenny, & Harrington, 2005; Poteat, Espelage, & Green Jr., 2007), and authoritarianism (Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 2008; Whitley & Lee, 2000).

Because sexual attraction to a man is construed as feminine, homosexual men might be more inclined to align themselves with a traditionally feminine identity, like feminist. Research suggests that not only do homosexual men score higher on measures of femininity and feminine gender identity (Hooberman, 1979), but that more feminine men tend to show greater support for the feminist movement (Jackson et al., 1996), and were more likely to self-identify as feminists (Toller et al., 2004). Therefore, it seems plausible to suggest that homosexual men will be more likely to identify as feminists than their heterosexual counterparts. Participants in this study also suggested that the feminist movement provided a “safe place” where feminine men and masculine women could perform unconventional gender roles. Gay men’s own experiences of oppression at the hands of straight men might make them more open-minded (conceived of as a feminine trait), and the injustices done to women more readily recognizable (Suter & Toller, 2006). Therefore, homosexual men could adopt the label of feminist out of sympathy for the sexism that women encounter, as well as to combat the homophobia that they experience (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008).

Although gay men are not necessarily feminine, nor are feminine men necessarily gay, the two groups are commonly conflated (Kilmartin, 2007). As such, useful conclusions can be drawn from the study of feminine men and applied indirectly to homosexual men. These findings can then be used to inform discussions about male feminist self-identification. Based upon the social identity literature, it seems that homosexuality could be perceived as a challenge to the traditional male gender role, which is based upon heterosexuality. As such, heterosexual

men with higher levels of gender self-esteem would, in theory, distance themselves from out-group members, like homosexuals or male feminists. What remains unclear is the impact that a homosexual identity and high levels of gender self-esteem would have on feminist identification.

Although homosexual men score higher on measures of femininity and feminine gender identity (Hooberman, 1979), and more feminine men tend to show greater support for the feminist movement (Jackson et al., 1996), homosexual men may not always be more likely to self-label as feminists. In fact, it is possible that gay men may reject feminism as a way of asserting their masculinity. High gender self-esteem in homosexual men may result in the usage of compensatory strategies as a way to reconcile these potentially contradictory identity components. Sanchez, Greenberg, Liu, and Vilain (2009) surveyed 547 self-identified gay men about the effects of their masculine ideals on their self-image and their same-sex relationships. Many participants noted that the masculine and feminine stereotypes upon which gender roles are based in the gay community have adverse effects on their self-image and romantic relationships. Importantly, results demonstrated that gay men feel pressure to appear masculine so that they will be accepted both by society, as well as by other gay men. Therefore, gay men may be unwilling to label themselves as feminists due to the persecution that they already experienced as a result of their sexual orientation. Indeed, homosexual men have been found to engage in a multitude of behaviors to counteract their lowered male status (See Gender Role Strain-Compensatory Strategies discussion).

Race

Race has always been a crucial factor in the feminist movement. Women of color have historically not viewed feminism as relevant to their particular concerns (Anderson et al., 2009), due, in part, to the glaring oversights made by first wave feminists with regard to race. In fact,

women of color tend to view men of color as allies in the fight against oppression, rather than viewing them as the perpetrators of it (Evans, Kincade, Marbley, & Seem, 2005; hooks, 1984; Renzetti & Curran, 1989). Even among the men's separatist groups, issues of race and class were largely ignored (Tarrant, 2009). The implicit assumption is that men have very much the same experience in life, regardless of their racial identity. However, being a man of color in a culture that privileges White men can be incredibly difficult.

Race and racial identity have been found to mediate feminist self-identification (Cowan et al., 1992; Harnois, 2005; Kane, 1992; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; White, 2006). The women's movement represents not one singular organization or identity, but a wide variety of groups with differing views, goals, and priorities (Joseph & Lewis, 1981). Not only is it constantly changing to fit the needs of emerging groups, but more importantly, the feminist movement recognizes that individuals experience multiple identities which place them within a "complex web of historical and social contexts" (Israeili & Santor, 2000, p. 244). As such, men of color may be more likely to reject hegemonic masculinity by identifying as a feminist because the movement itself recognizes the intersectionality of multiple identities.

Cultural differences associated with various racial identities allow for the possibility of multiple definitions of masculinity. African American men's construction of masculinity has been shown to differ considerably from dominant American conceptualizations by emphasizing more traditionally feminine processes, like the importance of interpersonal and emotional connections with others (Hammond & Mattis, 2005; Hunter & Davis, 1992). Hurtado and Sinha (2008) found similar results in their study of Latino feminist men, who seemed to hold a more relational, counter-hegemonic perspective on manhood. Indeed, because men of color do not "fit" the model of hegemonic masculinity, their definition of masculinity, and the self-esteem

they derive from it, is better informed by the presence of other intersecting identities, like race, sexual orientation, and class. As such, they may not experience the same negative consequences as White men who adopt a feminist label. A national study conducted by Kane (1992) found that African Americans, when compared to White Americans, are more likely to support feminist goals. Moreover, African American men were more likely to openly acknowledge sexism and support action geared towards addressing those issues than White men and women were. It is possible that men of color are not subject to the same stigma associated with feminist self-identification because participation in feminism is not perceived as threatening to their culturally specific conceptualization of masculinity. In this way, intersectionality is inextricably linked to feminist self-identification (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008).

Membership in a social group that has become politicized makes a positive sense of self more difficult to maintain (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008). This is especially true when membership is visibly communicated, as with racial identity. Hunter and Sellers (1998) addressed the question of divided loyalties between race and feminism within the African American community, which suggested that racism may be a more salient issue for men of color because their inability to conform to the hegemonic norm of masculinity is so readily apparent. Therefore, any sexism that they encounter may be perceived to be of lesser significance. Hurtado (1997) found that members of socially devalued groups are more likely to work towards revaluing their groups as a way to maintain a positive sense of self. Therefore, men of color might not label themselves as feminists due to their focus on reducing the stigma associated with their racial group membership. It is also possible that men of color, who are already discriminated against for their racial group membership, may be reluctant to adopt another stigmatized identity.

Thus, the relationship between race and feminist self-identification remains unclear. The aforementioned studies suggest that men of color are more likely to identify as feminists, perhaps because their own experiences of oppression provide a catalyst for the recognition of sex-based oppression; however, the pervasive negative effects of racism experienced by men and women of color suggests that race might be the single most important system of stratification that they experience. If this is the case, then devoting time and energy to combat sexism (and identifying as feminists) will likely not occur until resolution of racial discrimination is achieved. As such, race is an inconsistent mediator of feminist self-labeling (McCabe, 2005)

Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status also appears to play an important, albeit ambiguous, role in feminist self-identification. In general, higher education, and thus, income, is correlated with less traditional attitudes about gender for both men and women (Hatchett & Quick, 1983; Ransford & Miller, 1983; Thornton & Freedman, 1979). However, men whose families are financially dependent upon multiple sources of income may not attribute any social stigma to women working to support their families (Hunter & Sellers, 1998). Such men may be more willing endorse feminist attitudes due to the economic advantages (equal pay for women) associated with feminism. Admittedly, a lack of negative attitudes towards women who transgress traditional gender roles by working outside of the home does not necessarily translate into male feminist self-identification. Still, support for the economic equality of women remains an important facet of feminist goals. Black men, in particular, show marked differences in gender attitudes depending on whether or not their mothers worked outside of the home. Ransford and Miller (1983) and Hershey (1978) found that more egalitarian views were seen in Black men whose mothers held blue-collar jobs. As such, men from lower SES, who tend also to

be men of color, may be more likely to identify as feminists than men who are capable of fulfilling the hegemonic masculinity role of breadwinner.

Greater exposure to feminism may help to dispel or reduce the negative stereotypes associated with feminism and feminists, which could ultimately impact the level of support for the feminist movement (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004; Duncan, 2010). Thus, the development of a feminist consciousness may reflect a socialization process in the educational system. Research has shown that education is directly related to liberalism (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004), and that education has a liberalizing effect on men and women's attitudes about sex discrimination (Ransford & Miller, 1983; Thornton & Freedman, 1979). As a result, feminists have been found to have higher levels of education (Duncan, 2010; McCabe, 2008; Zucker, 2004).

Men with higher SES may also be more likely to identify as feminists because they are afforded certain privileges as a result of their social class. Economic power, which frequently translates into social and political power, allows men a greater degree of freedom; freedom even, to engage in behaviors that transgress traditional gender roles (Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Smith, 1999; Tarrant, 2009). As such, these men may not experience the social backlash from publicly supporting stigmatized identities, like feminist. Indeed, great wealth or high social standing may act as a buffer, allowing men of privilege to forego some of the typical posturing that occurs in the performance of masculinity. Therefore, men of high social status or income may actually be more likely to identify as feminists than other men.

It is also plausible that having such privilege may enhance men's sense of entitlement and reinforce feelings of power. Such men may be less likely to self-label as feminists because they wish to maintain the system of privilege from which they directly benefit. Even well intentioned men of high socioeconomic class may inadvertently reproduce gender inequities by dominating

feminist activism groups, an outcome that has been found countless times throughout the movement's history (McMillen, 2008). As with race and sexual orientation, the relationship between SES and feminist self-identification remains unclear.

Religion and Politics

Two of the best predictors of feminist identity are religion and politics. In predominantly Christian societies, men's resistance to feminism and feminist identification may be the result of religious beliefs. Christianity, like many of the world's major religions, is patriarchal. God is conceived of as being masculine, with supreme power over the universe, whose son is the savior of all mankind. God created Adam, the first man, in His image. And seemingly as an afterthought, he created the first woman, Eve, out of Adam's spare rib (Stern, 1970). Eve's sole purpose was to be a companion for Adam, to bear his children, and to help him on Earth. Many Christian denominations blame Eve for man's fall from grace when she convinced Adam to eat from the forbidden tree. This "original" sin provides the essential justification for why men ought to have power over their wives and daughters. Even in modern day Protestant weddings, the idea that women are a form of property is maintained through the practice of the father "giving" his daughter to her new husband, whom she promises to "obey" (Stern, 1970). These practices communicate clear messages to believers about appropriate gender roles. Conceptualized in this way, women and men who fail to adequately perform their respective duties are disobeying God's will.

If feminist identification among men is considered by some to be a transgression of gender roles, particularly if that man is homosexual, then religiosity can be expected to significantly impact feminist self-identification. Numerous studies have suggested a consistent relationship between religious affiliation and support for feminism. Suter and Toller (2006)

found that some men and women were reluctant to label themselves as feminists because they believed it conflicted with their religious identity and threatened the gender roles set forth by the church. Likewise, Hunter and Sellers (1998) found that the more African American men were involved in church, the less likely they were to support egalitarian gender roles. Some individuals have even explained the gender inequality found in American society as “God’s will” (McCabe, 2005). This would suggest that these men would also be less likely to support feminism or identify as feminists. In the United States, Jewish people have been found to be the most supportive of nontraditional gender roles, with conservative Protestants being the least supportive, and mainline Protestants and Catholics falling in the middle (Hoffman & Miller, 1997, 1998). Identification with more fundamental religious beliefs is also associated with more negative attitudes towards lesbians and gay men (Herek, 1988; Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Schwartz & Lindley, 2005). Due to the fact that male feminists are often thought to be gay, men who are members of these religious groups will very likely avoid feminist identification.

Political affiliation is another factor consistently related to feminist self-identification. In fact, political ideology may be the best predictor of male feminist self-identification because men lack the direct life experiences of sexism that typically lead women to identify as feminists (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004). Democratic Party affiliation and liberalism show a strong correlation to feminism (Cowan et al., 1992; McCabe, 2005). Indeed, Twenge and Zucker (1999) found that feminists were rated as significantly more assertive and more politically liberal than women in general. This prompted McCabe (2005) to suggest that feminist self-identification may actually be a specific kind of liberal political view. The author suggested that some men and women have objected to feminism on political grounds, citing opposition to issues like abortion and the right to have multiple sexual partners as reasons why they did not identify

as feminists. Still others rejected a feminist label due to their desire to get married and have children (Suter & Toller, 2006), which suggests that people may confuse feminists with those who do not wish to marry or have children. Suter and Toller suggested that when the feminist label is in conflict with some other identity (religious, political, or otherwise), the individual is less likely to endorse a feminist label. Therefore, men who are liberal-minded and Democratically affiliated are the most likely to identify as feminists.

Although men are afforded certain privileges based on their sex, they may concurrently experience oppression from other men as a result of their race, class, sexuality, or religious affiliation. Therefore, men who do not fit the hegemonic norm of masculinity hold a perilous position in society, one in which they are both oppressed, and the oppressor (Tarrant, 2009). Further research should continue to explore factors that impact male feminist self-identification so that feminists can better understand why some men choose not to label themselves as feminists, and to develop more effective ways of making feminism applicable to these groups.

Age

Researchers have also suggested that the complex pattern of feminist identification in women may be mediated by age. At the present time, there are no studies that have examined the relationship between age and feminist identification in men. However, conclusions may be drawn based upon the existing research concerning feminist identification in women.

Stewart and Healy (1989) proposed a personality and social change theory that suggested that the same event may have vastly different effects on different birth cohorts, depending on the stage of the development that the cohort was in when the event occurred. According to the authors, events experienced in childhood and early adolescence influenced fundamental values and expectations; events experienced in early adulthood were liable to impact life choices,

opportunities, and conscious identity; events experienced in mature adulthood were suggested to influence actual behavior; and finally, events experienced in later adulthood prompt a revision of identity and influence new opportunities and choices. In the context of the women's movement, then, women who grew up during the second wave (often considered to be the heyday of the movement) were hypothesized to be more likely to have the ideals of the feminist movement integrated into their fundamental values and expectations for the world than older cohorts of women. Admittedly, acceptance of feminist values does not necessarily translate into the adoption of a feminist identity. However, it seems reasonable to suggest that women who grew up during a time when feminist ideals and activism were at their peak, would be more likely to self-label as feminists when compared to women who grew up in a time before feminism gained popularity and support.

Several studies have examined the hypothesized cohort effect in an attempt to better understand feminist identification. Zucker (2004) compared three collegiate alumnae classes on a variety of factors, including feminist identification and activism. Participants were split into three groups: feminists, who accepted the feminist label and held feminist beliefs, egalitarians, who held feminist beliefs, but either rejected or had mixed feelings about the feminist label, and nonfeminists, who rejected both feminist beliefs and the label. Women in the class of 1972 were much more likely to identify as feminists (51%) than nonfeminists (19%) or egalitarians (30%). However, the women from the class of 1992 were much more likely to identify as feminists (58%) than nonfeminist (20%) or egalitarians (22%), $\chi^2(4, 272) = 19.28, p < .001$. Women from the class of 1951/52 were significantly lower on the majority of measures of feminist consciousness than the other two groups. However, there were no significant cohort differences in feminist activism. Thus, there appears to be mixed support for Stewart and Healy's (1989)

theory. On the one hand, the aforementioned findings suggest that women who came of age before the second wave of feminism tended to be less involved with the movement on a variety of levels. On the other hand, there were no cohort differences between those who grew up during the second wave of feminism and those who came of age in its aftermath.

Duncan (2010) compared the willingness to self-label as a feminist in two generations: the Baby Boomers (born between 1943 and 1960) and Generation Xers (born between 1961 and 1975). Participants were split into three feminist identification groups: Strong feminists, weak feminists (akin to nonlabelers or egalitarians; see Zucker, 2004), and nonfeminists. Although Baby Boomers were more likely to self identify as strong feminists than Generation Xers, strong feminists, regardless of generation, held roughly equivalent views and were equally active in comparison to the other two groups. Overall, results showed that there was little meaningful difference between the generations in activism or feminist attitudes. Thus, the relationship between age and willingness to endorse a feminist label and to participate in the women's movement remains unclear.

Recognition of Power and Guilt

Feminist identity might also be discounted because an acknowledgment of inequities between men and women is inherently threatening to the patriarchal power structure. "No one wants to acknowledge that their comforts are made possible through the suffering of others. It is taboo to name power" (Hagan, 1992, p. 58). In order to preserve the patriarchal system, such inequities must be denied or hidden. Thus, one of the most common complaints about the feminist movement is that it is a relic of the past. By attributing men's current positions (and the value attached to these positions) to a simple matter of coincidence, the concerns of women are denied a sense of legitimacy and societal responsibility is denied.

In essence, then, for a man to adopt the label “feminist” is akin to admitting that the privileges that he has been afforded by virtue of his sex are unearned. Moreover, even if a man acknowledges that gender discrimination is present, he will likely not want to relinquish any power. Indeed, no group willingly relinquishes control; instead, they use various means to reinforce and maintain the status quo (Lipman-Blumen, 1984). The problem lies in the fact that power is conceptualized as a limited resource (Tarrant, 2009). In this way, feminism represents not only the desire for equal rights for women, but the demand for men to give up their unearned privileges, as well. Therefore, support of feminism may be viewed as a loss for men, a loss of power and status. Giving power to a group of individuals that has been systematically oppressed can be a scary concept. Will women retaliate? Will manhood and masculinity become devalued?

Such musings may lead some men who recognize their role in women’s oppression, both direct and indirect, to feel overwhelming guilt, despair, or anger (Gough, 2001). So pervasive is belief in “natural” power differentials between men and women, that it is possible that some men reject a feminist label because they believe that widespread change is impossible. Indeed, they may be convinced that current hierarchies have *always* existed (Lipman-Blumen, 1984), thereby making the complete erasure of sexism an insurmountable task. For these men, feminism may well represent a waste of time, energy, and resources. It may make men feel defensive, as well. Although men may not consciously participate in sexism, they do benefit from it. Guilt or fear-based defensiveness can be expressed in a multitude of ways. One way is for men to focus on their own oppression. By solely emphasizing the discrimination that they experience based on their sexual orientation, race, class, or religion, men mask masculine privilege (Tarrant, 2009).

Although men are afforded certain privileges based on their sex, they may concurrently experience oppression from other men as a result of their race, class, sexuality, or religion. Thus, men who fail to uphold the hegemonic norm of masculinity hold a perilous position in society, one in which they are both oppressed, and the oppressor (Tarrant, 2009). Further research should continue to explore factors that impact male feminist self-identification so that feminists can better understand why some men choose not to label themselves as feminists, and to develop more effective ways of making feminism applicable to these groups.

I'm A Feminist...So, Now What?

As Edley and Wetherell (2001) suggested, many men have responded positively to feminism and have worked extensively in supporting feminist goals. Despite the increase in male support for feminist goals, men may unintentionally reproduce patriarchal norms. Even if a man identifies as a feminist, this does not preclude him from behaving in a sexist manner. The following section will explore the ways in which even feminist men with the best intentions may inadvertently reinforce sexism.

Hostile vs. Benevolent Sexism

One way in which feminist men may unwittingly engage in sexist behaviors is through benevolent sexism. Due to their work on ambivalent sexism, Glick and Fiske (1997) found that men concurrently hold negative and positive views of women. The authors conceptualized these disparate attitudes as hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, respectively. Sexism, as it has been conventionally described, is hostile or prejudicial attitudes towards women or men. However, much of the literature on sexism has been focused on sexism towards women. *Hostile sexism* is typically reserved for women that challenge the status quo, like feminists and lesbians (Kilmartin, 2007). *Benevolent sexism*, the authors argued, is far more insidious. Benevolent

sexism subordinates women under the guise of protective, or even complimentary attitudes towards women. Common examples of benevolent sexism are beliefs that women are morally superior and more refined than men, that men ought to protect women from the harsh realities of the world, or that men are responsible for treasuring women (Anderson et al., 2009). By propogating such beliefs, women are relegated to conventional gender roles in which they are subordinate to men. Indeed, women who conform to benevolent sexism myths are often rewarded and held up as paragons of femininity and virtue. Women may even invite this subtle oppression, believing that male domination is necessary, a kindness done to ensure the protection of women. More importantly, stereotypes about the virtues of women, many of which are predicated on their “inherent” goodness or vulnerability, create a special, protective role for men which allows them to maintain their preeminance (Glick & Fiske, 1997).

Such relations are problematic, however, as they introduce the possibility of male feminists acting as protectors of their female counterparts. Instead of working to reduce sexism, male feminists’ participation in protectionist models (and women’s tacit acceptance of them) perpetuates the very same gender stereotypes that the feminist movement works to dismiss (Kilmartin, 2007; Tarrant, 2009). This complex process has not been extensively documented, although tentative conclusions can be drawn from the study of feminist fraternity brothers. Wantland (2005) reported changes in fraternity members’ behavior over the course of two semesters while taking part in a rape education course. Initially, students displayed the masculine posturing typically seen in an all-male setting. After moving past the feelings of anger and defensiveness brought on by “male-bashing,” (p. 159) they developed a greater awareness of how society encourages sexual violence and homophobia. However, class members, now armed with increased recognition of sexism, reconceptualized their roles as the heroes or protectors of

women. Thus, despite the strides they made in examining their own masculine privilege, these young men quickly slipped into a mindset of benevolent sexism. Instead of viewing women as newfound partners in the fight against sexism, the fraternity members reinforced the idea that women are weak, powerless victims who are dependent on men for protection. This study illustrates the possibility that male feminists, because they are more cognizant of overt displays of sexism, may actually engage in more subtle, benevolent forms of sexism. In summary, male feminists must be careful to ensure that they are not just updating or modernizing existing patriarchal practices or structures.

Gender Role Strain-Compensatory Strategies

In addition to being vulnerable to more participation in more subtle forms of sexism, men who identify as feminists may also experience gender role strain. Gender Role Strain theory (Pleck, 1981) proposes that psychological health is dependent upon successful integration of either a masculine or feminine identity, depending on one's sex. "Gaining the full privileges of manhood is thus shown to depend not merely on being recognized as male, but on the whole ensemble of signs that are conventionally taken as evidence of a masculine self" (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009, p. 284). As a result, men occupy a unique position within society; viewed as powerful, yet often feeling powerless. Some men feel powerless because masculinity must be constantly proven. Dowd (2010) argued that "masculinity can never be simply achieved and claimed. It is easy to be a woman; it is a constant struggle to be a man" (p. 44). Therefore, men must constantly defend against potential threats to their masculinity by adhering to socially constructed gender norms. Gender norms, however, are problematic because they are inconsistent and contradictory. The violation of social norms by failing to adhere to gendered expectations for behavior causes both negative consequences and psychological distress. In fact,

gender role failure in one area may lead an individual to overcompensate in other areas. Because “feminist” is an identity perceived to be a threat to hegemonic masculinity and the patriarchal order, men who adopt this label may engage in compensatory strategies as a means of reasserting their masculinity.

Courtenay (2000) suggested that men who are marginalized due to their race, sexuality, socioeconomic status, or education level, and thus fail to conform to the hegemonic ideal of masculinity, might enact their masculinity in other ways. For example, men are able to reassert their manhood by pointing out instances of failed masculinity in other men (Corbett, 2001; Hamilton, 2007; Kimmel, 2000; Pascoe, 2005). Other research seems to suggest that marginalized men may participate in risky or even socially undesirable behavior to reaffirm their masculinity. Wantland (2005) noted that even when fraternity brothers were uncomfortable with sexist jokes told by their peers, they laughed along with them in order to maintain their status within the all-male group. Homosexual men, who reject the crucial heterosexuality component of hegemonic masculinity, express their manhood through sexual risk-taking (Courtenay, 2000; Green & Halkitis, 2006), misogyny (Frye, 1983), and the creation of a subculture that celebrates muscularity (Hennen, 2005). Men of color and lower SES assert their masculinity through heavy drinking (Eastman & Schrock, 2008; Tilki, 2006), sports and fighting (Anderson, 1999; Wacquant, 2003), and crime (Messerschmidt, 1993).

On a broader scale, Brooks (2001) explored areas that are associated with traditional masculinity. These include participation in violence, sexual misconduct or sexual excess, alcohol and drug abuse, neglect of personal needs, and overall risk taking. Brooks (2001) suggested that men use alcohol as a way to cope with perceived role failures or life stressors. American society also communicates to men that engaging in sexual aggression and frequent

sexual activity are ways to validate or reassert masculinity (Brooks, 2001). Brooks (2001) also noted that men are more likely to end up in prison, four times as likely to commit suicide, four times more likely to be homicide victims than women, and represent 70% of individuals who have not been to the doctor in more than five years. These disturbing trends suggest that men participate in these risky, self-destructive behaviors because they are considered “manly.” Moreover, men who fail to uphold traditional masculine ideals in some way engage in risky activities at even greater rates. Therefore, male feminists may be at greater risk to engage in these behaviors as a compensatory strategy for their perceived gender role transgression. It is also plausible to suggest that gender self-esteem moderates the use of compensatory strategies. Indeed, men with high gender self-esteem may be more likely to experience gender role strain and therefore may be more likely to use compensatory strategies when their masculinity is threatened. As such, gender role strain may be more problematic for some men than others, and research in this area needs to be conducted.

Present Study

The present study was intended to continue the work of Pierce et al. (2003) and Anderson (2009) by examining the effect of feminist orientation and sexual orientation on character ratings. In the current study, the feminist orientation and sexual orientation of a male vignette character were experimentally manipulated. The character was identified as a feminist, anti-feminist, or non-feminist, and as heterosexual or homosexual. Characters that are considered to be non-feminists support goals of the feminist movement, but do not identify as feminists. Anti-feminists are characters that are strongly opposed to the goals of the feminist movement and do not identify as feminists. Characters that are considered to be feminists support the goals of the feminist movement and identify as feminists. All other descriptors and extraneous information

were identical across the vignettes. The six possible combinations were as follows:

Heterosexual-Feminist, Heterosexual-Non-Feminist, Heterosexual-Anti-Feminist, Homosexual-Feminist, Homosexual-Non-Feminist, or Homosexual Anti-Feminist. After reading one of the six vignettes, participants rated the hypothetical man on two dimensions: Competence and Warmth. These dimensions were designed to measure stereotypes associated with masculinity and femininity in various out-groups, like feminists (Fiske et al., 2002).

Based on the literature, several hypotheses were explored: 1) Heterosexual men and women would attribute fewer masculine (competent) traits toward men who identify as gay, feminist, or both. 1a) A man identified as heterosexual and non-feminist would be rated as more competent and less warm by both men and women compared to a man identified as homosexual and feminist. 1b) Heterosexual men would rate the feminist man as less competent and more warm than heterosexual women. 2) Heterosexual men, but not heterosexual women, who endorse high levels of gender self-esteem would endorse less positive attitudes toward feminism. 3) Negative attitudes towards feminism would be correlated with more conservative political affiliation and higher levels of religiosity.

Method

Design

This study utilized vignettes to investigate attitudes towards male feminists in a quasi-experimental design. Participants read a vignette about a hypothetical male character whose sexual orientation and feminist orientation were manipulated. All other descriptors and extraneous information were identical across the vignettes. The six possible combinations were as follows: Heterosexual- Feminist, Heterosexual-Non-Feminist, Heterosexual-Anti-Feminist, Homosexual Feminist, Homosexual-Non-Feminist, or Homosexual-Anti-Feminist. Participants

were randomly assigned to one of six vignettes and were asked to rate the character on a variety of dimensions that correspond to traditional male and female traits. The predictor variables were participants' gender, and the character's sexual orientation and feminist orientation, with the latter two being manipulated in the vignette. The criterion variables were the dimensional ratings on the Warmth and Competence subscales, which are designed to measure stereotypes associated with masculinity and femininity, as well as ratings on a scale of feminist attitudes.

Participants

Participants were a convenience sample of male and female undergraduate students from Indiana State University. Of the 600 initial participants, 24 were excluded for not completing questionnaires, and 110 were excluded for incorrectly responding to questions on the manipulation check regarding the character's feminist orientation and sexual orientation. This left a sample of 466 participants (117 men and 349 women). One participant did not report whether they were a transgender man or woman. Of the 465 that did, four participants identified as transgender, representing 0.9% of the sample. One participant did not report their sexual orientation. Of the 465 that did, the majority were Heterosexual only (86.5%), followed by Heterosexual mostly (6.9%), Heterosexual/Gay or Lesbian equally (2.2%), Other (1.5%), Gay or Lesbian only (1.3%), Heterosexual somewhat more (0.9%), Gay or Lesbian mostly (0.6%), or Gay or Lesbian somewhat more (0.2%). The majority of participants were first year students (53%), followed by sophomores (23%), seniors (12.7%), juniors (11.2%), and graduate students (0.2%). Participants were largely Caucasian (70.0%), followed by African American (21.5%), Biracial (3.4%), Hispanic (2.8%), Asian (1.5%), Other (0.6%), and Middle Eastern (0.2%). The average age was 20.35 years ($SD = 4.3$), but participants' ages ranged from 18-55 years. The participants were relatively evenly split with regard to political affiliation, with the majority

identifying as Democrat (30.7%), followed by Independent (20.8%), Republican (20.6%), or Other (2.8%). A significant number of participants indicated that they did not know their political affiliation (25.1%). The importance of religion varied from Very important (32.6%), Moderately important (28.5%), Slightly important (16.1%), Not important at all (11.4%), Moderately unimportant (6.2%), to Slightly unimportant (5.2%).

Power Analysis

There are no data documenting the specific factors that mediate male feminist identification and few have investigated the stereotypes associated with male feminists. However, it is generally accepted that a medium effect size is appropriate because it represents an effect that is noticeable to the careful observer (Cohen, 1992). Consistent with suggestions for determining sample size in a multivariate analysis of variance design with four groups, a sample of approximately 210 participants (35 per group) was needed to detect a medium effect between the variables of interest (i.e., gender of participant, feminist orientation of the vignette character, sexual orientation of the vignette character, attitudes toward male feminists, gender self-esteem, and ratings on warmth and competence scales) with an α of 0.05 and power of .80. The current research obtained a sample of 466 undergraduate participants.

Materials

Vignettes. Participants were randomly assigned to one of six possible vignettes, created for this study, describing a hypothetical man whose sexual orientation and feminist orientation were manipulated. The vignette conditions were as follows: Heterosexual- Feminist, Heterosexual-Non-Feminist, Heterosexual-Anti-Feminist, Homosexual Feminist, Homosexual-Non-Feminist, or Homosexual-Anti-Feminist. All other descriptors and extraneous information were identical across the vignettes. See Appendix B.

Competence and Warmth Dimensions. After reading one of the six vignettes, participants rated the hypothetical man on two dimensions: Competence and Warmth. These dimensions are designed to measure stereotypes associated with masculinity and femininity in various out-groups, like feminists. The Competence scale (Fiske et al., 2002; See Appendix C) is composed of six items typically associated with stereotypical masculinity, which include (1) Competent, (2) Confident, (3) Capable, (4) Efficient, (5) Skillful, and (6) Intelligent. Participants also completed the Warmth scale (Fiske et al., 2002; See Appendix C) which is composed of six items traditionally associated with stereotypical femininity: (1) Friendly, (2) Warm, (3) Good natured, (4) Well-intentioned, (5) Trustworthy, and (6) Sincere. Participants rated the vignette character on each of the aforementioned items using a five-point scale from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Extremely). Thus, the maximum score on both the Warmth and Competence measures was 30. Using ratings from student and non-student samples, Fiske et al. (2002) found good internal consistency for both the competence scale ($\alpha = .85$ to $.90$) and the warmth scale ($\alpha = .82$) using 23 separate comparison groups, including feminists. Based on their analyses, the authors concluded that the warmth and competence dimensions adequately differentiated the groups, with large Warmth effect sizes by Cohen's (2003) standards. Feminists, in particular, were perceived by participants to be significantly more competent than warm, although it is likely that participants assumed the feminist category to be composed of women, as sex of the feminist was not specified. Internal consistency for these scales was calculated with this population. The Warmth alpha coefficient for the current sample was 0.88 and the Competence alpha coefficient was 0.81.

Manipulation Check. Participants completed a manipulation check that asked for the character's sexual orientation and feminist orientation. Participants who incorrectly responded to

these questions were excluded from data analysis. See Appendix D.

The Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale. This questionnaire is a shortened version of a 60-item scale developed by Morgan (1996) to measure liberal feminist attitudes. The Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale (LFAIS, Short, Form; Morgan, 1996; See Appendix E for complete list of items) is an 11-item scale intended to predict overt-feminist-related behaviors. The short form consists of statements relating to issues of political, economic, and gender role equality for women, with four items worded for reverse coding. All of the items were from the “feminist ideology” or “feminist goals” domain of the standard LFAIS. For example, one item states “A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.” Participants rated their agreement to items using six-point Likert-type scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating a strong feminist position and agreement with feminist attitudes. The total possible score on the short form ranged from 11 to 66, with higher scores indicating more positive feminist attitudes. The long form of this questionnaire was found to have an overall Cronbach’s alpha of .94 when administered to an undergraduate sample; the short form was found to have a Cronbach’s alpha of .84 among the undergraduate sample (Morgan, 1996). Test-retest reliability was conducted over a span of four weeks using only the 60-item scale, and the Pearson correlation was 0.83. The long version of this questionnaire had good convergent validity with the short version of the LFAIS, as well as with a measure of political liberalism, a measure of socio-political efficacy, and with other feminism measures. The long version of the questionnaire was also found to have divergent validity with measures of social desirability and personal efficacy. The eleven items selected for the short version of this questionnaire were found to be particularly predictive of future feminist behaviors, and were labeled as statements of feminist ideology or feminist goals, rather than

endorsements of certain gender-role beliefs (Morgan, 1996). Internal reliability and consistency was computed for this sample and found to be sufficient, with an alpha coefficient of 0.78.

Collective Self-Esteem. Participants were asked to complete the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSE; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; See Appendix F). The CSE is a 16-item scale intended to measure aspects of self-esteem that are related to membership in a social group. The current study modified the scale to measure collective self-esteem towards the participant's gender group (i.e., I feel good about my gender group). The measure includes four subscales, and each subscale contains four items. Only the total score was used in the current analyses. All the items are scored on a Likert-type scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). The possible range overall is 16-112, with higher scores indicating higher gender self-esteem. Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) found good internal consistency (total scale $\alpha = .85$), construct validity, and test-retest reliability. The authors also concluded that altering the measure for a specific group does not appear to compromise the psychometric properties of the scale. The alpha coefficient for the current study was 0.84.

Social Desirability. The participants were asked to complete the Social Desirability Scale-17 (SDS-17; Stöber, 2001; See Appendix H for full list of items). The SDS-17 questionnaire has 16 items designed to measure the extent to which respondents are answering items in a socially desirable, less candid way. An example of an item is "I always admit my mistakes openly and face the potential negative consequences." Participants were asked to answer "True" or "False" to each item; "True" items are then given one point each and a sum total calculated, for a total possible range of scores from 0 to 16, with higher scores indicating a stronger pattern of answering questions in a socially desirable manner. Questionnaire items demonstrated good internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .80. This questionnaire has

shown good convergent validity with several other established measures of social desirability, including the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) Lie Scale (particularly the EPQ measure of social desirability), the Marlowe-Crowne Scale, the Sets of Four Scale, and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, or BIDR. In addition, the SDS-17 has been found to have good discriminant validity with many personality measures, including the EPQ scales of neuroticism, extraversion, and psychoticism, and the NEO Five Factor Inventory (FFI) scales of neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience. There is also some evidence that the SDS-17, unlike other measures of social desirability, is a particularly good measure of social desirability in the absence of symptoms of psychopathology. The alpha coefficient for the current sample was 0.73.

Participant Feminist Orientation. Feminist identification was measured using a scale developed by Myaskovsky and Wittig (1997; See Appendix I). Participants chose one of the following seven statements: (1) I do not consider myself a feminist at all, and I believe that feminists are harmful to family life and undermine relations between women and men; (2) I do not consider myself a feminist; (3) I agree with some of the objectives of the feminist movement but do not call myself a feminist; (4) I agree with most of the objectives of the feminist movement but do not call myself a feminist; (5) I privately consider myself a feminist but do not call myself a feminist around others; (6) I call myself a feminist around others; and (7) I call myself a feminist around others and am currently active in the women's movement. Higher scores indicate a stronger feminist identification.

Demographics Questionnaire. Finally, participants answered additional demographic questions regarding their age, gender, sexual orientation, race, year in school, religiosity, and political affiliation (Appendix I). Political affiliation, in particular, has been reliably shown to

impact feminist identification, with more liberal individuals being more likely to identify as feminists than those with conservative political beliefs. Participants were asked to indicate what political party best represented their political affiliation using a five-point scale (1= Democrat, 2= Republican, 3= Independent, 4= Other, 5= Don't know). Participants were also asked to indicate whether their affiliation was strong or not strong and whether they identified more as a Republican or Democrat. Participants rated how important their religion/spirituality is to them using a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) Not important at all to (6) Very important. Finally, using a variation of the Klein Sexual Orientation Grid (Klein, Sepekoff, & Wolf, 1985), participants rated their present sexual orientation on a seven-point Likert-type scale: 1) Heterosexual only, 2) Heterosexual mostly, 3) More Heterosexual than Lesbian or Gay, 4) Heterosexual/Lesbian or Gay equally, 5) More Lesbian or Gay than Heterosexual, 6) Lesbian or Gay mostly, or 7) Lesbian or Gay only. See Appendix I.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from undergraduate courses at Indiana State University using the experiment recruiting tracking system online (i.e., SONA systems). They were provided with a brief description of the study so that they could decide whether or not they wanted to participate. (See Appendix A for the Informed Consent form). Individual computer-based administration was completed online using a Qualtrics survey. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of the six vignettes: Heterosexual- Feminist (67 women, 16 men), Heterosexual-Non-Feminist (59 women, 31 men), Heterosexual-Anti-Feminist (58 women, 22 men), Homosexual Feminist (38 women, 17 men), Homosexual-Non-Feminist (66 women, 18 men), or Homosexual-Anti-Feminist (61 women, 13 men). After reading the vignette, participants completed the measures. The Warmth and Competence ratings were always

completed first, and the demographic questionnaire was completed last. The manipulation check was completed immediately after the Warmth and Competence ratings and immediately prior to all remaining questionnaires. Completion of the questionnaires took approximately 30 minutes. After the measures were completed, participants were provided with a written debriefing statement (See Appendix J).

Results

Descriptive Analyses

Several bivariate analyses were used to calculate correlations between all continuous variables (i.e., LFAIS, SDS-17, and CSES scores). The Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale was significantly and positively correlated with the Collective Self-Esteem Scale for women, but not for men. The Warmth and Competence ratings were significantly correlated for both men and women. In addition, the CSES was significantly correlated with Competence ratings for men, but not for women. The SDS-17 did not correlate significantly with the CSES, LFAIS, Warmth or Competence scales for women or for men. See Table 1 for correlations between aforementioned scales for both women and men.

Participants who responded 1 or 2 on the feminist orientation scale were categorized as being anti-feminist (do not consider themselves feminist); responses of 3, 4, and 5 were categorized as non-feminist (agree with feminist objectives but do not call themselves feminists); and responses of 6 and 7 were categorized as feminist (call themselves feminists). Two participants did not report their feminist orientation. Of the 464 that did, the majority of participants identified as Non-feminists (62.1%), followed by Anti-feminist (25.6%), and Feminist (12.3%). The majority of men identified as Non-feminist (64.7%), followed by Anti-feminist (31%), and Feminist (4.3%). Similarly, most women identified as Non-feminist

(61.2%), followed by Anti-feminist (23.9%), and Feminist (14.9%).

Women were more likely than men to identify as feminists (14.9% versus 4.3%) and men were more likely than women to identify as anti-feminists (31% versus 23.9%), $X^2(2, N = 464) = 9.92, p = .007$. Similar percentages of women and men identified as non-feminist (64.7% of men and 61.2% of women). Finally, compared to men, women had significantly higher LFAIS scores, $F(1, 463) = 45.67, p < .001, d = .69$. SDS-17 and CSES scores did not differ by gender $F(1, 464) = 0.004, p = .951, d = .007$, and $F(1, 465) = 0.067, p = .796, d = -.028$, respectively. See Table 2 for the means and standard deviations for women's and men's scores.

Multivariate results indicated a significant effect for participant gender on Warmth and Competence ratings, $F(2, 463) = 5.86, p = .003, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .025$. However, univariate results indicated no significant gender differences for the Warmth, $F(1, 464) = 0.24, p = .628, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .001$, or for the Competence scales, $F(1, 464) = 3.37, p = 0.067, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .007$. See Table 2 for the means and standard deviations.

Attributions of Warmth and Competence to Vignette Character

Significant correlations between attitudes towards feminism, collective self-esteem, Warmth, and Competence measures justified using a multivariate analysis of covariance. As such, a 2x2x3 factorial multivariate analysis of covariance was conducted to test the hypotheses that: (1) Heterosexual men and women will attribute fewer masculine (competent) traits toward men identified as gay, feminist, or both, (1a) A man identified as heterosexual and non-feminist will be rated as more competent and less warm by both men and women compared to the man identified as gay and feminist, and (1b) Heterosexual men will rate the feminist man as less competent and more warm than heterosexual women. Gender of the participant, character's sexual orientation, and the character's feminist orientation were entered as the independent

variables and the ratings of the character on the Warmth and Competence measures were the dependent variables. Scores on the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) were entered as covariates; however, these scores did not significantly contribute to the results. See Table 3 for the means and standards deviations for the Warmth and Competence ratings as a function of vignette and participant gender.

Two multivariate main effects were significant. See Table 4 for the multivariate results of the Warmth and Competence ratings. Participant gender and the feminist orientation of the vignette character significantly influenced the Warmth and Competence ratings of the vignette character.

See Table 5 for univariate results of Warmth and Competence ratings. Univariate analyses indicated that in comparison to men, women assigned higher Competence scores to the vignette character, regardless of the character's feminist or sexual orientation. Also, feminist characters received the highest Warmth and Competence ratings, followed by non-feminists, and anti-feminists. Tukey's post-hoc analyses showed that anti-feminist characters received significantly lower scores on both the Warmth and Competence measures when compared to feminist and non-feminist characters, $p < .001$. Warmth, $p = .831$, and Competence ratings, $p = .183$, did not differ significantly between feminist and non-feminist characters. None of the other main effects or interactions were significant.

Gender, Gender Self-esteem, Attitudes Toward Feminism, and Feminist Orientation

To test the second hypothesis that heterosexual men, but not heterosexual women, with high levels of gender self-esteem will endorse less positive attitudes towards feminism, separate correlations were calculated between gender self-esteem and attitudes towards feminism for men and women (See Table 1). After controlling for social desirability, gender self-esteem was not

significantly related to attitudes towards feminism for men. In contrast, higher levels of gender self-esteem were correlated with more positive attitudes toward feminism in women.

An analysis of covariance was conducted in order to determine the influence of men's feminist orientation on their gender self-esteem ratings. Due to the small sample size, the feminist and non-feminist categories on the feminist orientation scale were combined and subsequently compared to anti-feminists. Scores on the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) were entered as covariates; however, these scores did not significantly contribute to the results, $F(1, 113) = .16, p = .694$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$. Univariate analyses demonstrated that there were no significant differences in the gender self-esteem levels of feminist/non-feminist men ($M = 84.6, SD = 12.9$) and anti-feminist men ($M = 84.5, SD = 14.5$), $F(1, 113) = .01, p = .941$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$.

A second ANCOVA was calculated using the same independent and dependent variables, and covariate, but with women. The effect of SDS-17 scores was not significant, $F(1, 344) = .08, p = .778$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$. Given the larger sample size of women, feminist orientations were left in the original categories (Anti-feminist, non-feminist, or feminist). Gender self-esteem levels did not differ significantly between feminist ($M = 85.0, SD = 10.7$), non-feminist ($M = 85.0, SD = 12.0$), and anti-feminist women ($M = 82.3, SD = 12.4$), $F(2, 344) = 1.68, p = .187$, partial $\eta^2 = .010$. Thus, men's and women's gender self-esteem scores did not vary significantly based upon their reported feminist orientation.

Political Affiliation, Religiosity, and Attitudes Toward Feminism

To test the third hypothesis that negative attitudes toward feminism would be correlated with more conservative political affiliation, separate independent samples t-tests were conducted

using self-identified Democrats and Republicans as the independent variable, and LFAIS scores as the dependent variable.

Participants who identified as strong Democrats had significantly more positive attitudes toward feminism ($n = 89, M = 53.6, SD = 7.2$) than not strong Democrats ($n = 54, M = 51.0, SD = 6.8$), $t(141) = 2.1, p = .038$. Conversely, analyses showed a marginally significant difference in self-identified Republicans' responses on the LFAIS measure. Participants who identified as strong Republicans had less positive attitudes toward feminism ($n = 54, M = 47.0, SD = 6.4$) than those who identified as not strong Republicans ($n = 42, M = 49.5, SD = 6.1$), $t(94) = -1.91, p = .060$.

In order to determine the relationship between participants' religiosity and their attitudes toward feminism, several partial correlations were conducted, controlling for social desirability scores. Overall, there was a significant negative correlation between participants' religiosity and their LFAIS scores, $r(462) = -.112, p = .015$. Participants with higher levels of religiosity tended to have less positive attitudes toward feminism than those with lower levels of religiosity. Separate correlations were calculated for men and women in order to detect gender differences. After controlling for social desirability, religiosity was not significantly related to attitudes towards feminism for men, $r(114) = -.159, p = .089$. In contrast, there was a significant negative correlation between women's religiosity and their attitudes towards feminism, $r(345) = -.123, p = .022$. Thus, higher levels of religiosity were correlated with less positive attitudes toward feminism in women, but not men.

Feminist Orientation and Character Ratings

An exploratory 2x3 multivariate analysis of covariance was conducted to test whether or not women's feminist orientation was related to their ratings of the vignette character on the

Warmth and Competence scales. Men were not included due to the small sample sizes in some of the conditions. The character's feminist orientation, and the participants' feminist orientation (anti-feminist, non-feminist, and feminist) were entered as the independent variables and the ratings of the character on the Warmth and Competence measures were the dependent variables. Scores on the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) were entered as covariates; however, these scores did not significantly contribute to the results. Neither women's feminist orientation nor the interaction between women's feminist orientation and the character's feminist orientation had a significant multivariate effect on the Warmth and Competence ratings of the vignette character. However, the feminist orientation of the vignette character did significantly influence Warmth and Competence scores. See Table 6 for the multivariate results.

Univariate analyses indicated that the character's feminist orientation significantly influenced character ratings on the Warmth and Competence scales. As described in previous analyses, the anti-feminist character was described as being less warm and less competent than the non-feminist and feminist characters, $p < .001$. The non-feminist and feminist characters did not differ significantly from each other on the warmth and competence ratings, $p = .80$ and $.376$, respectively. See Table 7 for univariate results of Warmth and Competence ratings by participants' feminist orientation and Table 8 for the means and standard deviations.

Gender, Feminist Attitudes, and Character Ratings

Although no specific predictions were made about the relationship between feminist attitudes and the Warmth and Competence ratings, we conducted partial correlations for men and women separately for each of the six vignette conditions in order to determine whether participants' attitudes toward feminism, as measured by the LFAIS, affected the ratings they assigned to the vignette character. Men with more positive attitudes toward feminism attributed

higher Warmth and Competence ratings to the heterosexual feminist character, and lower Warmth scores to the heterosexual anti-feminist character. Women with more positive attitudes toward feminism assigned higher Warmth ratings to the heterosexual feminist and homosexual feminist characters, and lower Warmth ratings to the heterosexual anti-feminist character. See Table 9 for the full list of correlations.

Race, Gender, Religion, Attitudes Toward Feminism, and Feminist Orientation

Although no formal predictions were made, exploratory 2 x 2 analyses of variance were conducted in order to determine the relationship between participants' race and gender and their attitudes toward feminism, with social desirability entered as a covariate. Due to small sample sizes for other races/ethnicities, only White and Black participants were included in the following analyses. Scores on the Social Desirability Scale (SDS-17) were entered as a covariate; however, these scores did not significantly contribute to the results, $F(1, 421) = .07, p = .79$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$. There were significant main effects for both gender and race. Compared to men, women had higher LFAIS scores, and thus, more positive attitudes toward feminism, $F(1, 421) = 33.54, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .074$. In comparison to Whites, Blacks reported more positive attitudes toward feminism, $F(1, 421) = 6.71, p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .016$. The interaction between race and gender was not significant, $F(1, 421) = .01, p = .917$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$. See Table 10 for means and standard deviations.

An additional exploratory analysis of variance was conducted in order to test whether participants' level of religiosity was affected by their gender and race, using scores on the SDS-17 as a covariate. Social desirability had a significant effect on participants' responses, $F(1, 421) = 4.84, p = .028$, partial $\eta^2 = .011$. Participants with higher social desirability scores reported significantly higher levels of religiosity than those with lower social desirability scores, $r(466) =$

.158, $p = .001$. Gender did not have a significant influence on participants' religiosity, $F(1, 421) = 1.49$, $p = .223$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$. However, Blacks reported higher levels of religiosity than Whites, $F(1, 421) = 12.860$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .030$. The interaction between race and gender was not significant, $F(1, 421) = .45$, $p = .501$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$. See Table 10 for the means and standard deviations for religiosity.

In order to determine the relationship between participants' race, gender, attitudes toward feminism, and religiosity, several partial correlations were conducted, controlling for social desirability. Separate correlations were calculated for men, women, Blacks, and Whites in order to detect gender and race differences. After controlling for social desirability, there was a significant negative correlation between LFAIS scores and religiosity in White men, $r(77) = -.34$, $p = .002$ and White women, $r(243) = -.21$, $p = .001$. In other words, White participants with higher levels of religiosity had less positive attitudes toward feminism. There was no significant correlation between attitudes toward feminism and religiosity for Black men $r(21) = .21$, $p = .332$, or Black women, $r(73) = .21$, $p = .065$.

Finally, we computed chi-square analyses to determine whether men and women of different races differed in their reported feminist orientation. See Table 11 for the frequencies and percentages of participant feminist orientations by race and gender.

Chi-square analyses indicated no significant racial differences in participants' feminist orientation for men, $\chi^2(2, N = 103) = 1.26$, $p = .531$, or for women, $\chi^2(2, N = 321) = 4.30$, $p = .117$. There was a significant gender difference in feminist orientation for Whites, $\chi^2(2, N = 325) = 6.48$, $p = .039$, but not for Blacks, $\chi^2(2, N = 99) = 4.55$, $p = .103$. White women were more likely to identify as feminists and less likely to identify as anti-feminists than White men.

Discussion

Research on male feminists has been limited, with few studies exploring attitudes toward male feminists and factors that mediate feminist identification in men (Anderson, 2009; Breen & Karpinski, 2008; Gourley & Anderson, 2007; Pierce et al., 2003). The broad goal of the current research was to contribute to knowledge regarding attitudes towards male feminists by examining the relationship between undergraduate students' levels of gender self-esteem and attitudes toward heterosexual and homosexual men who identify as feminist, non-feminist, and anti-feminist. We did not find studies that examined the relationship between attitudes toward male feminists and gender self-esteem. The current study could begin to fill these gaps in the literature and offer a better understanding of the impediments to feminist self-identification in men, as well as stereotypes about male feminists.

Sexual Orientation and Feminist Orientation

There was no support for the hypotheses that: 1) Heterosexual men and women would attribute fewer competent traits toward the character identified as gay, feminist, or both; 1a) A man identified as heterosexual and non-feminist would be rated as more competent and less warm compared to the man identified as gay and feminist; and 1b) Heterosexual men would rate the feminist man as less competent and more warm than heterosexual women. There were no significant interaction effects between the feminist orientation and sexual orientation of the vignette character, nor did the sexual orientation of the vignette character influence participants' ratings. However, there was a significant main effect for the feminist orientation of the vignette character on warmth and competence ratings. Feminist and non-feminist characters received the highest ratings on both scales, whereas anti-feminists received the lowest scores. Contrary to hypotheses, the homosexual feminist character received higher warmth and competence ratings

than the heterosexual non-feminist character. There was a significant main effect for gender, with women assigning higher competence scores to the vignette character regardless of his feminist or sexual orientation, and assigning higher warmth and competence scores to the feminist man than did men.

Consistent with prior literature suggesting that male feminists are perceived to be more feminine than traditional men (Anderson, 2009; Pierce et al., 2003), participants in the present study assigned higher warmth ratings, which are stereotypically associated with feminine traits, to male feminists. Novel to this study, however, was the finding that male feminists also received the highest competence ratings, as compared to non-feminists and anti-feminists. Given that the competence scale is stereotypically associated with masculinity, male feminists were also perceived to be highly masculine in this study. Prior research has suggested that because traditional masculinity is dependent on rejection of femininity and feminine attributes (Sanchez et al., 2009), men who identify as feminists may inadvertently call their masculinity into question. As such, more traditional men may be much less likely to endorse such a label at the risk of losing social standing, even if they endorse feminist attitudes.

However, given the results of the present study, male feminists may simply be seen as more androgynous than traditional men, possessing qualities associated with both masculinity and femininity, but are not necessarily perceived as deficient in terms of masculinity. In support of this hypothesis, Kilmartin (2007) stated that profeminist men often support androgyny and behave in more feminine ways than men who do not identify as feminists. Thus, it seems that male feminists and non-feminists reject the practice of antifemininity shown in hegemonic masculinity. This line of reasoning may also be used to inform feminist identification practices in anti-feminist men. It is possible that such men choose to disavow a feminist label not because

feminists are perceived as less masculine, but because they are perceived to be more feminine than traditional men.

Although gender role violations have been shown to elicit negative reactions (Blashill & Powlishta, 2008, 2009; Kilmartin, 2007; Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009), participants in the current study did not attribute fewer masculine traits to male feminists than to non-feminists, despite the fact that they have historically been viewed as less traditionally masculine and more feminine than more traditional men. As such, they did not elicit negative responses from male or female participants. One explanation for this disparate finding may be found by examining participant demographics. This study utilized a university-based sample of participants whose average age was 20.35 years and whose primary political affiliation was Democratic (30.7%). As previously noted, higher education has been shown to correlate with less traditional attitudes about gender for men and women (Hatchett & Quick, 1983; Ransford & Miller, 1983; Thornton & Freedman, 1979). Considerable research has also been conducted to examine the impact of higher education on broader social and political attitudes. In general, college has been shown to have a liberalizing effect on students, whereby college students are more progressive and politically liberal than their non-student counterparts, even after accounting for level of education (Wildman & Wildman, 1974). A change in social attitudes has even been demonstrated from freshman to senior year, with seniors voicing more liberal attitudes toward a variety of social issues (Jones, 1970). Moreover, studies have shown that liberals are more tolerant of ambiguity than their more conservative counterparts (Castelli & Carraro, 2011; Shook & Fazio, 2009; Sidanius, 1978). Given that the participants in the current study were college students and the majority identified with a more liberal political affiliation, it is possible that they were more progressive and open-minded when evaluating the vignette characters than their more

conservative peers, particularly when evaluating vignette characters that challenged traditional male gender roles. As such, these participants may not have reacted negatively to the feminist character, as was expected. Thus, gender role transgressions or gender role fluidity may be less stigmatized in people with relatively high levels of education.

Backus and Mahalik (2011) sampled a female undergraduate population at a private Northeastern university and examined preferences for masculinity in an ideal male partner. They found that women in this sample actually preferred men with lower traditional masculinity scores as their ideal male partner, lending further credence to the argument that undergraduates may be less traditional in their beliefs in comparison to the general population and that higher education tends to have a liberalizing effect. This finding may also reflect a societal shift with regard to gender roles, whereby it is becoming more socially acceptable and desirable for men to possess stereotypically feminine traits, like emotional expressiveness. This may also help to explain why feminists received the highest warmth and competence ratings from participants in the current study and why female participants, compared to men, rated the feminist man higher on the competence and warmth dimensions.

Contrary to expectation, sexual orientation did not influence character ratings in the current study. The lack of influence that sexual orientation had on participants' ratings of the vignette character may be attributed to a more widespread shift in social and political opinions. Although stigma toward the LGB community has unarguably persisted, there has been increasing support for gay, lesbian, and bisexual rights (Blashill & Powlishta, 2009), with blatant sexual prejudice no longer considered socially acceptable (Morrison et al., 2005). A 2013 Pew research study found that 70% of individuals born since 1980 (Millennials, 2014), support same-sex marriage, compared to results from the 2003 survey, indicating that only 51% supported these

unions. Moreover, the study noted that 74% of Millennials believe that homosexuality should be accepted within society, compared to Generation X (ages 33-48) and Baby Boomers (ages 49-67), where support for homosexuality ranged from 62% to 46%, respectively (Pew Research Center, 2014). Thus, homosexuality may be less stigmatized than it once was, particularly among younger adults.

Interestingly, there was a slight gender difference in character ratings, whereby the women in the current study assigned higher competence scores overall than men. This is consistent with prior research findings, which have suggested that women are less threatened by gender role transgression (Herek, 1988; Maccoby, 1987) and that they tend to hold less negative attitudes towards gay men and lesbians than do men (Haslam & Levy, 2006; Herek, 2000a; Kite, 1984; LaMar & Kite, 1998; Nagoshi et al., 2008; Ratcliff et al., 2006). This gender disparity also lends credence to the argument that the construction of masculinity has been heavily influenced by a culture of homophobia and misogyny (Hamilton, 2007).

Gender Self-Esteem and Attitudes toward Feminism

The hypothesis that heterosexual men, but not heterosexual women, with high levels of gender self-esteem would endorse less positive attitudes toward feminism was not supported. Gender self-esteem was related to attitudes toward feminism for women, but not for men. Women whose gender was more important to their self-esteem and identity had more positive attitudes toward feminism. However, despite the relationship between women's gender self-esteem and their attitudes toward feminism, gender self-esteem was not significantly related to their reported feminist orientation in the present study. This is consistent with prior research that demonstrated that feminist and anti-feminist women were indistinguishable with regard to the level of gender self-esteem, as both saw gender as being important to their self-concept (Smith,

1999). It was also consistent with previous research findings that suggested that although most men and women endorse feminist attitudes, the majority of individuals identify as non-feminists (Anderson, 2009; Zucker, 2004), and thus, reject a feminist identity. Thus, our finding lends further credence to the argument that feminist attitudes and feminist identity are two distinct constructs, though they are commonly conflated (Cowan et al., 1992; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Szymanski, 2004).

Gender self-esteem may not be a sufficient predictor of feminist attitudes in men because men, regardless of their feminist attitudes or orientation, may value their gender equally. It has been argued that masculine identity is predicated on a rejection of femininity (Kimmel, 1998; Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009), and thus, gender plays an integral role in male identity development. Although prior research has suggested that men with low gender self-esteem may be more likely to support feminism than men with high gender self-esteem (Burns et al., 2000), it is possible that gender self-esteem may be high in both feminist and anti-feminist men, albeit for different reasons. Anti-feminist men may report high levels of gender self-esteem because they not only view their gender as integral to their identity, but because they also view feminism as a threat to their masculinity. They may also express negative attitudes toward feminism as a means of distancing themselves from a stigmatized group, and therefore protecting their masculine identity from threat. Conversely, men who identify as feminists may have high gender self-esteem because they recognize the significance of their gender with regards to issues of social, economic, and political equality and may therefore use their gender as a platform to address these issues.

It is also possible that men's identification as feminists and their attitudes toward feminism are more strongly influenced by factors other than gender self-esteem. The modest

body of literature on male feminists has proposed that factors like race (Cowan et al., 1992; Harnois, 2005; Kane, 1992; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; White, 2006), education (Hatchett & Quick, 1983; Ransford & Miller, 1983; Thornton & Freedman, 1979), and political affiliation (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004; Cowan et al., 1992; McCabe, 2005) may directly influence not only men's attitudes toward feminism, but their feminist identification, as well. Therefore, it is possible that gender self-esteem is simply a less salient factor when determining men's attitudes toward feminism.

Political Affiliation, Religiosity, and Attitudes Toward Feminism

The hypothesis that negative attitudes toward feminism would be correlated with more conservative political affiliation was supported. Consistent with the literature, participants who identified as more politically liberal (Strong Democrats) had more positive attitudes toward feminism than those who were less liberal. Similarly, participants with more conservative political affiliation (Strong Republicans) had less positive attitudes toward feminism than those with less conservative views (Not Strong Republicans). Political affiliation has consistently been shown to relate to feminist attitudes and feminist self-identification (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004; Cowan et al., 1992), with some researchers suggesting that feminism is a specific kind of liberal political view (McCabe, 2005).

The hypothesis that negative attitudes toward feminism would be correlated with higher levels of religiosity was partially supported. Higher levels of religiosity were correlated with less positive attitudes toward feminism in women, but not men. Although it was not a statistically significant difference, women in the present study reported that religion was of greater importance to them than did men. There is some research to suggest that there may be an inherent gender difference in religiosity, with women demonstrating greater religious devotion,

more participation in religious ceremony and tradition, and increased responsibility for the religious upbringing of children (Miller & Hoffman, 1995). Although some researchers have suggested that these gender differences can be attributed solely to socialization practices, as traditionally feminine traits like submissiveness, passivity, obedience, and nurturing are associated with higher levels of religiosity (Suziedelis & Potvin, 1981), it is possible that women are simply more influenced by societal forces and convention, including religion, than are men. Men, particularly those with considerable political, social, and economic power, are afforded more freedom to engage in behaviors that transgress traditional gender or social roles (Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Smith, 1999; Tarrant, 2009). As such, their participation in non-traditional activities (i.e., feminism) or lack of participation in more conventional practices (i.e., religion), may be less heavily stigmatized than it would be for women. Future research is needed to determine whether male feminists, who are thought to possess both masculine and feminine traits, are more religious than traditional men. These results suggest that political affiliation, but not necessarily religiosity, can be used as an effective predictor of feminist attitudes in men.

Political affiliation may also be a good predictor of feminist attitudes in men because it appears to reflect an inherent learning difference in the way that members of various political affiliations respond to stigmatized groups, which often become heavily stereotyped. Castelli and Carraro (2011) suggested that although stereotypes can represent exaggerations of real group differences, they might also be formed in the absence of any real differences between groups. The authors argued that a pattern of asymmetrical learning exists whereby negative information is learned more easily. They went on to suggest that this unbalanced learning is particularly salient when comparing participants of different political ideologies. Compared to liberals, conservatives are not only more vigilant about negative information, but they also overestimate

the occurrence of negative events. This causes conservatives to hold more biased and negative evaluations of perceived minority groups, report greater intolerance of ambiguity, and display greater sensitivity to fear and threats (Castelli & Carraro, 2011; Shook & Fazio, 2009; Sidanius, 1978; Sidanius & Ekehammar, 1980).

Given the plethora of negative stereotypes concerning feminists, conservative participants might have had more difficulty learning and integrating positive information about feminists due to their negative informational bias. Furthermore, their avoidant behavioral style, while limiting the number of negative experiences they have, likely prevents them from having experiences that challenge their assumptions about stigmatized groups, like feminists. It is also possible that the androgynous mix of traditionally feminine and masculine traits that participants attributed to male feminists in the present study might cause conservatives, who are less tolerant of ambiguity (Castelli & Carraro, 2011; Shook & Fazio, 2009; Sidanius, 1978; Sidanius & Ekehammar, 1980), to avoid identifying as feminists. Conservative individuals might also have been reluctant to identify as feminists due to the perceived extremity of feminist action and belief (Anderson, 2009). Research has shown that not only do negative attitudes generalize more readily than positive attitudes, but that extreme attitudes generalize more quickly than mild ones (Shook & Fazio, 2009; Shook, Fazio, & Eiser, 2007). Given that female feminists are often conceptualized as man-hating extremists (Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Aronson, 2003; Herbert, 2007; Smith, 1999), these stereotypes may elicit similarly extreme and negative reactions from conservative participants.

However, similar cognitive and behavioral patterns have been elicited in liberal individuals, as well. Nail, McGregor, Drinkwater, Steele, and Thompson (2009) found that when exposed to various forms of threat, liberals became more psychologically and politically

conservative, thereby supporting the reactive-liberals hypothesis. This phenomenon, whereby individuals who typically demonstrate more tolerance for ambiguity and less prejudicial attitudes toward minority groups, results in liberal individuals defending against perceived threats with reactive conservatism. In effect, they become virtually indistinguishable from conservative individuals, who are dispositionally reactive and feel chronically under threat (Nail et al., 2009). Taken in the context of the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 2004), a feminist label may be perceived as a threat to the masculine identity, and thus, may trigger a reactive response from individuals who are otherwise supportive of feminism. Thus, the reactive-liberals hypothesis might help to explain why socially and politically liberal men who endorse feminist attitudes, still reject a feminist identity.

Gender, Race, Feminist Attitudes, and Feminist Orientation.

Exploratory analyses demonstrated that participants' reported feminist orientation did not significantly influence their warmth and competence ratings of the vignette character. The lack of correlation between participants' feminist identification and their ratings of the vignette character on the warmth and competence scales could be attributed to sample size issues, as only 14.9% of women and 4.3% of men self-identified as feminists. Because so few women identified as feminists, attitudes toward feminism may have been a better predictor of character ratings. However, attitudes toward feminism did influence women's character ratings in certain vignette conditions. Women with more positive attitudes toward feminism assigned higher warmth and competence ratings to the heterosexual feminist character, and lower warmth ratings to the heterosexual anti-feminist vignette character. In effect, women with strong feminist attitudes attributed more masculine and feminine traits to the heterosexual feminist character, and fewer feminine characteristics to the heterosexual antifeminist character. These results

suggest that not only were women's ratings more influenced by the character's feminist orientation than his sexual orientation, but their reactions were also affected by their own attitudes toward feminism. These findings are consistent with prior literature that suggests that feminist men are viewed as somewhat more androgynous than men who do not endorse a feminist identity (Kilmartin, 2007; Twenge, 1999).

Women with more positive attitudes toward feminism may have viewed the heterosexual anti-feminist man as the most traditionally masculine character, yet lacking in many of the positive personality traits typically associated with the female gender. There has been some research to suggest that women with strong feminist attitudes respond more positively to non-traditional men than do women who are less supportive of the feminist movement (Backus & Mahalik, 2011). The aforementioned study showed that women preferred lower masculinity scores in their ideal male partner, particularly in factors like emotional control, violence, dominance, power over women, and primacy of work, all of which have been associated with traditional masculinity. This contradicts the notion that feminist and non-feminist men and women perceive highly masculine men to be ideal (Mezydlo & Betz, 1980).

Exploratory analyses also demonstrated a complex interplay between gender, race, feminist attitudes, and feminist orientation. With regard to racial differences in feminist attitudes, Black participants reported more positive attitudes toward feminism than White participants overall. This finding supports earlier research, which has suggested that Black people are more likely than White people to support feminist goals and to openly acknowledge sexism (Kane, 1992). However, this finding contradicts later research, which has suggested that women of color have not viewed feminism as relevant to their concerns (Anderson et al., 2009). Interestingly, although Black participants generally held more positive attitudes towards

feminism than White participants in our sample, they were not found to be more likely to identify as feminists. White women more frequently identified as feminists than White men, whereas White men self-identified more frequently as anti-feminists than White women. There were no gender differences in feminist identification among the Black participants. This finding may reflect the racial separation that was characteristic of the early American feminist movement (hooks, 1984; Renzetti & Curran, 1989; Thompson, 2010) and a lingering uncertainty about whether modern day feminists accurately represent the needs of all women, not simply those of white women (Mack-Canty & Wright, 2004; Tarrant, 2009). It may also lend credence to the argument that although gender inequality is certainly recognized among Black men and women, racial inequality and discrimination may still be a more salient issue (Hunter & Sellers, 1998). The disparity in feminist attitudes and feminist identification found among Black participants may also reflect a reluctance to adopt another stigmatized identity, and may choose to work towards revaluing their racial group (Hurtado, 1997). Further research is necessary in order to gather a more diverse sample in order to assess motivation for feminist self-labeling among individuals of color.

These racial differences in attitudes toward feminism were also related to religiosity. Interestingly, Black participants reported higher levels of religiosity than did White participants, yet their religiosity was not predictive of their feminist attitudes. This is in contrast to White participants, where there was an inverse relationship between religiosity and support for feminism. White participants with higher levels of religiosity had less positive attitudes toward feminism than Whites with lower levels of religiosity. This may be related to the finding that there was a higher concentration of conservative political values among participants high in religiosity. As previously stated, political conservatism was closely associated with less positive

attitudes toward feminism. Therefore, there may be an indirect connection between religiosity and attitudes toward feminism among White college students, mediated by political affiliation.

The present research extends the existing body of literature on race and feminist attitudes and suggests that race may be a significant predictor of feminist attitudes. However, the relationship between race and feminist self-identification, particularly in men, remains unclear. Given the oversights made by first wave feminists with regards to the intersections of race and gender, men and women of color may be less likely to endorse a feminist label, despite their positive attitudes toward feminism and the feminist movement's recognition of intersectionality (Israeli & Santor, 2000). It is possible that race is simply a more salient issue for women and men of color than gender inequality.

Limitations and Future Directions

Perhaps the greatest limitation of this study is that it is exploratory in nature due to the paucity of literature examining attitudes towards male feminists. Although conducting new research in this area is exciting and may ultimately make an important contribution to the existing body of literature, it is also difficult to identify and thoroughly examine the multitude of complex factors believed to influence attitudes toward stigmatized groups. It is possible that there were several factors that were not mentioned in the aforementioned review that play a role in determining attitudes toward male feminists. Moreover, the factors that have been identified as being important predictors of feminist attitudes in men appear to have complex interactions with one another, making interpretations exceedingly complicated and establishing meaningful relationships more cumbersome. This study ideally represents a broad starting point from which additional, more narrowly focused research may be conducted.

This study utilized a sample of college students from a large Midwestern university. As a result, participants were disproportionately White, non-feminist, and heterosexual. Moreover, approximately 75% of the sample was comprised of women, making gender comparisons difficult and less useful in informing interpretations of differences in attitude and feminist identification. As a result, the lack of robust findings may be due, in part, to the relative homogeneity of the sample population. It is also possible that the people who chose to participate were relatively more open-minded about gender and sexuality issues than members of the general population. In effect, the lack of significant findings with regard to the character's sexual orientation may be due to a self-selection process, whereby participants who were more liberal-minded or socially progressive elected to participate. Although the present study compared Black and White participants, the sample size for Black men was quite small. As such, it is likely that this sample lack sufficient power to detect meaningful differences between racial groups. Future research should seek to replicate the present study with a more diverse population, paying special attention to the recruitment of men, individuals from a variety of racial groups, self-identified feminists, as well as those representing a broader spectrum of sexual orientations.

Another possible limitation of this research was that it focused on a heavily stigmatized group, feminists. Due to the negative stigma attached to feminism and feminists (Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Aronson, 2003; Brown & Brodsky, 1992; Edly & Wetherell, 2001; Goldberg et al., 1975; Herbert, 2007; Jenen et al., 2009; Rubin, 1994; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Smith, 1999; Suter & Toller, 2006; Tarrant, 2009; Twenge & Zucker, 1999) and the relative lack of feminist-oriented groups on campus, participants who would be willing to complete the study, particularly men, may have been fewer in number. Research suggests that individuals who hold negative

stereotypes about feminists are less likely to identify as feminists, regardless of their race, prior exposure to or experience with feminism, awareness of sexism, and egalitarian attitudes (Leaper & Arias, 2011). Moreover, despite neutral or even positive evaluations of feminists and feminist values, respondents tend to view their own identities as dissonant or somehow incompatible with a feminist identity (Suter & Toller, 2006; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). However, the online format of the study facilitates easy access and participation, and may even allow participants who privately hold feminist beliefs, but disavow the feminist identity due to perceived stigma, to respond in a more forthright manner.

This study was effective in confirming the use of religiosity and political affiliation as predictors of feminist identification. However, there was a complex interrelationship between these demographic factors and the participants' gender and race. Future research may wish to clarify the exact nature of their relationships after sampling a more diverse pool of participants. Furthermore, we had some difficulty measuring political affiliation, as many participants responded to questions about the strength of their affiliation with both the Democratic and Republican parties, despite previously identifying with only one of the political groups. Researchers who wish to replicate this study may wish to use a more nuanced measure of political affiliation or ideology, as there may be participants who do not strictly identify with one of the two major political parties in the United States, or who identify with elements of both parties.

It may also be useful to include more qualitative items to add greater depth to future quantitative study findings. Potential items may include asking participants about their definition of liberal feminism, what it means to be a male or female feminist, and why they do or do not identify as a feminist. This may not only help to highlight conceptual differences in the

way that feminism is defined by various racial groups, but it may also give a more accurate representation of why individuals either endorse or disavow a feminist identity.

Social Implications

The results of the current study demonstrated that despite the lack of negative response to male feminists, a significant portion of participants (32% men, 24% women) described their own feminist orientation as anti-feminist. In the context of Social Identity Theory, this finding may reflect the notion that male feminists are no longer perceived to be a threat, and are therefore responded to in a less discriminatory fashion, but they continue to be viewed as inherently different in identity than those who do not identify as feminists. Because male feminists have been viewed as violating group norms, participants may have distanced themselves from them by disavowing a feminist identity. Thus, there may be a tacit tolerance of feminist values, but a simultaneous rejection of feminist identity. As such, the Social Identity theory appears to be generally supported in this study.

Results of the present study reflect greater acceptance of gender egalitarianism and feminism among today's young adults. Despite this trend, the majority of participants identified as non-feminists, and thus, rejected a feminist identity. Therefore, it is plausible that identifying oneself as a feminist means identifying with a deviant group, as previous researchers have suggested (Jenen et al., 2009; Smith, 1999). As such, labeling becomes an incredibly powerful act. Labeling oneself as a feminist brings recognition and legitimacy to the cause. Feminist men, in particular, who still benefit from male privilege, can offer social, political, and financial support for the feminist movement. Indeed, their acceptance and support of the feminist movement would be especially powerful, as it visibly challenges many of the stereotypes and assumptions associated with feminism. There is nothing intrinsic to feminism that requires the

total exclusion of men (Herbert, 2007). Therefore, scholarly work exploring the potential barriers to male feminist self-identification would be beneficial so that feminists can better understand how to make feminism applicable and meaningful to all citizens. Working to create an inclusive movement that addresses gender discrimination, in all its forms, remains important.

Feminism has immense potential to enact change, to give agency to those who lack a voice, and to change the way that we, as human beings, think. Patriarchies are harmful to all citizens, even those who appear to benefit most from them. Indeed, "...to be officially free is by no means the same thing as being actually and psychologically free" (Brophy, 1963, p. 74). Not only is hegemonic masculinity not representative of all men, but it is physically and psychologically damaging, as well (Brooks, 2001; Courtenay, 2000; Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). Indeed, prescriptive definitions of masculinity are very limiting to a man's development (Watzlawik, 2009). This is especially true for the men who are prevented from benefitting fully from a patriarchal society due to their race, sexual orientation, religion, or socioeconomic status.

Clinical Implications

There has been an increase in male support for feminism as men have begun to recognize the ways in which, they, too, are subtly oppressed by a patriarchal society (Edley & Wetherell, 2001; Kilmartin, 2007; Kimmel, 1998, 2000; Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009; Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009; Tarrant, 2009; Watzlawik, 2009). By addressing the existence of multiple masculinities, men might be able to better recognize the restrictive social norms that limit their potential, as well as the benefits that can be gained by aligning themselves with the feminist movement. Boys who demonstrate gender variant behaviors would be not be viewed as deficient or in need of psychological intervention; rather, their behavior would be conceptualized as normal variation on a continuum of masculine behaviors (Slesaransky-Poe & Garcia, 2009).

Thus study also suggests that the stigma associated with homosexuality may be decreasing, as men and women responded positively towards the feminist and non-feminist characters, regardless of the character's sexual orientation. This is clinically relevant as the prejudice and harassment that is often directed towards GLBT individuals has previously been shown to result in significant psychological distress (Bostwick, Boyd, Hughes, West, & McCabe, 2014). Without the threat of homophobia, men would not have to prove that they are "man enough" by engaging in physically and psychologically damaging activities (Hagan, 1992, p. 64) including sexual risk-taking (Courtenay, 2000; Green & Halkitis, 2006), misogyny (Frye, 1983), heavy drinking (Eastman & Schrock, 2008; Tilki, 2006), sports and fighting (Anderson, 1999; Wacquant, 2003), and crime (Messerschmidt, 1993). Men are more likely to end up in prison, four times as likely to commit suicide, four times more likely to be homicide victims than women, and represent 70% of individuals who have not been to the doctor in more than five years (Brooks, 2001). These disturbing trends suggest that men participate in these risky, self-destructive behaviors because they are considered "manly." However, if the masculine gender role is slowly becoming more flexible, and the stigma associated with feminism and homosexuality is decreasing, then it is plausible that the physical and psychological effects of the discrimination can be expected to decrease, as well. For men, participation in feminism may result in increased gender role flexibility, greater willingness to seek psychological services, and decreased participation in the aforementioned destructive activities. Thus, feminist identification in men has many clinical implications, as well.

Increased flexibility in masculine gender role and decreased stigma associated with feminism may also benefit women. Engaging men as feminist allies may help to dispel the longstanding stereotype that feminists are "man-haters," and therefore may lend more credibility

to the movement. As such, women who already identify as feminists may encounter less backlash for endorsing a feminist label if men were to respond less negatively to perceived threats to masculinity.

Masculine gender role flexibility may also improve interpersonal relationships. Research has shown that men who are concerned about fulfilling traditional masculine ideals report greater interpersonal problems including engaging in high-risk behaviors (Cohn & Zeichner, 2006) and experiencing more difficulties within romantic relationships (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002) than men who are not as concerned. Therefore, it stands to reason that less rigid gender roles may lessen the dissonance that men may encounter between gender role expectations and the expectations that accompany various interpersonal relationships. As such, women may be more emotionally satisfied by male partners who are not encumbered by rigid gender role expectations, who feel confident enough in their masculinity to transcend the rules of traditional masculinity. Moreover, although the relationship between gender role strain and domestic violence has not been clearly articulated, it is possible that women may experience domestic violence to a lesser degree if their male partners were not socialized to behave in dominant and physically aggressive ways. In light of these findings, it seems imperative that we reevaluate the way that we think about masculinity, as it has important implications for the physical and psychological health of both men and women.

References

- Acker, J. (2008). Helpful men and feminist support: More than double strangeness. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 15, 288-293. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00393.x.
- Alexander, S., & Ryan, M. (1997). Social constructs of feminism: A study of undergraduates at a women's college. *College Student Journal*, 31, 555-568.
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the more life of the inner city*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Anderson, K. J., Kanner, M., & Elsayegh, N. (2009). Are feminists man haters? Feminists' and nonfeminists' attitudes toward men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 33, 216-224. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01491.x.
- Anderson, V. N. (2009). What's in a label? Judgments of feminist men and feminist women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 33, 206-215. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01490.x.
- Anthony, S. B., & Harper, I. R. (Eds.). (1902). *The history of woman suffrage: Perfect equality of rights for woman, civil, legal, and political* (Vol. IV). Indianapolis: The Hollenbeck Press.
- Aronson, R. (2003). Feminists or "postfeminists"? Young women's attitudes toward feminism and gender relations. *Gender & Society*, 7, 903-922. doi:10.1177/0891243203257145.
- Backus, F. R., & Mahalik, J. R. (2011). The masculinity of Mr. Right: Feminist identity and heterosexual women's ideal romantic partners. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*, 35, 318-326. doi:10.1177/0361684310392357.

- Baird, M. K., Szymanski, D. M., & Ruebelt, S. G. (2007). Feminist identity development and practice among male therapists. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 8(2), 67-78. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.8.2.67.
- Berryman-Fink, C., & Verderber, K. S. (1985). Attributions of the term feminist: A factor analytic development of a measuring instrument. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9, 51-64. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1985.tb00860.x.
- Blashill, A.J. & Powlishta, K.K. (2008). Gay stereotypes: The use of sexual orientation as a cue for gender-related attributes. *Sex Roles*, 61, 783–793. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9684-7
- Blashill, A. J., & Powlishta, K. K. (2009). The impact of sexual orientation and gender role on evaluations of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10, 160-173. doi:10.1037/a0014583.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, E. C. (2000). Separation/individuation, parental attachment, and male gender role conflict: Attitudes toward the feminine and the fragile masculine self. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 1, 126–132. doi: 10.1037//1524-9220.1.2.126
- Blumenfeld, W. J. (1992). Squeezed into gender envelopes. In W. J. Blumenfeld (Ed.), *Homophobia: How we all pay the price*. (pp. 23-38) Boston: Beacon.
- Bolzendahl, C. I., & Myers, D. J. (2004). Feminist attitudes and support for gender equality: Opinion change in women and men, 1974-1998. *Social Forces*, 83, 759-790. doi:10.1353/sof.2005.0005.
- Bosson, J.K., Prewitt-Freilino, J.L., & Taylor, J.N. (2005). Role rigidity: A problem of identity misclassification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 552-565. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.4.552.

- Bostwick, W. B., Boyd, C. J., Hughes, T. L., West, B. T., & McCabe, S. (2014). Discrimination and mental health among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *84*, 35-45. doi:10.1037/h0098851.
- Breen, A. B., & Karpinski, A. (2008). What's in a name? Two approaches to evaluating the label feminist. *Sex Roles*, *58*, 299-310. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9317-y.
- Brooks, G. R. (2001). Masculinity and men's mental health. *Journal of American College Health*, *25*(4), 24-37. doi:10.1080/07448480109596315.
- Brophy, B. (1963). Women are prisoners of their sex. In J. Sochen (Ed.), *The new feminism in twentieth-century America* (pp. 73-79). Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Brown, L.S. (1994). *Subversive dialogues*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brown, L. S. (2006). Still subversive after all these years: The relevance of feminist therapy in the age of evidence-based practice. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *30*, 15-24. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00258.x.
- Brown, L. S., & Brodsky, A. M. (1992). The future of feminist psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, *29*, 51-57. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.29.1.51.
- Bullock, H. E., & Fernald, J. L. (2003). "Feminist lite?": Feminist identification, speaker appearance, and perceptions of feminist and antifeminist messengers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *27*, 291-199. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.00109.
- Burns, S. M., Aboud, R., & Moyles, C. (2000). The relationship between gender social identity and support for feminism. *Sex Roles*, *42*, 1081-1089. doi:10.1023/A:1007044802798.

- Buschman, J.K., & Lenart, S. (1996). "I am not a feminist, but...": College women, feminism, and negative experiences. *Political Psychology, 17*, 59-75.
- Carter, K., & Spitzack, C. (1990). Transformation and empowerment in gender and communication courses. *Women's Studies in Communication, 13*, 92-111.
- Castelli, L., & Carraro, L. (2011). Ideology is related to basic cognitive processes involved in attitude formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*, 1013-1016. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.03.016
- Cohen, J. (2003). A power primer. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Methodological issues & strategies in clinical research (3rd ed.)* (pp. 427-436). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association.
- Cohn A, & Zeichner, A. (2006). Effects of masculine identity and gender role stress on aggression in men. *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity, 7*, 179-190. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.7.4.179
- Corbett, K. (2001). Faggot = Loser. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality, 2*, 3-28.
doi:10.1080/15240650209349168.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine, 50*, 1385-1401.
doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00390-1.
- Cowan, G., Mestlin, M., & Masek, J. (1992). Predictors of feminist self-labeling. *Sex Roles, 27*, 321-330.
- de Man, A.F. & Benoit, R. (1982). Self-esteem in feminist and nonfeminist French Canadian women and French-Canadian men. *The Journal of Psychology, 111*, 3-7.
doi:10.1080/00223980.1982.9923504.

- DeWall, C.N., Altermatt, T.W., & Thompson, H. (2005). Understanding the structure of stereotypes of women: Virtue and agency as dimensions distinguishing female subgroups. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 396-405.
- Dowd, N.E. (2010). *Man question: Male subordination and privilege*. New York, NY: University Press.
- Duncan, L.E. (2010). Women's relationship to feminism: Effects of generation and feminist self labeling. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*, 498-507. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01599.x.
- Dunkle, J.H., & Francis, P.L. (1990). The role of facial masculinity/femininity in the attribution of homosexuality. *Sex Roles, 23*, 157-167. doi:10.1007/BF00289863.
- Eastman, J. & Schrock, D.P. (2008). Southern rock musicians' construction of white trash. *Race, Gender, & Class, 15*, 205-219.
- Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (2001). Jekyll and Hyde: Men's constructions of feminism and feminists. *Feminism and Psychology, 11*, 439-457.
doi:10.1177/0959353501011004002
- Eisele, H. & Stake, J. (2008). The differential relationship of feminist attitudes and feminist identity to self-efficacy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 233-244.
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00432.x.
- Evans, K. M., Kincade, E. A., Marbley, A. F., & Seem, S. R. (2005). Feminist and feminist therapy: Lessons from the past and hopes for the future. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83*, 269-277. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2005.tb00342.x.

- Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., & Mugny, G. (2009). "I'm not gay...I'm a real man!": Heterosexual men's gender self-esteem and sexual prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(9), 1233-1243. doi: 10.1177/0146167209338072.
- Farnham, C. (1996). Male bashing or what's in a name? Feminism in the United States today. *Journal of Women's History*, 8, 6-9.
- Fernandes, L. (2010). Unsettling "third wave feminism: Feminist waves, intersectionality, and identity politics in retrospect. In N.A. Hewitt (Ed.), *No permanent waves: Recasting histories of U. S. feminism* (pp. 98-118). New Brunswick, NJ, USA: Rutgers University Press.
- Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878-902. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878.
- Fitz, C. C., Zucker, A. N., & Bay-Cheng, L. Y. (2012). Not all nonlabelers are created equal: Distinguishing between quasi-feminists and neoliberals. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36, 274-285. doi:10.1177/0361684312451098.
- Follingstad, D.R., Robinson, E.A., & Pugh, M. (1977). Effects of consciousness-raising groups on measures of feminism, self-esteem, and social desirability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 24, 223-230. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.24.3.223.
- Frye, M. (1983). *The politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing.

- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 119-135.
doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x
- Goldberg, P.A., Gottesdiener, M., & Abramson, P.R. (1975). Another put down of women? Perceived attractiveness as a function of support for the feminist movement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *32*, 113-115.
- Gough, B. (2001). 'Biting your tongue': Negotiating masculinities in contemporary Britain. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *10*, 169-185. doi: 10/1080/0958923012005329-2
- Gourley, M. K., & Anderson, V. N. (2007). *Lend me your ears: Feminist orientation and perceptions of speakers*. Poster presented at the Association for Women in Psychology, San Francisco, CA.
- Green, A.I., Halkitis, P.N. (2006). Crystal methamphetamine and sexual sociality in an urban gay subculture: An elective affinity. *Culture, Health, & Sexuality*, *8*, 317-333.
doi:10.1080/13691050600783320.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (2008). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. In R. H. Fazio, & R. E. Petty (Eds.), *Attitudes: Their structure, function, and consequences* (pp. 183-198). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Hagan, K. L. (1992). *Women respond to the men's movement: A feminist collection*. New York: Harper San Francisco.
- Hamilton, L. (2007). Trading on heterosexuality: College women's gender strategies and homophobia. *Gender & Society*, *21*, 145-172. doi: 10.1177/0891243206297604.

- Hammond, W.P., & Mattis, J.S. (2005). Being a man about it: Manhood meaning among African-American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6, 114-126. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.6.2.114.
- Harnois, C.E. (2005). Different paths to different feminisms? Bridging multiracial feminist theory and quantitative sociological gender research. *Gender & Society*, 19, 809-828. doi:10.1177/0891243205280026.
- Haslam, N., & Levy, S. R. (2006). Essentialist beliefs about homosexuality: Structure and implications for prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 471-485. doi:10.1177/0146167205276516.
- Hatchett, S., & Quick, A. (1983). Correlates of sex role attitudes among black men and women: Data from a national survey of black Americans. *Institute for Urban Affairs and Research*, 9(2), 1-11.
- Hegarty, P., Pratto, F., & Lemieux, A.F. (2004). Heterosexist ambivalence and heterocentric norms: Drinking in intergroup discomfort. *Group processes and Intergroup Relations*, 7, 119-130. doi:10.1177/1368430204041399.
- Helgeson, V.S. (1994). Prototypes and dimensions of masculinity and femininity. *Sex Roles*, 31, 653-682. doi:10.1007/BF01544286.
- Hennen, P. (2005). Bear bodies, bear masculinity: Recuperation, resistance, or retreat? *Gender & Society*, 19, 25-43. doi:10.1177/0891243204269408.
- Herbert, L. A. (2007). Taking 'difference' seriously: Feminisms and the 'man question'. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 16, 31-45. doi: 10.1080/09589230601116141.

- Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of Sex Research, 25*, 451-477.
doi:10.1080/00224498809551476.
- Herek, G. M. (2000a). Sexual prejudice and gender: Do heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians differ? *Journal of Social Issues, 56*, 251-266. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00164.
- Herek, G.M. (2000b). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*, 19-22.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitano, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 412-424.
doi:10.1177/0146167296224007 .
- Hershey, M. (1978). Racial differences in sex-role identities and sex stereotyping: Evidence against a common assumption. *Social Science Quarterly, 58*, 583-596.
- Hoffman, J.P., & Miller, A.S. (1997). Social and political attitudes among religious groups: Convergence and divergence over time. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 36*, 528-546. doi:10.2307/1387882.
- Hoffman, J.P., & Miller, A.S. (1998). Denominational influences on socially divisive issues: Polarization or continuity? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 37*, 528-546. doi:10.2307/1388059.
- Hooberman, R. E. (1979). Psychological androgyny, feminine gender identity and self esteem in homosexual and heterosexual males. *The Journal of Sex Research, 15*, 306-315. doi:10.1080/00224497909551054.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.

- Hunter, A.G., & Davis, J.E. (1992). Constructing gender: An exploration of Afro American men's conceptualization of manhood. *Gender & Society, 6*, 464-479. doi:10.1177/089124392006003007.
- Hunter, A. G., & Sellers, S. L. (1998). Feminist attitudes among African American women and men. *Gender & Society, 12*, 81-99. doi:10.1177/089124398012001005.
- Hurt, M. M., Nelson, J. A., Turner, D. L., Haines, M. E., Ramsey, L. R., Erchull, M. J., et al. (2007). Feminism: What is it good for? Feminine norms and objectification as the link between feminist identity and clinically relevant outcomes. *Sex Roles, 57*, 355-363. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9272-7
- Hurtado, A. (1997). Understanding multiple group identities: Inserting women into cultural transformations. *Journal of Social Issues, 53*, 299-328.
- Hurtado, A., & Sinha, M. (2008). More than men: Latino feminist masculinities and intersectionality. *Sex Roles, 59*, 337-349. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9405-7
- Israeili, A. L., & Santor, D. A. (2000). Reviewing effective components of feminist therapy. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 13*, 233-247. doi:10.1080/095150700300091820.
- Jackson, L. A., Fleury, R. E., & Lewandowski, D. A. (1996). Feminism: Definitions, support, and correlates of support among female and male college students. *Sex Roles, 24*, 687-693. doi:10.1007/BF01551502.
- Jackson, L.A. & Sullivan, L.A. (1990). Perceptions of multiple role participants. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 53*, 274-282. doi:10.2307/2786965.

- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perception of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3, 97–106. doi: 10.1037//1524-9220.3.2.97
- Jenen, J., Winqvist, J., Arkkelin, D., & Schuster, K. (2009). Implicit attitudes towards feminism. *Sex Roles*, 60, 14-20. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9514-3.
- Jones, V. (1970). Attitudes of college students and their changes: A 37-year study. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 81, 3-80.
- Joseph, G. I., & Lewis, J. (1981). *Common differences: Conflicts in Black and White feminist perspectives*. Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Kane, E. (1992). Race, gender, and attitudes toward gender stratification. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55, 311-320. doi:10.2307/2786799.
- Kelly, C. & Breinlinger, S. (1995). Identity and injustice: Exploring women's participation in collective action. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 5, 41-57. doi:10.2307/2786799.
- Kilmartin, C. T. (2007). *The masculine self* (3rd ed.). Cornwall-on-Hudson, NY: Sloan Publishing.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1998). Who's afraid of men doing feminism? In T. Digby (Ed.), *Men doing feminism (thinking gender)*. (pp. 55-68) New York: Routledge.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2000). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In E. Disch (Ed.), *Reconstructing gender: A multicultural anthology* (pp. 132-139). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Kite, M. E. (1984). Sex differences in attitudes towards homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10, 69-81. doi:10.1177/0146167296224002.

- Kite, M.E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *11*, 83-96. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00776.x.
- Kite, M.E., & Whitely, B.E., Jr. (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual and methodological analysis. In G.M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 39-61). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Klein, F., Sepekoff, B., & Wolf, T. J. (1985). Sexual orientation: A multi-variable dynamic process. *Journal Of Homosexuality*, *11*, 35-49. doi:10.1300/J082v11n01_04
- LaMar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes towards gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Sex Research*, *35*, 189-196.
- Leaper, C., & Arias, D. M. (2011). College women's feminist identity: A multidimensional analysis with implications for coping with sexism. *Sex Roles*, *64*, 475-490. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-9936-1.
- Leavy, R.L. & Adams, E.M. (1986). Feminism as a correlate of self-esteem, self acceptance, and social support among lesbians. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *10*, 321-326.
- Lehavot, k., & Lambert, A.J. (2007). Toward a greater understanding of antigay prejudice: On the role of sexual orientation and gender role violation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *29*, 279-292. doi:10.1080/01973530701503390.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1984). *Gender roles and power*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc.

- Liss, M., Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2004). Predictors and correlates of collective action. *Sex Roles, 50*, 771-779.
- Liss, M., O'Connor, C., Morosky, E., & Crawford, M. (2001). What makes a feminist? Predictors and correlates of feminist social identity in college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25*, 124-133. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.00014.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302-318. doi: 10.1177/0146167292183006.
- Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109*, 267-296. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.267.
- Maccoby, E.E. (1987). The varied meanings of "masculine" and "feminine." In J.M. Reinisch, L.A. Rosenblum, & S.A. Sanders (Eds.), *Masculinity/femininity* (pp.227-239). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mack-Canty, C & Wright, S. (2004). Family values as practiced by feminist parents: Bridging third-wave feminism and family pluralism. *Journal of Family Issues, 25*, 851-880. doi: 10.1177/0192513X03261337.
- Martin, C.L. (1990). Attitudes and expectations about children with nontraditional and traditional gender roles. *Sex Roles, 31*, 517-531.
- McCabe, J. (2005). What's in a label: The relationship between feminist self identification and "feminist" attitudes among U.S. women and men. *Gender and Society, 19*, 480-505. doi: 10.1177/0891243204273498.

- McCreary, D. R. (1994). The male role and avoiding femininity. *Sex Roles, 31*, 517-531.
doi:10.1007/bf01544277.
- McMillen, S.G. (2008). *Seneca Falls and the origins of the women's rights movement*.
Cary, North Carolina: Oxford University Press.
- McNamara, K., & Rickard, K.M. (1989). Feminist identity development: Implications
for feminist therapy with women. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 68*, 184-189.
- Messerschmidt, J.W. (1993). *Masculinities and crime: Critique and reconceptualization
of theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mezydlo, L. S., & Betz, N. E. (1980). Perceptions of ideal sex roles as a function of sex
and feminist orientation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27*, 282-
285. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.27.3.282.
- Miller, Alan S., and John P. Hoffmann. 1995. "Risk and Religion: An Explanation of
Gender Differences in Religiosity." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 34*: 63–
75.
- Morgan, B. L. (1996). Putting the feminism into feminism scales: Introduction of a
Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS). *Sex Roles, 34*, 359–390.
- Morley, L. (1993). Women's studies as empowerment of "nontraditional" learners in
community and youth work training: A case study. In M. Kennedy, C. Lubelska, & V.
Walsh (Eds.), *Making connections: Women's studies, women's movements, women's
lives* (pp. 118-141). London: Taylor & Francis.

- Morrison, T. G., Kenny, P., & Harrington, A. (2005). Modern prejudice toward gay men and lesbian women: Assessing the viability of a measure of modern homonegative attitudes with an Irish context. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 131*, 219-250. doi: 10.3200/mono.131.3.219-250.
- Myaskovsky, L., & Wittig, M.A. (1997). Predictors of feminist social identity among college women. *Sex Roles, 37*, 861-883. doi:10.1007/BF02936344.
- Nagoshi, J. L., Adams, K. A., Terrell, H. K., Hill, E. D., Brzuzy, S., & Nagoshi, C. T. (2008). Gender differences in correlates of homophobia and transphobia. *Sex Roles, 59*, 521-531. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9458-7.
- Nail, P. R., McGregor, I., Drinkwater, A. E., Steele, G. M., & Thompson, A. W. (2009). Threat causes liberals to think like conservatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 901-907. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.013.
- Nelson, J.A., Liss, M., Erchull, M.J., Hurt, M.M., Ramsey, L.R., Turner, D.L., et al. (2008). Identity in action: Predictors of feminist self-identification and collective action. *Sex Roles, 58*, 721-728. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9384-0.
- Ossana, S.M., Helms, J.E., & Leonard, M.M. (1992). Do “womanist” identity attitudes influence college women’s self-esteem and perceptions of environmental bias? *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 402-408. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1992.tb01624.x.
- Pascoe, C. J. 2005. “Dude, you’re a fag”: Adolescent masculinity and the fag discourse. *Sexualities, 8*, 329-346. doi:10.1177/1363460705053337.
- Pew Research Center. (2014). *Millennials in adulthood: Detached from institutions, networked with friends*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2014/03/07/millennials-in-adulthood/>

- Pierce, W.D., Sydie, R.A., Stratkotter, R., & Krull, C. (2003). Social concepts and judgments: A semantic differential analysis of the concepts feminist, man, and woman. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 338-346.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Poteat, V. P., Espelage, D. L., & Green Jr, H. D. (2007). The socialization of dominance: Peer group contextual effects on homophobic and dominance attitudes. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 92, 1040-1050. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1040.
- Ransford, H. E., & Miller, J. (1983). Race, sex, and feminist outlooks. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 46-59. doi:10.2307/2095144.
- Ratcliff, J. J., Lassiter, G. D., Markman, K. D., & Snyder, C. J. (2006). Gender differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: The role of motivation to respond without prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1325-1338. doi:10.1177/0146167206290213.
- Renzetti, C. (1987). New wave or second stage? Attitudes of college women towards feminism. *Sex Roles*, 16, 265-227.
- Renzetti, C. M., & Curran, D. J. (1989). *Women, men, and society: The sociology of gender*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rubin, L. (1994). *Families on the faultline: America's working class speaks about the family, the economy, race and ethnicity*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Rudman, L.A. & Fairchild, K. (2007). The F word: Is feminism incompatible with beauty and romance? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31-125-136. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00346.x.

- Sánchez, F. J., Greenberg, S. T., Liu, W., & Vilain, E. (2009). Reported effects of masculine ideals on gay men. *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity, 10*, 73-87. doi:10.1037/a0013513.
- Schrock, D., & Schwalbe, M. (2009). Men, masculinity, and manhood acts. *The Annual Review of Sociology, 35*, 277-295. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115933.
- Schwartz, J., & Lindley, L. (2005). Religious fundamentalism and attachment: Prediction of homophobia. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 15*, 145-157. doi:10.1207/s15327582ijpr1502_3.
- Shook, N. J., & Fazio, R. H. (2009). Political ideology, exploration of novel stimuli, and attitude formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 995-998. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.003.
- Shook, N. J., Fazio, R. H., & Eiser, J. (2007). Attitude generalization: Similarity, valence, and extremity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43*, 641-647. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2006.06.005.
- Sidanius, J. (1978). Intolerance of ambiguity and socio-politico ideology: A multidimensional analysis. *European Journal Of Social Psychology, 8*(2), 215-235. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420080207.
- Sidanius, J., & Ekehammar, B. (1980). Sex-related differences in socio-political ideology. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 21*(1), 17-26. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.1980.tb00336.x.
- Slesaransky-Poe, G., & Garcia, A. M. (2009). Boys with gender variant behaviors and interests: from theory to practice. *Sex Education, 9*, 201-210. doi: 10.1080/14681810902829679.

- Smith, C. A. (1999). I enjoy being a girl: Collective self-esteem, feminism, and attitudes toward women. *Sex Roles, 40*, 281-293. doi:10.1023/A:1018855106539.
- Stern, P. (1970). The womanly image. In J. Sochen (Ed.), *The new feminism in twentieth century America*. (pp.80-88) Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Stewart, A. J., & Healy, J.M., Jr. (1989). Linking individual development and social changes. *American Psychologist, 44*, 30-42. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.1.30.
- Stöber, J. (2001). The Social Desirability Scale-17 (SDS-17): Convergent validity, discriminant validity, and relationship with age. *European Journal Of Psychological Assessment, 17*, 222-232. doi:10.1027//1015-5759.17.3.222.
- Suter, E. A., & Toller, P. W. (2006). Gender role and feminism revisited: A follow-up study. *Sex Roles, 55*, 135-146. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9065-4 .
- Suziedelis, A. & Potvin, R.H. (1981). Sex differences in factors affecting religiousness among catholic adolescents. *Journal for Scientific Study of Religion, 20*, 38-50.
- Szymanski, D. M. (2004). Relations among dimensions of feminism and internalized heterosexism in lesbians and bisexual women. *Sex Roles, 51*, 145-159. doi: 10.1023/B:SERS.0000037759.33014.55
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In J. T. Jost, & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Political psychology: Key readings* (pp. 276-293). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Tarrant, S. (2009). *Men and feminism*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Studies.

- Thompson, B. (2010). Multiracial feminism: Recasting the chronology of second wave feminism. In N.A. Hewitt (Ed.), *No permanent waves: Recasting histories of U. S. feminism* (pp. 40-60). New Brunswick, NJ, USA: Rutgers University Press.
- Thornton, A., & Freedman, D. (1979). Changes in the sex role attitudes of women, 1962-1977: Evidence from a panel study. *American Sociological Review*, *44*, 831-842.
- Tilki, M. (2006). The social constructs of drinking among Irish men in London. *Drugs*, *13*, 247-261. doi:10.1080/09687630600577964.
- Tipton, R.M., Bailey, K.G., & Obenchain, J.P. (1975). Invasion of males' personal space by feminists and non-feminists. *Psychological Reports*, *37*, 99-102. doi:10.2466/pr0.1975.37.1.99.
- Toller, P. W., Suter, E. A., & Trautman, T. C. (2004). Gender role identity and attitudes towards feminism. *Sex Roles*, *51*, 85-90. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000032316.71165.45.
- Twenge, J. M. (1999). Mapping gender: The multifactorial approach and the organization of gender-related attributes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *23*, 485-502. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00377.x.
- Twenge, J. M., & Zucker, A. N. (1999). What is a feminist? Closed and open-ended responses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *23*, 591-605. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00383.x.
- Wacquant, L. (2003). *Body and soul: Notebooks of an apprentice boxer*. New York: Routledge.
- Wantland, R. (2005). Feminist frat boys?: Fraternity men in the (women's studies) house. *National Women's Studies Association*, *17*, 156-163.

- Watzlawik, M. (2009). When a man thinks he has female traits-constructing femininity and masculinity: Methodological potentials and limitations. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science, 43*, 126-137. doi: 10.1007/s12124-008-9085-4.
- White, A.M. (2006). Racial and gender attitudes as predictors of feminist activism among self identified African American feminists. *Journal of Black Psychology, 32*, 455-478. doi:10.1177/0095798406292469.
- Whitley, B. E., & Lee, S. E. (2000). The relationship of authoritarianism and related constructs to attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 144-170. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02309.x.
- Wildman, R., & Wildman, R. W. (1974). Liberalism of college students and general public on the Thumin Conservatism-Liberalism Scale. *Psychological Reports, 35*, 441-442.
- Williams, R., & Wittig, M. A. (1997). "I'm not a feminist, but..." Factors contributing to the discrepancy between pro-feminist orientation and feminist social identity. *Sex Roles, 37*, 885-904. doi:10.1007/BF02936345.
- Yoder, J.D. (2003). *Women and gender: Transforming psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zucker, A. N. (2004). Disavowing social identities: What it means when women say, "I'm not a feminist, but...". *Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 28*, 423-435. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00159.x.

Table 1

Zero-Order Correlations Between the Warmth, Competence, LFAIS, SDS-17, and GSE for Men and Women

	Warmth	Men		
		Competence	LFAIS	SDS-17
Warmth				
Competence	.67***			
LFAIS	-.11	-.00		
SDS-17	.12	.08	-.08	
CSE (Gender)	.05	.18*	.01	-.04

	Warmth	Women		
		Competence	LFAIS	SDS-17
Warmth				
Competence	.79**			
LFAIS	-.02	.01		
SDS-17	.01	.01	.09	
CSE (Gender)	.03	.08	.30***	.01

Note. LFAIS = Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale; CSE = Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Modified for gender); SDS-17 = Social Desirability Scale-17. Warmth and Competence Scale scores range from 6 to 30, with higher scores indicating higher levels of stereotypical femininity and masculinity, respectively. The Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology scale ranges from 11 to 66, with higher scores indicating more positive feminist attitudes. The Social Desirability Scale scores ranges from 0 to 16, with higher scores indicating a stronger pattern of socially desirable response style. The Collective Self-Esteem Scale scores range from 16 to 112, with higher scores indicating higher gender self-esteem. Sample sizes were 117 for men and ranged from 348-349 for women.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Warmth, Competence, LFAIS, SDS-17, and CSE Scales by Gender of Participant

	Women	Men	Total
Measures	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Warmth	20.4 (5.7)	20.7 (5.0)	20.5 (5.5)
Competence	22.0 (4.4)	21.2 (4.1)	21.8 (4.3)
LFAIS	52.0 (6.5)	47.2 (7.3)	50.8 (7.0)
SDS-17	8.2 (3.2)	8.1 (3.3)	8.2 (3.2)
CSE (Gender)	84.4 (12.0)	84.7 (13.4)	84.5 (12.3)

Note. $N = 349$ for women. $N = 117$ for men. LFAIS= Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale; SDS-17 = Social Desirability Scale; CSE= Collective Self-Esteem Scale (modified for gender). Warmth and Competence Scale scores range from 6 to 30, with higher scores indicating higher levels of stereotypical femininity and masculinity, respectively. The Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology scale ranges from 11 to 66, with higher scores indicating more positive feminist attitudes. The Social Desirability Scale scores ranges from 0 to 16, with higher scores indicating a stronger pattern of socially desirable response style. The Collective Self-Esteem Scale scores range from 16 to 112, with higher scores indicating higher gender self-esteem.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for the Warmth and Competence Ratings for Men and Women as a Function of Vignette Feminist Orientation and Vignette Sexual Orientation

		Warmth					
		N	Non-Feminist	N	Feminist	N	Anti-Feminist
Men							
	Heterosexual	31	22.7 (3.1)	16	22.4 (4.2)	22	16.0 (4.3)
	Homosexual	18	23.3 (2.9)	17	23.4 (3.6)	13	14.7 (4.2)
Women							
	Heterosexual	59	23.6 (3.6)	67	24.0 (3.6)	58	14.6 (3.7)
	Homosexual	66	23.4 (3.5)	38	23.3 (3.6)	61	14.0 (3.7)

		Competence					
		N	Non-Feminist	N	Feminist	N	Anti-Feminist
Men							
	Heterosexual	31	21.5 (3.2)	16	22.3 (3.8)	22	18.4 (3.4)
	Homosexual	18	22.8 (3.8)	17	23.2 (3.4)	13	18.9 (5.6)
Women							
	Heterosexual	59	23.3 (3.8)	67	24.3 (3.4)	58	18.7 (3.8)
	Homosexual	66	23.5 (3.8)	38	23.5 (4.0)	61	19.0 (3.6)

Note. Warmth and Competence Scale scores range from 6 to 30, with higher scores indicating higher levels of stereotypical femininity and masculinity, respectively.

Table 4

Multivariate Results for the Character Ratings on Warmth and Competence Scales

	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Social Desirability	.66	.517	.003
Participant Gender	3.67	.027	.016
Sexual Orientation	1.76	.174	.008
Feminist Orientation	87.97	<.001	.280
Gender*Sexual Orientation	.77	.464	.003
Gender*Feminist Orientation	1.08	.367	.005
Sexual Orientation*Feminist Orientation	1.00	.406	.004
Gender*Sexual Orientation*Feminist Orientation	.45	.776	.002

Note. Social Desirability, Gender, Sexual Orientation, Gender* Sexual Orientation ($df= 2, 452$); Feminist Orientation, Gender*Feminist Orientation, Sexual Orientation*Feminist Orientation, Gender*Sexual Orientation*Feminist Orientation ($df= 4, 904$).

Table 5

Univariate Results for the Character Ratings on the Warmth and Competence Scales

	Warmth Ratings			Competence Ratings		
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Social Desirability	1.18	.278	.003	.20	.652	.000
Participant Gender	.02	.888	.000	4.37	.037	.010
Sexual Orientation	.30	.587	.001	.92	.339	.002
Feminist Orientation	195.65	<.001	.463	47.21	<.001	.172
Gender*Sexual Orientation	.51	.475	.001	1.52	.219	.003
Gender*Feminist Orientation	2.03	.133	.009	.64	.526	.003
Sexual Orientation*Feminist Orientation	.98	.375	.004	.21	.809	.001
Gender*Sexual Orientation*Feminist Orientation	.86	.423	.004	.254	.776	.001

Note. Social Desirability, Gender, Sexual Orientation, Feminist Orientation, Gender*Sexual Orientation ($df= 1, 453$); Feminist Orientation, Gender*Feminist Orientation, Sexual Orientation*Feminist Orientation, Gender*Sexual Orientation* Feminist Orientation ($df= 2, 453$).

Table 6

Multivariate Results for the Effects of Participant Feminist Orientation and Vignette Feminist Orientation on Women's Ratings of Warmth and Competence

	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Social Desirability	.28	.755	.002
Vignette Feminist Orientation	79.28	<.001	.320
Participant Feminist Orientation	1.77	.133	.010
Vignette Feminist Orientation*Participant Feminist Orientation	1.31	.233	.015

Note. Social Desirability (*df*= 2, 902); Vignette Feminist Orientation and Participant Feminist Orientation (*df*= 4, 674); Vignette Feminist Orientation*Participant Feminist Orientation (*df*= 8, 674).

Table 7

Univariate Results for the Effects of Participant Feminist Orientation, and Vignette Feminist Orientation on Women's Ratings of Warmth and Competence

	Warmth Ratings			Competence Ratings		
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p
Social Desirability	.54	.463	.002	.17	.682	.000
Vignette Feminist Orientation	181.21	<.001	.517	45.29	<.001	.211
Participant Feminist Orientation	.07	.929	.000	2.06	.130	.012
Vignette Feminist Orientation*Participant Feminist Orientation	1.39	.237	.016	1.17	.326	.014

Note. Social Desirability (*df*= 1, 338); Vignette Feminist Orientation and Participant Feminist Orientation (*df*= 2, 338); Vignette Feminist Orientation*Participant Feminist Orientation (*df*= 4, 338).

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for Warmth and Competence Ratings by Participant Feminist Orientation and Vignette Feminist Orientation

		Women					
		N	Anti-Feminist	N	Non-Feminist	N	Feminist
Warmth							
Non-Feminist	36	23.7 (3.5)	75	23.5 (3.5)	13	23.2 (3.4)	
Feminist	13	22.7 (3.9)	76	24.1 (3.4)	16	23.1 (3.9)	
Anti-Feminist	34	15.1 (3.1)	62	13.7 (3.7)	23	14.5 (4.2)	
Competence							
Non-Feminist	36	23.6 (4.2)	75	23.5 (3.6)	13	22.8 (3.7)	
Feminist	13	22.2 (3.1)	76	24.5 (3.5)	16	23.3 (3.9)	
Anti-Feminist	34	19.3 (3.0)	62	19.0 (3.9)	23	17.7 (3.9)	

Table 9

Partial Correlations Between LFAIS Scores and Warmth and Competence Ratings for Men and Women

Vignette	Men		Women	
	Warmth	Competence	Warmth	Competence
Heterosexual Non-feminist	.17	.23	-.02	-.04
Homosexual Non-feminist	.40	-.01	.01	-.03
Heterosexual Feminist	.56*	.66**	.30*	.21
Homosexual Feminist	-.13	-.28	.37*	.30
Heterosexual Anti-feminist	-.74***	-.42	-.28*	-.12
Homosexual Anti-feminist	.37	.23	.12	.09

Note. Sample sizes ranged from 185 to 187 for women and 202 to 204 for men. Higher scores represent higher levels of prejudice. SDS-17 scores were partialled out before calculating the correlations.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) for Attitudes Toward Feminism and Religiosity by Gender and Race

		Men		Women		Total	
		N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)
LFAIS							
	White	80	46.2 (7.2)	246	51.2 (6.7)	326	50.0 (7.2)
	Black	24	48.5 (6.5)	76	53.7 (5.5)	100	52.4 (6.1)
Religiosity							
	White	80	3.9 (1.9)	246	4.3 (1.6)	326	4.2 (1.7)
	Black	24	5.0 (1.2)	76	5.0 (1.4)	100	5.0 (1.3)

Table 11

Frequencies (in Parentheses) and Percentages of Participant Feminist Orientation by Race and Gender

	White		Black	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Anti-Feminist	31.6% (25)	21.5% (53)	33.3% (8)	32.0% (24)
Non-Feminist	63.3% (50)	64.6% (159)	66.7% (16)	52.0% (39)
Feminist	5.1% (4)	13.8% (34)	0.0% (0)	16.0% (12)

Appendix A

Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a research study on attitudes toward men. This research is being conducted by doctoral student, Abigail Slowik and Dr. Veanne Anderson of the Psychology Department at Indiana State University. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate.

PARTICIPANT REQUIREMENTS

To participate in this study, you must be at least 18 years old.

PROCEDURE

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will click on a link below that says “I agree” and you will be routed to an Indiana State University website where you will be asked to answer questions about your attitudes toward men. You will also be asked questions about your age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, politics, and education level. The survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Your responses to the questionnaire will be kept in a secure database and we will not be collecting any identifying information. Only the researchers will have access to this database and it will be secured with a password.

PARTICIPANT RISKS AND BENEFITS

Risks of participation are minimal and not expected to be greater than what you encounter in everyday activities. You may experience some mild anxiety when completing some of the questions due to examining your own attitudes. The benefits of participation include more exposure to psychological research and encouragement to think about your attitudes toward men. Also, you will be contributing to a broader understanding of feminism and sexuality.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your participation is voluntary and you may choose to withdraw at any time without consequence. Your responses will not be entered into the database until the end of the survey, when you click “Submit.” If you decide to withdraw in the middle of the survey, you may do so. You may also refuse to answer any questions you do not want to answer. You will not be penalized if you withdraw from the study or if you decline participation and will receive credit for participation.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

This project has been reviewed and determined to be exempt, due to minimal risk to you as a participant, by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Indiana State University. The study has been determined to adequately safeguard the participant’s privacy welfare, civil liberties, and rights. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Indiana State University institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Institutional Review Board, Indiana State University, 114 Erickson Hall, Terre Haute, IN 47809; by phone at (812) 237-8217; or by email at irb@indstate.edu.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about this research, please contact the project supervisor, Veanne Anderson, Department of Psychology, Indiana State University at (812) 237-2459, or by email at vanderson1@indstate.edu.

You may also contact the primary researcher, Abigail Slowik in the ISU Psychology Clinic at 812-237-3317, or by email, aslowik1@sycamores.indstate.edu.

Please print a copy of this form for your records and click “I agree” below to begin the study.

Appendix B

Vignettes

The bold-faced sentences describe the feminist orientation of the hypothetical character (non-feminist, feminist, or anti-feminist). The italicized sentences describe heterosexual or homosexual characteristics of the character. The bold-faced and italicized font will not appear in the final versions.

Heterosexual non-feminist

Brian is currently a 20-year old college student. **He believes that women and men should have equal economic, political, and social rights but he does not consider himself a feminist.** Brian is also involved in student government and has been conducting research for the last two years with a faculty member in his department. *In his spare time, Brian enjoys spending time with his girlfriend, with whom he has been in a committed relationship for the past two years.*

Homosexual non-feminist

Brian is currently a 20-year old college student. **He believes that women and men should have equal economic, political, and social rights but he does not consider himself a feminist.** Brian is also involved in student government and has been conducting research for the last two years with a faculty member in his department. *In his spare time, Brian enjoys spending time with his boyfriend, with whom he has been in a committed relationship for the past two years.*

Heterosexual feminist

Brian is currently a 20-year old college student. **He considers himself a feminist and strongly believes that women and men should have equal economic, political, and social rights. Brian is an active member of the campus feminist student organization.** Brian is also involved in student government and has been conducting research for the last two years with a faculty member in his department. *In his spare time, Brian enjoys spending time with his girlfriend, with whom he has been in a committed relationship for the past two years.*

Homosexual feminist

Brian is currently a 20-year old college student. **He considers himself a feminist and strongly believes that women and men should have equal economic, political, and social rights. Brian is an active member of the campus feminist student organization.** Brian is also involved in student government and has been conducting research for the last two years with a faculty member in his department. *In his spare time, Brian enjoys spending time with his boyfriend, with whom he has been in a committed relationship for the past two years.*

Heterosexual anti-feminist

Brian is currently a 20-year old college student. **He strongly dislikes feminists and believes that women do not deserve the same economic, political, and social rights as men. Brian is an active member of a campus anti-feminist student organization.** Brian is also involved in student government and has been conducting research for the last two years with a faculty member in his department. *In his spare time, Brian enjoys spending time with his girlfriend, with whom he has been in a committed relationship for the past two years.*

Homosexual anti-feminist

Brian is currently a 20-year old college student. **He strongly dislikes feminists and believes that women do not deserve the same economic, political, and social rights as men. Brian is an active member of a campus anti-feminist student organization.** Brian is also involved in student government and has been conducting research for the last two years with a faculty member in his department. *In his spare time, Brian enjoys spending time with his boyfriend, with whom he has been in a committed relationship for the past two years.*

Appendix C

Warmth and Competence Scales

Please rate Brian on the following characteristics.

- | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Extremely friendly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not at all friendly |
| 2. Not at all well-intentioned | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extremely well-intentioned |
| 3. Extremely trustworthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not at all trustworthy |
| 4. Extremely competent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not at all competent |
| 5. Not at all confident | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extremely confident |
| 6. Not at all warm | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extremely warm |
| 7. Not at all capable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extremely capable |
| 8. Extremely good-natured | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not at all good-natured |
| 9. Not at all sincere | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extremely sincere |
| 10. Extremely efficient | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not at all efficient |
| 11. Not at all intelligent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Extremely intelligent |
| 12. Extremely skillful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Not at all skillful |

Appendix D

Manipulation Check

What was the character's name?

1. Brandon
2. Brian
3. Billy

What is Brian's attitude toward feminism?

1. Brian considers himself a feminist.
2. Brian believes that women and men should have equal rights but he does not consider himself a feminist.
3. Brian strongly dislikes feminists.

What is Brian's sexual orientation?

1. Brian is a gay man.
2. Brian is a heterosexual man.

Appendix E

Liberal Feminist Attitudes and Ideology Scale (LFAIS), Short Form

Below you will find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and then indicate the number that best matches your opinion.

1. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.*

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Men should respect women more than they currently do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. Many women in the workforce are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.*

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. America should pass the Equal Rights Amendment.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

9. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.*

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

10. Women in the U.S. are treated as second-class citizens.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

11. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.*

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree	Strongly Agree

*These items are reverse scored.

Appendix F

Collective Self-Esteem Scale

We are all members of different social groups or social categories, such as gender, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Please respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about your gender group (women, men, etc.) and your membership in your gender group. Use the following scale to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statements below.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. _____ I am a worthy member of my gender group.
2. _____ I feel I don't have much to offer to my gender group.*
3. _____ I am a cooperative participant in my gender group.
4. _____ I often feel I'm a useless member of my gender group.*
5. _____ I often regret that I belong to my gender group.*
6. _____ In general, I'm glad to be a member of my gender group.
7. _____ Overall, I often feel that the gender group of which I am a member is not worthwhile.*
8. _____ I feel good about my gender group.
9. _____ Overall, my gender group is considered good by others.
10. _____ Most people consider my gender group, on the average, to be more ineffective than other social groups.*
11. _____ In general, others respect the gender group that I am a member of.
12. _____ In general, others think that the gender group I am a member of is unworthy.*
13. _____ Overall, my gender group membership has very little to do with how I feel about myself.*
14. _____ The gender group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.
15. _____ The gender group I belong to is unimportant for my sense of what kind of person am. *
16. _____ In general, belonging to my gender group is an important part of my self-image.

- items are reverse scored

Appendix G

The Social Desirability Scale-17

Below you will find a list of statements. Please read each statement carefully and decide if that statement describes you or not. If it describes you mark *true*; if not, mark the word *false*.

- | | | |
|--|------|-------|
| 1. I sometimes litter.* | True | False |
| 2. I always admit my mistakes openly and face the potential negative consequences. | True | False |
| 3. In traffic I am always polite and considerate of others. | True | False |
| 4. I always accept others' opinions, even when they don't agree with my own. | True | False |
| 5. I take out my bad moods on others now and then.* | True | False |
| 6. There has been an occasion when I took advantage of someone else.* | True | False |
| 7. In conversation I always listen attentively and let others finish their sentences. | True | False |
| 8. I never hesitate to help someone in case of emergency. | True | False |
| 9. When I have made a promise, I keep it – no ifs, ands, or buts. | True | False |
| 10. I occasionally speak badly of others behind their back.* | True | False |
| 11. I would never live off other people. | True | False |
| 12. I always stay friendly and courteous with other people, even when I am stressed out. | True | False |
| 13. During an argument I always stay objective and matter-of-fact. | True | False |
| 14. There has been at least one occasion when I failed to return an item that I borrowed.* | True | False |
| 15. I always eat a healthy diet. | True | False |
| 16. Sometimes I only help because I expect something in return. * | True | False |

* items are reverse coded.

Appendix H
Demographic Questionnaire

Age: _____

Gender:

1. Male
2. Female
3. Other

Are you a transgender man or woman?

1. Yes
2. No

Current Sexual Orientation:

1. Heterosexual Only
2. Heterosexual Mostly
3. Heterosexual More
4. Gay or Lesbian/Heterosexual Equally
5. Gay or Lesbian More
6. Gay or Lesbian Mostly
7. Gay or Lesbian Only
8. Other (please specify) _____

Year in School:

1. First-Year
2. Sophomore
3. Junior
4. Senior
5. Graduate Student

Race:

1. White/Caucasian
2. Black/African American
3. Hispanic/Latino(a)
4. Native American/American Indian
5. Asian/Asian American
6. Middle Eastern
7. Biracial
8. Other (please specify) _____

Which best represents your political affiliation?

1. Democrat
2. Republican
3. Independent
4. Other
5. Don't know

Do you think of yourself as a strong Republican or not a very strong Republican?

1. Strong
2. Not Strong

Do you think of yourself as a strong Democrat or not a strong Democrat?

1. Strong
2. Not strong

As an independent, do you tend to lean more Republican or more Democrat?

1. Republican
2. Democrat

How important is religion to you?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not important at all	Moderately unimportant	Slightly unimportant	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important

Please choose the statement that best represents your beliefs:

1. I do not consider myself a feminist at all, and I believe that feminists are harmful to family life and undermine relations between women and men
2. I do not consider myself a feminist.
3. I agree with some of the objectives of the feminist movement but do not call myself a feminist
4. I agree with most of the objectives of the feminist movement but do not call myself a feminist.
5. I privately consider myself a feminist but do not call myself a feminist around others.
6. I call myself a feminist around others.
7. I call myself a feminist around others and am currently active in the women's movement.

Appendix I

Written Debriefing

In this study we are interested in college students' beliefs about feminist men and the factors that affect why men may or may not identify as a feminist. Previous research indicates that attitudes towards feminist women may be influenced by a variety of factors including race, sexual orientation, gender, and political affiliation. We are interested in whether similar factors are related to attitudes towards feminist men.

Thank you for your participation in this study. If you have any questions or if you are interested in the results of the study please contact Veanne N. Anderson, Department of Psychology at 812-237-2459. You can also email her at vanderson1@indstate.edu.

If you experience any distress as a result of participating in this study, you can access psychological services at the University's Student Counseling Center (812-237-3939) or the Psychology Clinic in Root Hall (812-237-3317).

Also, please do not discuss this study with your friends because they may be participating in it in the future.