

**Anti-femininity and Gender Role Conflict
as predictors of
Social Dominance and Genderism
in Irish Males**

Susie Glynn

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the Higher Diploma in Psychology at
Dublin Business School, School of Arts, Dublin.

Supervisor: Dr. Lucie Corcoran

Programme Leader: Dr. Rosie Reid

March 2017

Department of Psychology

Dublin Business School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	v
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The Male Gender Role and Femininity	1
1.2 Gender Role Conflict	5
1.3 Genderism	7
1.4 Social Dominance Orientation	9
1.5 The Present Study	11
CHAPTER II: METHODS	13
2.1 Participants	13
2.2 Design	14
2.3 Materials	14
2.4 Procedure	16
CHAPTER III: RESULTS	18
3.1 Descriptive Statistics	18
3.2 Inferential Statistics	19
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION	20
4.1 Research Findings	20
4.2 Implications	26
4.3 Strengths	27
4.4 Limitations	27
4.5 Future Research	28
4.6 Conclusion	29
REFERENCES	30
APPENDICES	38
Appendix A: Survey Cover Letter	38
Appendix B: Survey Conclusion Page	39
Appendix C: Demographic Questionnaire	40
Appendix D: Anti-femininity Subscale from the Male Role Norms Scale	41
Appendix E: Transphobia Scale	42
Appendix F: Social Dominance Orientation Scale	43
Appendix G: Gender Role Conflict SF Scale	44

Acknowledgements

Appreciation is extended to those who gave their time to complete the questionnaire, and to the lecturers at the Department of Psychology, Dublin Business School, for representing a constant source of encouragement. A particular thanks to Dr. Lucie Corcoran for supervising this project, being supportive, and lending invaluable expertise. And finally to Eimear Morrissey, for always singing the important bits importantly.

“We’re born naked, the rest is drag.”

– Ru Paul

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the combined contributions made by anti-femininity, gender role conflict (GRC), and sexual orientation (grouped heterosexual and non-heterosexual), to genderism and social dominance orientation (SDO) in a sample of Irish males. A correlational design was employed and 183 male participants completed self-report measures in an online questionnaire. Overall, results showed anti-femininity to be the stronger predictor of genderism and SDO. GRC did not have a significant partial effect on genderism. GRC did have a significant partial effect on SDO, with anti-femininity making the larger contribution. Sexual orientation had a significant partial effect on genderism, with results showing anti-femininity to be the stronger predictor. Results suggest that attitudes toward femininity are important to consider in the GRC, genderism, and SDO research domains, with conclusions drawn from the results suggesting potential implications for the role of anti-femininity in the socialisation of the male gender role.

CHAPTER I: Introduction

Gender related issues continue to be of pressing concern amid the social, legal, and political realms, both domestically and internationally (“International Women’s Day: Calls to Action,” 2017). The salience and magnitude of the burgeoning challenge to the deeply entrenched status quo of male dominance was surmised by former US presidential candidate, Hillary Clinton, taking to the political world stage to proclaim “The future is female” (Przybyla, 2017). Despite egalitarian gains made recently in Ireland (“Legal Gender Recognition in Ireland,” 2015; Ó Caollaí & Hilliard, 2015), the problem of prejudice remains for gender issues (Higgins et al., 2016). Thus, offering a timely endeavour for this study to examine a number of variables empirically shown to support the maintenance of the gender hierarchy.

The purpose of this study is to examine anti-femininity, gender role conflict (GRC), and sexual orientation, as regards how they relate to genderism and social dominance orientation (SDO) in a sample of Irish males. A review of the relevant literature will first consider the socialisation of the male gender role together with attitudes toward femininity, to put context to GRC. This is followed by consideration of the points of GRC that are salient to this study. And finally, a review of theories and research on genderism and SDO will be explored before proceeding to research questions of interest.

1.1 The Male Gender Role and Femininity

Gender role socialisation can begin from the moment of birth from the simple question "is it a boy or a girl?" (Gleitman, Friedlund & Reisberg, 2000, p. 499). Roles are imparted and

men learn the expected norms of masculine behaviour for their culture (Pleck, 1995). According to David and Brannon's (1976) "No Sissy Stuff" theory, through the male socialisation process, a fear of femininity (FOF) is learned. The FOF, is defined as a strong, negative emotion associated with feminine values, attitudes, and behaviours, and regarded as inferior – essentially a devaluation of all that is feminine (O'Neil 1981; O'Neil, Denke, & Blazina, 2016). According to David and Brannon (1976) this fear produces "guidelines" as to how a "real man" should carry himself and is learned by: (1) early anxiety of being considered a girl, sissy, or feminine; (2) a rule dictating that a "real man" must never resemble a woman or possess feminine characteristics; (3) openness and vulnerability being considered un-masculine; (4) fear of being seen as a homosexual (Solomon, 2013, p. 20). Accordingly, a life-long aversion to any quality considered to be feminine can arise, and constant striving for the ways to be masculine, with boys learning to reject and repress feminine parts of their personalities and walk the 'straight and narrow' (Altmaier & Hansen, 2012, p. 382; Herek, 2009; Thompson & Pleck, 1986; Wellman & McCoy, 2014). "Big boys don't cry" (Good & Sherrod, 2001, p. 24) becomes the mantra (Wester & Vogel, 2002, p. 370).

As a social phenomenon, researchers agree there is no one "traditional" masculinity, rather a constellation of standards and expectations that focus on common dimensions, amongst them, achievement, emotional control, anti-femininity, and anti-homosexuality (Pleck, 1995, p. 20). It has therefore been suggested that masculinity, rather than a concrete construct, is defined more or less by its opposition to that which is not masculine (i.e. feminine) (Winter, 2010, p. 510). On that basis, theorists and researchers argue that masculinity is an unstable phenomenon, never ultimately achieved (Reeser, 2010, pp. 30 – 31). Attempts to achieve it are described as constant vigilance to rigid gender expectations which results in a fragility that is unique to the masculine gender role (Wellman & McCoy, 2014, p. 182). It is suggested that

this rigidity and fragility can lead men to reject all things feminine (e.g., Kimmel, 1997; O'Neil, 2008; O'Neil & Egan, 1992) and reject homosexuality in efforts to bolster one's masculinity, thus exhibiting proper gender role compliance, and ensuring social acceptance (Kite & Whitley, 1998; Parrott, 2009; Whitley & Kite, 2006, p. 368; Wilkinson, 2004). Indeed, many widely used psychological tools measuring adherence and conformity to the male role norm comprise the repudiation of femininity and the rejection of homosexuality (e.g., Levant's Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI)).

Broad literature connects the endorsement of masculine norms, more specifically the anti-femininity norm, with heterosexual men's prejudice and negative attitudes toward homosexual men (Keiller, 2010; Martínez, Vázquez, & Falomir-Pichastor, 2015; Parrott, Peterson, Vincent, & Bakeman, 2008; Theodore, Maguire, Sandy, & Bellis, 2015; Wellman & McCoy, 2014), and toward feminine-appearing men (Gerhardstein & Anderson, 2010). And heterosexual masculinity has been linked with the fear of appearing feminine or being associated with feminine characteristics (Theodore & Basow, 2000; Vandello et al., 2008; Vincent, Parrott, & Peterson, 2011; Wilkinson, 2004). The common interplay between the repudiation of both femininity and homosexuality have lead researchers to suggest that negative attitudes towards non-heterosexuals may be reflecting a broad anti-feminine disposition, depicting "general negative attitudes against feminine characteristics" (Parrott, Adams, & Zeichner, 2002, p. 1275). Support for this notion comes from a study by Glick, Gangl, Gibb, Klumpner, and Weinberg (2007). The researchers found defensive reactions to masculinity threat increased negative affect toward effeminate, but not toward masculine, homosexual men. Results from another study showed that a broad anti-feminine disposition is not reserved for heterosexuals, where effeminate homosexual men elicited more negative emotions compared to masculine homosexual men both in homosexual and heterosexual

respondents, with no difference in intensity (Salvati, Ioverno, Giacomantonio, & Baiocco, 2016). Another study showed a threat to masculinity involved a distancing from femininity in homosexual men (Hunt, Fasoli, Carnaghi, & Cadinu, 2016).

Despite the stereotype that homosexual men are viewed as effeminate and thus unaffected by masculine norms (Hunt et., 2016; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Madon, 1997) , although unimportant to some (Riggle, Whitman, Olson, Rostosky, & Strong, 2008), masculinity plays a prominent role in the lives of many homosexual men (Halkitis, Moeller, & Deraleau, 2008; Sánchez, Bocklandt, & Vilain, 2009; Sánchez & Vilain, 2012). According to some scholars, since the early 20th century there have been homosexual men who rigidly emphasised traditional masculinity and stigmatised effeminate homosexual men (Chauncey, 1994; Mosse, 1996). One reason put forth to explain this trend suggests that ridicule leads many homosexual men to “defeminize” their behaviour and conform to stereotypical masculinity to avoid alienation (Harry, 1983); a phenomenon referred to by researchers as “marginalisation among the marginalised” (Taywaditep, 2002), and “Sissyphobia”; a “fear” of effeminate homosexual men (Bergling, 2001).

In light of the literature, considering the centrality of anti-femininity to the socialised male gender role, one aim of this study is to examine the combined contribution of anti-femininity and sexual orientation, in relation to both genderism and SDO, two variables depicted in the literature as sharing close ties, which this review will later turn to.

1.2 Male Gender Role Conflict

Men are being called on to defend themselves, to change, to become something other than what they have been.... Many men feel as if they are involved in a night battle in a jungle against an unseen foe. Voices from the surrounding darkness shout hostile challenges: Men are too aggressive . . . too soft . . . too macho . . . too wimpy . . . too much like little boys . . . too rational. Exactly what we are supposed to [be] is not clear (Keen, 1991, pp. 5–6).

According to O'Neil (2008), the “hazards of being male” is no longer just the title of a once popular paperback (Goldberg, 1977) but a documented scientific finding in the research. GRC is defined as “a psychological state where gender roles have negative consequences or impact on a person or others” (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986, p. 336), and conceptualised as an “interaction of environmental and biological factors that promote certain masculine values (masculine mystique¹) and the fear of femininity” (O'Neil 2008, p. 361). According to GRC theory, the FOF drives men to rigidly adhere to restrictive masculine gender role stereotypes (O'Neil, 2008). This fear perpetuates four patterns of masculine standards (O'Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995) each representing a unique aspect of the socialised male role deemed to lead to conflict for men: (a) success, power, and competition; (b) restrictive emotion; (c) restrictive affectionate behaviour between men; and (d) conflict between work and family relations (O'Neil et al., 1986). GRC arises when rigid or overly restrictive male roles conflict with incompatible situational demands and lead to negative consequences for men (Wester, Vogel, O'Neil, & Danforth, 2012). As an illustrative example, boys who are taught to avoid the expression of tender emotions for fear of having their masculinity questioned, may learn to present a more stoic demeanour to others as a result. For interpersonal relationships then, particularly those when men are expected to be open and

¹ “The masculine mystique is seen as a front that men put up by giving up their femininity in order to maintain their position or power” (Kahn 2009, p. 221).

expressive, conflict can occur between the demands of their socialisation and the demands of the situation; “Some men experience conflict and confusion as a result — hallmarks of GRC” (Wester et al., 2012, p. 200).

Within the literature, the GRC paradigm has been one of the most productive research programs explaining the impact of restrictive gender roles in men’s lives (Wester et al., 2012, p. 199), and has offered substantial insights into the negative aspects of masculine socialisation (Beaglaioich, Sarma, & Morrison, 2014). Empirical studies by O’Neil et al., (1986) have reported that men who were categorised as masculine (high masculine/low feminine) suffered greater GRC than men categorised feminine (low masculine but high feminine). As noted by O’Neil et al. (1986), those in the feminine category experience less GRC. Extensive research relates men’s GRC to myriad psychological problems, both intrapersonal and interpersonal. A review of 249 studies showed men’s problems significantly correlated with the gender role conflict scale (GRCS) (O’Neil, 2008). Significant correlations identified of interest to this study, include traditional gender role attitudes, gender role stereotyping, prejudiced and negative attitudes toward homosexuals and sexism (O’Neil, 2008). According to Altmaier and Hansen (2012) “The hazards of being male appear to empirically relate to men’s attitudes about their masculinity and gender roles”, and to answer the question as to whether men’s problems are related to socialised gender roles, “the answer based on the correlational data, is an absolute yes” (p. 385). As noted, these studies are simple correlational studies and do not account for the effects of moderator or mediator variables (Heppner, 1995; O’Neil, 2008). For this reason, in the present study, GRC will be examined together with anti-femininity in efforts to illuminate their contributions toward both genderism and SDO.

All of O’Neil’s GRC patterns have been theoretically linked to the FOF (O’Neil, 1981, 1982; O’Neil et al., 1986) and operationalised through the GRCS (Altmaier & Hansen, 2012, p. 383; O’Neil et al., 1986). While most of the aforementioned research has relied on the original 37-item Gender Role Conflict Scale (O’Neil et al., 1986). The GRCS short form (GRCS-SF) was chosen for the current study in an effort to decrease “response burden” (Parent & Moradi, 2009, p. 186) on participants. Furthermore, the GRCS-SF is also considered to have answered many criticisms levelled at the original scale (Wester et al., 2012, p. 207).

1.3 *Genderism*

The gender binary system is described as a social system that insists on individuals being raised as either a boy or a girl, which then dictates a whole host of outcomes, including, the careers options available, suitable dress and behaviours, how gender presentation should be, and whom the individual should be attracted to for romantic and sexual endeavours (Beyond the Binary, 2010). Within this system the rules dictate: there are two and only two genders; genitals signify gender; every person is one gender or the other; the male/female dichotomy is a "natural one" (Roffee & Waling, 2016). These expectations can reinforce negative attitudes and discrimination toward people who do not conform to the system (McGeeney & Harvey, 2015, pp. 149–162). Hill and Willoughby (2005) coined the term genderism to reflect “an ideology that reinforces the negative evaluation of gender nonconformity” (p. 534), defined in terms of “societal discrimination and stigma of individuals who do not conform to traditional norms of sex and gender” (Sugano, Nemoto, & Operario, 2006, p. 217). Genderism is considered to be parallel to heterosexism (Beemyn, & Rankin, 2011, pp. 89-90; Steinberg, 2009, pp. 229–230; Sue, 2010, p. 224), as individuals who identify as heterosexual are given privileged status, sexual minorities are regarded negatively (Hill & Willoughby, 2005). In the

same way that non-heterosexual identities challenge the gender binary (Brewster & Moradi, 2010; Mohr & Rochlen, 1999), so too do non-normative gender behaviours (Nagoshi et al., 2008). Indeed, it is argued that traditional gender role attitudes form the basis for prejudice toward both non-normative gender behaviours (e.g., Nadal, Rivera, & Corpus, 2010), and non-heterosexuals (e.g., Goodman & Moradi, 2008; Herek, 2002; Keiller, 2010). Indeed, prejudicial attitudes toward non-heterosexuality and non-normative gender behaviours are highly correlated constructs (Nagoshi et al., 2008).

While theoretically there is a clear distinction between sexual orientation and gender expression, according to research, from the standpoint of manifestation of prejudice, that distinction appears more tenuous (Costa, Peroni, Bandeira, & Nardi, 2013). For instance, how one *actually* identifies can be unimportant. Studies show prejudicial and negative attitudes toward individuals who do not express their gender roles according to societal standards whether heterosexual or non-heterosexual (Thomas & Blakemore, 2013), including men showing feminine behaviour (D'Augelli et al., 2006; Rubio and Green 2009), and women showing masculine behaviour (Carr, 2007). Not following the gender rules leaves individuals disclaimed as "sissies" or "tomboys" (Valdes, 1995). Along these lines, examining a variety of social attitudes studies, researchers have proposed that intolerant views are essentially interrelated (Parrott & Gallagher, 2008). Fassinger and Arseneau's (2007) conceptualised that non-heterosexual and gender nonconforming individuals' shared experiences of prejudice may reflect their shared status as perceived gender transgressors. Aosved and Long (2006) found that intolerant views are all co-occurring systems of belief. Valdes (1996) highlights the potentially disguising social practice of relegating gender to the realm of "women's issues" and sexual orientation to the realm of "sexual minorities' issues"; where the twain are assumed hardly ever to meet (p. 5). However, whereas it may be possible to engage in gender

discrimination without simultaneously engaging in sexual orientation discrimination, it is impossible to practice sexual orientation discrimination without also practicing sex and/or gender discrimination (Valdes, 1996, p. 167).

Research examining attitudes toward individuals who challenge the gender binary is nascent (Tebbe & Moradi, 2012). However, negative attitudes toward non-normative gender behaviours have been observed amongst heterosexuals and non-heterosexuals (Farmer & Byrd, 2015; Jones, 2016). In the literature, one consistent finding is that males, particularly heterosexual males, are more likely to express negative attitudes and prejudice (Costa & Davies, 2012; Gerhardstein & Anderson, 2010; Norton & Herek, 2013; Tee & Hegarty, 2006; Tompkins, Shields, Hillman, & White, 2015; Willoughby et al., 2010; Winter, Webster, & Cheung, 2008), and this phenomenon has also been observed in homosexual males (Nagoshi et al., 2008). As aforementioned, traditional gender role attitudes have been argued to underlie prejudicial beliefs toward both non-heterosexuality and non-normative gender behaviours. Anti-femininity (as a male role norm) and GRC and both share these same correlations with traditional gender role attitudes. What is not clear from the literature is the correlation between Anti-femininity, GRC, sexual orientation, and genderism. The present study will address this gap and examine the combined contributions made by these variables.

1.4 Social Dominance Orientation

Another widely measured variable amid the gender literature is SDO, which refers to a personality variable predicting social and political attitudes, defined as “the extent to which one desires one’s in-group to dominate and be superior to out-groups” (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; p. 742). SDO is grounded in social dominance theory (SDT) of

intergroup relations that focuses on the maintenance and stability of group-based social hierarchies (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Researchers have postulated that due to the lower socio-political status of women and homosexuals in society, persons high on SDO are more likely to hold negative attitudes toward these groups (Pratto et al., 2004; Whitley & Lee, 2000). A review of the literature finds many studies supporting that proposition. SDO has been shown to be associated with sexist attitudes toward women (Pratto, Sidanius, Van Laar, & Levin, 2004), toward homosexuals, (Licciardello, Castiglione, Rampullo, & Scolla, 2014; Poteat, Espelage & Green, 2007; Pratto et al., 1994), and has been found to predict negative attitudes toward non-normative gender behaviours (Tebbe et al., 2014). Furthermore, in one study high femininity was linked to low SDO, whereas high masculinity was linked to high SDO (Snellman, Ekehammar, & Akrami, 2009), with the same trend observed for GRC (O'Neil, 1986), as previously highlighted.

Evidence suggests that men tend to score higher on SDO than women, and this is largely invariant across cultural, contextual, and situational boundaries (Pratto et al., 2004). It has been argued from a socio-cultural perspective that the gap relates to societal norms prescribing different gender role expectations for men and women (Eagly, Diekmann, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Koenig, 2004). Further examination of the literature suggests that the relationship between males and SDO is not simply straightforward. Studies have found that the gender-SDO relationship is moderated by the strength of gender and group identification, with increased identification associated with increased SDO scores for males (Dambrun, Duarte, & Guimond, 2004; Wilson & Liu, 2003). In the study by Nagoshi et al., (2008), it was found that homosexual men had less negative attitudes than heterosexual men toward non-normative gender behaviours, but they scored significantly higher than homosexual women (Nagoshi et al., 2008). Such findings have lead researchers to suggest that men in general are more prejudiced

because they perceive the existence of feminine men and individuals who are perceived to express their gender and sexuality outside of traditional social roles, to threaten the loss of their social power (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2001; Nagoshi et al., 2008; Warriner et al., 2013).

No research was found in the literature examining anti-femininity, GRC, sexual orientation, and SDO. As the research shows, GRC and SDO share correlations with prejudice toward homosexuals, with levels of femininity impacting both GRC and SDO scores. It is expected therefore that anti-femininity and GRC, will contribute to SDO. This present study examines this possible relationship with the combined effect of sexual orientation.

1.5 The Present Study

The socialisation of the male gender role is characterised by the masculine mystique of “no sissy stuff” (David & Brannon, 1976) culminating in a FOF (O’Neil, 2008). Empirical work firmly suggests “The male gender role is dangerous to men’s emotional and interpersonal health” (Laker & Davis, 2011, p. 27). Research suggests that while deleterious outcomes have been observed for men, by way of gender role conflict (GRC), the impact of the socially constructed male gender role extends to women and indeed society at large (Levant, 1996; O’Neil, 2008). Research shows that particular influence is felt, colloquially speaking, by queers, sissies, dykes, and tomboys (Valdes, 1995). While the detrimental effects of GRC on males have been researched extensively, this study focuses on the interpersonal aspects of GRC and its contribution toward other variables prevalent amid the gender prejudice literature.

The principle aims of this study are to analyse the contributions made by anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation (grouped by heterosexual and non-heterosexual), to

genderism and SDO. It is unclear from the literature the combined contribution of these variables. Numerous gaps have been identified relating to this area, and the current study attempts to contribute findings to illuminate the roles of the variables. Two research questions are addressed by the present study: (1) do GRC, anti-femininity, and sexual orientation predict genderism and what are their individual contributions? (2) do GRC, anti-femininity, and sexual orientation predict SDO and what are their individual contributions?

Considering the literature conflating prejudice toward gender and sexual orientation as highly correlated constructs, and in light of the many shared correlations so identified among the predictor and criterion variables in question, it is hypothesised as follows:

1. Anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation will significantly predict genderism.
2. Anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation will significantly predict SDO.

To test these hypotheses a correlational design was employed, with self-report online questionnaires administered to adult males in Ireland.

CHAPTER II: METHODS

2.1 *Participants*

A non-probability sample of 184 males participated in the study. One participant responded as aged 17 and thus data was removed from further analysis resulting in a total sample size of 183. Participants were 124 heterosexual (68%), and 59 (32%) non-heterosexual males who met the inclusion criteria of the study by being male, living in Ireland and aged 18 years or over. The mean age was 36.30 ($SD = 11.30$; range = 18–67). 97% of participants indicated an Irish nationality ($n=177$) with the remaining 3% composed of UK ($n=2$), USA ($n=1$) and 3 missing data. Education levels were reported as second level 15% ($n=27$) with 57% ($n=104$) holding a third level education, 22% ($n=41$) at masters level, and 6% ($n=10$) at PhD level.

Participants were recruited using social networking sites, including Facebook and Twitter. Purposive sampling was initially deployed whereby a link to the online survey was posted on the researcher's personal Facebook page and Twitter account. Convenience and snowball sampling techniques were used encouraging Facebook friends and Twitter followers to circulate the link to those who met the inclusion criteria. The link when clicked brought participants directly to the study cover page of the online questionnaire. Participants were advised that participation was voluntary and anonymous and were asked to confirm that they meet the required inclusion criteria. No reward or incentive was offered in exchange for participation and given the nature of the questionnaire, participation was confined to the online environment. Participants were advised by the cover letter, that completing and submitting the survey denoted their consent to participate in the study.

2.2 Design

This study involved quantitative research using a cross-sectional correlational research design using anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation as predictor variables, with genderism and SDO as criterion variables.

2.3 Materials

Self-report measures were used to collect all data and analyses was conducted using SPSS Statistics Package 24. At the beginning of the survey, participants were asked to state their age, choose between 'heterosexual' or 'non-heterosexual', state their nationality and choose their current level of education. After demographic questions, the remainder of the survey comprised four published measures:

Gender Role Conflict Scale-Short Form (GRCS-16; Wester et al., 2012)

The original 37 item GRCS (O'Neil et al., 1986) was developed to measure psychological distress stemming from rigid adherence to traditional gender role norms. The short form version contains 16 items which ask participants to rate their level of agreement with each of the 16 statements on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Example items include "Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth" and "I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings." Overall scores were calculated by adding the individual item responses and dividing by 16. Higher scores indicate greater levels of conflict and concern than lower scores. The GRCS-SF was demonstrated to be reliable and valid in a diverse sample (Wester et al., 2012), with coefficient alphas for all four subscales

ranging from the low 70s to the low 90s. An adaptation was made to two items on GRCS-SF. The word “school” was substituted for “college” as the latter was deemed more appropriate for an adult sample. The short form version was chosen over the original GRCS to decrease “response burden” (Parent & Moradi, 2009, p. 186) on participants.

Transphobia Scale (TS, Nagoshi et al., 2008)

Attitudes toward non-normative gender behaviours were assessed using a nine-item TS created by Nagoshi and colleagues (2008). The nine items were adapted from Bornstein’s (1998) My Gender Workbook flexibility of gender aptitudes (pp. 9–10) questions, which assess a person’s degree of discomfort when encountering individuals who don’t conform to conventional gender norms. Participants are asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree). Item ratings were averaged, with higher scores indicating more prejudicial attitudes. Sample statements include, “I think there is something wrong with a person who says that they are neither a man nor a woman” and “I believe that the male/female dichotomy is natural.” An adaptation was made to one item on the TS. Feedback during the editing process indicated confusion over the meaning of the word “dichotomy” and so the word “divide” was substituted. The reliability and validity of the scale has been shown to be good with a strong Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ($\alpha = .82$) reported (Nagoshi et al., 2008).

Anti-Femininity Subscale from the Male Role Norm Scales (Thompson & Pleck, 1986)

The MRNS assesses three dimensions of masculine ideology based on cultural standards that reproduce men’s power and privilege: status norms, toughness norms, and anti-femininity norms. The 7-item Anti-femininity subscale assesses the belief that men should avoid stereotypically feminine activities. Participants are asked to rate their level of agreement

on a 7-point Likert scale (1 *strongly disagree* to 7 *strongly agree*). Item 6 is reverse-scored. The ratings of the 7 items are averaged with higher scores reflecting greater adherence to the three dimensions of masculinity. Sample statements include “It bothers me when a man does something I consider “feminine” and “It is a bit embarrassing for a man to have a job that is usually filled by a woman.” Reliability and validity has been well documented across correlation studies with Cronbach’s alpha (ranging from .79 - .89) (Pavot & Diener, 2008) and for the anti-femininity subscale ($\alpha = .81$) (Gallagher & Parrott, 2011).

Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994)

The 16-item balanced SDO6 scale was used. This scale is intended to measure the degree to which individuals endorse anti-egalitarian values, and support and perpetuate hierarchical group-based systems of inequality. The SDO is comprised of 16 items that asks participants to rate their level of positive or negative feelings toward statements on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = very negative to 7 = very positive. A sample item is “Some groups of people are inferior to other groups” and “Group equality should be our ideal.” Items 9-16 are reverse scored. Scores are calculated by the mean response to the 16 items with higher scores reflecting greater social dominance orientation. Sample items include “The reliability and validity of the scale has been shown to be strong with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ($\alpha = .80$) reported (Pratto et al., 1994).

2.4 Procedure

Prior to the collection of data, ethical approval to conduct the study was granted by the Dublin Business School Psychology Department Board of Ethics. Data was collected over a two week period in January 2017. Google Forms was used to create the online questionnaire

and a link to the survey was distributed via the social networking websites Facebook and Twitter. Once participants accessed the questionnaire link, they were presented with an introductory letter (see appendix A) inviting them to participate in a study that was researching attitudes of adult males in Ireland toward gender, relationships, and social issues. Participants were informed of the voluntary nature of taking part with the right to withdraw from the study at any time prior to submitting their responses. As responding was anonymous, participants were advised that once the survey was submitted it would not be possible to withdraw. Participants were advised that 10 – 15 minutes were required to complete the survey and by completing and submitting the questionnaire they were consenting to participate in the study. Participants were also provided with the contact details of the researcher and the project supervisor should they have any queries relating to the study.

The questionnaire opened by asking participants to confirm that they were male, living in Ireland, and at least 18 years of age. Demographic questions proceeded enquiring about participants' age, sexual orientation, nationality, and level of education (see appendix B). Next, the Anti-femininity Male Role Norms subscale (see appendix D) was administered, followed the Transphobia Scale (see appendix E), the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (see appendix F) and finally the Gender Role Conflict Scale (see appendix G). On conclusion of the questionnaire contact details were provided for two support services in the event that any questions had raised issues for respondents. The support contact details provided were for The Samaritans and LGBT Helpline (see Appendix C).

CHAPTER III: Results

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

Participants (n=183) were 124 heterosexual (68%), and 59 (32%) non-heterosexual males who met the inclusion criteria of the study by being male, living in Ireland and aged 18 years or over. The mean age of participants was 36.30 with ages ranging from 18 – 67 ($SD = 11.30$). 97% (n=177) of participants indicated an Irish nationality, with the remaining 3% comprised of UK (n=2), USA (n=1), and data was missing for 3 participants. Level of education of participants was 15% (n=27), 57% (n=104) holding a third level education, 22% (n=41) at masters level, and 6% (n=10) at PhD level. Summaries of the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values, skewness and kurtosis for all measures used in this study are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: *Descriptive Statistics of Psychological Measures*

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
GRC	183	43.26	12.22	18	79	.36	-.31
SDO	178	26.77	13.06	12	83	1.69	2.87
Anti-Femininity	183	10.59	4.96	6	30	1.33	1.62
Genderism	183	19.79	10.58	6	54	1.20	1.02

Reliability analysis was conducted for all measures. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient in all cases showed a result above the satisfactory level of .70: GRC ($\alpha=.82$), Genderism ($\alpha=.86$), SDO ($\alpha=.92$), Anti-femininity ($\alpha=.77$). All scale variables were checked for normality. Shapiro-Wilk's tests for each of the variables were found to have $p < .001$, together with visual

inspection of histograms and assessment of skewness and kurtosis values, as can be seen in Table 1, indicating that the data has a skewed and kurtotic distribution. Parametric test analysis was preserved in the current data analysis of the research hypotheses without transformation as parametric testing is considered "robust" to violations of normality (Field, 2013). As assumptions of normality distribution were violated, results will be interpreted with caution.

3.2 Inferential Statistics

For hypothesis 1 multiple regression was used to test whether anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation were predictors of genderism. The results of the regression indicated that three predictors explained 43% of the variance ($R^2 = .43$, $F(3, 177) = 45.50$, $p < .001$). GRC did not have a significant partial effect ($\beta = .12$, $p = .071$, 95% CI = $-.01 - .21$). Anti-femininity ($\beta = .52$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = $.87 - 1.44$) and sexual orientation ($\beta = -.20$, $p = .001$, 95% CI = $-6.90 - -1.86$) did have significant partial effects.

For hypothesis 2 multiple regression was used to test whether anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation were predictors of SDO. The results of the regression indicated that three predictors explained 17% of the variance ($R^2 = .17$, $F(3, 172) = 13.11$, $p < .001$). GRC ($\beta = .19$, $p = .018$, 95% CI = $.03 - .37$) and anti-femininity ($\beta = .32$, $p < .001$, 95% CI = $.43 - 1.32$) had significant partial effects. Sexual orientation did not have a significant partial effect ($\beta = .07$, $p = .337$, 95% CI = $-1.20 - 5.79$).

CHAPTER IV: Discussion

4.1 *Research Findings*

The present study was designed to examine the contributions made by anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation, to both genderism and SDO in a sample of Irish males. It was hypothesised that anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation would predict (1) genderism and (2) SDO. A total of 183 males participated in the study comprised of 124 heterosexual (68%), and 59 (32%) non-heterosexual, and 97% of Irish nationality. The results reflected a well-educated sample with 85% holding a third level education or above. Age of respondents ranged from 18-67 years, with a mean age of 36.30 ($SD = 11.30$).

Support was found for both hypotheses. For the first hypothesis multiple regression was used to test whether anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation were predictors of genderism. Consistent with predictions, the results of the regression indicated the three variables significantly predicted genderism. Anti-femininity and sexual orientation had significant partial effects. GRC did not have a significant partial effect.

For the first hypothesis, anti-femininity had a significant partial effect on genderism. As reviewed in the literature, the male role norm of anti-femininity has been consistently linked with various gender related prejudices, including homosexuality (Keiller, 2010; Martínez et al., 2015; Parrott et al., 2008; Theodore et al., 2015; Wellman & McCoy, 2014), and a rejection of feminine attributes (Gerhardstein & Anderson, 2010; Theodore & Basow, 2000; Vandello et al., 2008; Vincent et al., 2011; Wilkinson, 2004). On the basis that negative attitudes toward

non-heterosexuality and non-normative gender behaviours are interrelated (Fassinger & Arseneau, 2007; Parrott & Gallagher, 2008; Nagoshi et al., 2008) and based on co-occurring belief systems (Aosved & Long, 2006), results from the present study are consistent with past research, with anti-femininity predicting negative attitudes toward non-normative gender behaviours. In this way, the results in the present study do lend support to the proposition that anti-femininity operates as a driving force behind such prejudicial attitudes, rather than attitudes toward homosexuality, or non-normative gender behaviours, per se (Glick et al., 2007; Parrott et al., 2002; Salvati et al., 2016). Thus, examination is warranted of the role played by anti-femininity in the context of sexual/gender related prejudices, avoiding the disguising social practice of relegating gender to the realm of "women's issues" and sexual orientation to the realm of "sexual minorities' issues" and potentially illuminating where always the twain shall meet (Valdes, 1996).

GRC did not have a significant partial effect. Prior research shows much connection between GRC, traditional gender role attitudes, gender role stereotyping, and prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuality (O'Neil, 2008). Past work also demonstrates the strongly interrelated nature of prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuality and gender nonconformity (Nagoshi et al., 2008; Warriner et al., 2013; Willoughby et al., 2010). On that basis, results from the current work, with GRC failing to predict genderism, are considered inconsistent with past findings. Prior research illustrates a consistent link between GRC and prejudice toward homosexuality, suggesting that GRC would predict genderism.

Table 2: *Zero-order correlations between genderism, anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation.*

Variable	Genderism	Anti-fem	GRC	Sexual Orientation
1. Genderism	-	-	-	-
2. Anti-femininity	.623**	-	-	-
3. GRC	.384**	.476**	-	-
4. Sexual Orientation	-.329**	-.229**	-.096	-

**p < 0.01

As shown in Table 2, when the other predictors were ignored, GRC had a significant zero-order moderate correlation with genderism, but when the effects of the other predictors were controlled, GRC failed to predict genderism. Therefore, on the basis that prejudicial attitudes toward homosexuality and non-normative gender behaviours function as part of the same belief system (Aosved & Long, 2006), as highly correlated constructs (Nagoshi et al., 2008), the finding in the current work is important as regards the simple correlations of GRC so identified in the literature, particularly in the context of prejudice toward homosexuality (O'Neil, 2008), when not controlled for anti-femininity. This is further pronounced by the fact that, as shown by results in Table 2, anti-femininity had a strong zero-order correlation with genderism, and remained a significant predictor of genderism while controlling for GRC and sexual orientation. Thus, the results of the present study warrant further analysis of the role of anti-femininity in the GRC and sexual/gender prejudice domain.

Sexual orientation had a significant partial effect, with heterosexual males recording higher scores. Research suggests that males, and particularly heterosexual males, are more likely to express negative attitudes and prejudice toward non-normative gender behaviours (Costa & Davies, 2012; Gerhardtstein & Anderson, 2010; Nagoshi et al., 2008; Norton & Herek, 2013; Tee & Hegarty, 2006; Tompkins et al., 2015; Willoughby et al., 2010; Winter et al.,

2008). Past research and theories also show close ties between genderism and heterosexism (Beemyn, & Rankin, 2011; Nagoshi et al., 2008; Steinberg, 2009; Sue, 2010). The results from the present study are therefore consistent with prior findings, with sexual orientation significantly predicting genderism. The parallel between genderism and heterosexism may also go toward explaining this result; the notion of privileged sexuality status amongst heterosexuals, would suggest it is less likely for non-heterosexuals to score highly on genderism, considering the shared status as gender transgressors attached to non-heterosexual and non-normative gender behaviours (Fassinger & Arseneau, 2007).

For the second hypothesis multiple regression was used to test whether anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation were predictors of SDO. Consistent with predictions, the results of the regression indicated the three variables significantly predicted SDO. Anti-femininity and GRC had a significant partial effect. Sexual orientation did not have a significant partial effect. No research was found in the literature measuring GRC and SDO. What was found in past studies is that men tend to score higher on SDO than women (Pratto et al., 2004), although the gender-SDO relationship is moderated by the strength of gender and group identification (Dambrun et al., 2004; Wilson & Liu, 2003). Past research also shows a connection between SDO and negative attitudes toward homosexuals (Licciardello et al., 2014; Poteat et al., 2007; Pratto et al., 1994), and has been found to predict negative attitudes toward non-normative gender behaviours (Tebbe et al., 2014). This finding in the present study is consistent with past research findings and thus extends the SDO literature and similarly for GRC. It should be noted that the strength of gender or group identification was not measured in the present study. Further research in this area would benefit from including measures of people's perceived group status, in addition to measures of their gender identification and SDO.

Anti-femininity had a significant partial effect. Past research has demonstrated a link between high femininity scores and low SDO scores, whereas high masculinity scores were linked to high SDO scores (Snellman et al., 2009). The same trend was observed for GRC (high masculinity/high GRC and high femininity/low GRC, (O'Neil et al., 1986)). Results from the current work are consistent with previous findings, whereby the present study examined anti-femininity with higher scores predicting higher SDO. A noteworthy observation is that while GRC and anti-femininity both had a partial significant effect on SDO, within the current study, the larger contribution was made by anti-femininity. As a stronger predictor of SDO in the present data, future research could also factor in anti-femininity to the SDO-gender-identity/group domain. It should be noted that the present study did not enquire of participants how they perceived themselves in terms of femininity or masculinity, but rather their views toward femininity expressed by males. This result, together with the results from hypothesis one both point toward the instrumentality of anti-femininity in GRC research related to genderism and SDO.

Sexual orientation did not have a significant partial effect on SDO. No research was found in the literature that examined the contribution of sexual orientation toward SDO. Research has also shown that while homosexual men can have less negative attitudes than heterosexual men toward gender issues, they can still score significantly higher than women (Nagoshi et al., 2008). As discussed, researchers have suggested that the loss of social power is threatened by the existence of feminine men and gender nonconformity (Nagoshi et al., 2008; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2001; Warriner et al., 2013). The finding in the present study could potentially be interpreted in support of this proposition, with the suggestion that SDO in males relates to the holding of an identity of social power (male identity), functioning regardless of one's sexual orientation. Further support for this proposition is offered by the zero-order

correlations between the variables, displayed in Table 3. A simple correlation shows sexual orientation was not significantly correlated with SDO, but anti-femininity and GRC were. The results of the regression model produced the same trend; anti-femininity and GRC significantly predicted SDO whereas sexual orientation did not. In the present study, results from the first hypothesis show that sexual orientation had a significant partial effect on genderism, with heterosexual males scoring higher. Results from the second hypothesis show that sexual orientation did not significantly predict SDO suggesting that, while in this sample, more favourable attitudes toward gender nonconformity were held by non-heterosexuals, their non-heterosexuality did not impact their SDO. In the present sample, the findings offer empirical support for the notion that sexual orientation is not a determinant in the context of males' SDO levels.

Table 3: *Zero-order correlations between SDO, anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation.*

Variable	SDO	Anti-fem	GRC	Sexual Orientation
1. SDO	-	-	-	-
2. Anti-femininity	.393**	-	-	-
3. GRC	.337**	-	-	-
4. Sexual Orientation	-.023	-	-	-

**p < 0.01

Peripheral to the hypotheses, but pertinent to the overall context of the study, some further findings were noted. The data showed that scoring in this sample was on the lower end of the scales (with the exception of GRC which was close to normal distribution). The measures of anti-femininity, genderism and SDO, were positively skewed as per inspection of histograms, with mean scores represented in Table 1, denoting more favourable attitudes toward femininity expressed by males and toward non-normative gender behaviours, together with beliefs in group based equality, respectively. Such findings hold promise and are in line

with recent egalitarian gains made in Ireland. ("Legal Gender Recognition in Ireland," 2015; Ó Caollaí & Hilliard, 2015). It should also be noted however that these low scores come with the connotation that higher scoring on these measures may produce different results.

4.2 Implications

One implication for practice and research calls for intervention regarding the socialisation of the male gender role, particularly the repudiation of femininity. Research depicts the instrumentality of anti-femininity to the male gender norm, and results from the current study support postulations as to the centrality of anti-femininity in the gender prejudice literature. As anti-femininity was a stronger predictor of genderism and SDO, than GRC and sexual orientation, interventions aimed at developing flexibility in males' beliefs about femininity could potentially have an effect on reducing genderism and SDO.

The research on GRC demonstrates the hazardous nature of the socialised male norm, where adhering to it, and deviating from it, can both be met with deleterious consequences for men and for society at large. Adherence to male norms, as depicted, necessarily brings with it a repudiation of femininity and a distain for homosexuality, amongst other attributes. Not adhering to norms sees men disclaimed as "sissies", which suggests a no-win position for men in the context of the socialised male gender norm, leaving a choice between being the perpetrators or the victims of prejudice.

4.3 *Strengths*

The present study focused on the relationship between previously untested variables and shed new light on the interaction between anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation as regards genderism, and SDO. As a correlational study, the analyses can't lend themselves to any suggestion of cause and effect, but the findings do suggest that measuring attitudes toward femininity is an important factor to consider in relation to GRC, genderism, and SDO research. The present study centred on a prevalent issues, topical both domestically and internationally, and contributes many new findings to the literature which may support alternative perspectives, potentially encouraging new avenues for research. The study also benefitted from a reasonably sized sample of males (n=183).

4.4 *Limitations*

The present findings should be interpreted in light of several important limitations, some of which were covered in the discussion. First, the study used a convenience sample. The study was also limited to males in Ireland. Recruitment and data collection occurred online, excluding individuals without internet access, and was further confined to the social networking environment. Results are based on a single wave of data collection and cannot be generalised. This study also did not control for socially desirability response bias. Data violated assumptions for parametric testing and results should be interpreted with caution on that basis. The cross-sectional nature of this study and the correlational design limit the ability to understand causation, and without longitudinal data little can be said in terms of cause and effect between the tested variables. As a further limitation, the present study did not investigate

the four subscales of GRCS, but rather treated the scale as a whole. Examination of the subscales may better illuminate the contribution of GRC, particularly in the context of SDO.

4.5 Future Research Directions and Perspectives

A number of potential directions for future research were mentioned in the discussion. In addition, future studies could examine the relationship between anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation to both genderism and SDO in larger, more diverse samples in different geographical locations. Attempts could also be made to explore the variables using experimental designs to make inferences about causality, as well as longitudinal designs to understand how anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation relate to both genderism and SDO over time. Research questions could be generated to promote a more empirically informed understanding of the role played by the avoidance and repudiation of femininity in the context of sexual/gender prejudice. In consideration of the firm theoretical distinction between sexual orientation and gender prejudice, yet the tenuous divide in the manifestation of that prejudice, future research could investigate whether attitudes measured as heterosexism are reflective of a broader anti-feminine disposition. Research examining attitudes toward non-normative gender behaviours is emerging, and the potential role played by anti-femininity, in light of the results of the present work, could be incorporated into future studies. Future research could also examine attitudes and behaviours of females and the potential role played in endorsing and enforcing the male gender role, particularly when socialisation of males and adherence to the male norm, as broadly represented in the literature, is defined by and predicated on, amongst other attributes, a repudiation of femininity, rejection of non-heterosexuality, and dominance. Research questions and theories could also be generated to investigate the psychological benefits of a feminine disposition. As aforementioned, prior research has linked high femininity

with low GRC, high femininity with low SDO, and the results of the present study link low anti-femininity with both low SDO and low genderism, collectively indicating that perhaps a research question arises as to, not whether the future is female, but whether the future is feminine.

4.6 Conclusion

The current study sought to examine the combined contribution of anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation, to both genderism and SDO. It was hypothesised that anti-femininity, GRC, and sexual orientation would predict (1) genderism, and (2) SDO. Multiple regression analysis was used to test the predictions. The hypotheses were supported. Results demonstrated for the first hypothesis that anti-femininity and sexual orientation, with heterosexual males scoring higher, had significant partial effects on genderism. GRC did not have a significant partial effect. For the second hypothesis results showed that anti-femininity and GRC had significant partial effects on SDO. Sexual orientation did not have a significant partial effect. Overall, results showed anti-femininity to be the stronger predictor of both genderism and SDO. Results from this study denote the importance of including attitudes toward femininity in GRC, genderism, and SDO research.

REFERENCES

- Altmaier, E. M., & Hansen, J. I. C. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of counseling psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- Aosved, A. C., & Long, P. J. (2006). Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex roles, 55*(7-8), 481-492.
- Beaglaioich, C. Ó., Sarma, K. M., & Morrison, T. G. (2014). New directions in gender role conflict research. In *Masculinities in a global era* (pp. 17-51). Springer New York.
- Beemyn, B. G., & Rankin, S. (2011). *The lives of transgender people*. Columbia University Press.
- Bergling, T. (2001). *Sissyphobia: Gay men and effeminate behavior*. Harrington Park Pr.
- Beyond the Binary: Gender Identity Activism in Your School. (2010). Retrieved from <http://gsanetwork.org/>
- Bornstein, K. (1998). *My gender workbook: How to become a real man, a real woman, the real you, or something else entirely*. Psychology Press.
- Brewster, M. E., & Moradi, B. (2010). Perceived experiences of anti-bisexual prejudice: Instrument development and evaluation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*(4), 451.
- Carr, C. L. (2007). Where have all the tomboys gone? Women's accounts of gender in adolescence. *Sex Roles, 56*(7-8), 439-448.
- Chauncey, G. (1994). *Gay New York: Gender, urban culture, and the making of the gay male world, 1890-1940*. Basic Books.
- Costa, A. B., Peroni, R. O., Bandeira, D. R., & Nardi, H. C. (2013). Homophobia or sexism? A systematic review of prejudice against nonheterosexual orientation in Brazil. *International Journal of Psychology, 48*(5), 900-909.
- Costa, P. A., & Davies, M. (2012). Portuguese adolescents' attitudes toward sexual minorities: Transphobia, homophobia, and gender role beliefs. *Journal of homosexuality, 59*(10), 1424-1442.
- D'Augelli, A. R., Grossman, A. H., & Starks, M. T. (2006). Childhood gender atypicality, victimization, and PTSD among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 21*(11), 1462-1482.
- Dambrun, M., Duarte, S., & Guimond, S. (2004). Why are men more likely to support group-based dominance than women? The mediating role of gender identification. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(2), 287-297.
- David, D. S., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role*. Random House.
- Deaux, K., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Thinking about gender.

- Eagly, A. H., Diekmann, A. B., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Koenig, A. M. (2004). Gender gaps in sociopolitical attitudes: a social psychological analysis. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 87(6), 796.
- Farmer, L. B., & Byrd, R. (2015). Genderism in the LGBTQQIA community: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 9(4), 288-310.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.
- Gallagher, K. E., & Parrott, D. J. (2011). What accounts for men's hostile attitudes toward women? The influence of hegemonic male role norms and masculine gender role stress. *Violence against women*, 1077801211407296.
- Gerhardstein, K. R., & Anderson, V. N. (2010). There's more than meets the eye: Facial appearance and evaluations of transsexual people. *Sex roles*, 62(5-6), 361-373.
- Gleitman, H., Fridlund, A. J., & Reisberg, D. (2000). Social development. *Basic Psychology* (pp. 480–517).
- Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles*, 57(1-2), 55-59.
- Goldberg, H. (1976). *The hazards of being male*. New York: Sanford J. Greenburger Associates.
- Good, G. E., & Sherrod, N. B. (2001). Men's problems and effective treatments: Theory and empirical support. In G. R. Brooks & G. E. Good (Eds.), *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men* (Vol. 1, pp. 22–42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodman, M. B., & Moradi, B. (2008). Attitudes and behaviors toward lesbian and gay persons: Critical correlates and mediated relations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(3), 371.
- Halkitis, P. N., Moeller, R. W., & DeRaleau, L. B. (2008). Steroid use in gay, bisexual, and nonidentified men-who-have-sex-with-men: Relations to masculinity, physical, and mental health. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9(2), 106.
- Harrison, J. (1978). Warning: The male sex role may be dangerous to your health. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34(1), 65-86.
- Harry, J. (1983). Defeminization and adult psychological well-being among male homosexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12(1), 1-19.
- Heppner, P. P. (1995). On gender role conflict in men—Future directions and implications for counseling: Comment on Good et al., (1995) and Cournoyer and Mahalik (1995).
- Herek, G. M. (2002). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward bisexual men and women in the United States. *Journal of sex research*, 39(4), 264-274.
- Herek, G. M. (2009). Hate crimes and stigma-related experiences among sexual minority adults in the United States prevalence estimates from a national probability sample. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 24(1), 54-74.

- Higgins, A; Doyle, L; Downes, C; Murphy, R; Sharek, D; DeVries, J; Begley, T; McCann, E; Sheerin, F and Smyth, S (2016). The LGBTIreland report: national study of the mental health and wellbeing of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people in Ireland. Dublin: GLEN and BeLonG To.
- Hill, D. B., & Willoughby, B. L. (2005). The development and validation of the genderism and transphobia scale. *Sex roles*, 53(7-8), 531-544.
- Hunt, C. J., Fasoli, F., Carnaghi, A., & Cadinu, M. (2016). Masculine self-presentation and distancing from femininity in gay men: An experimental examination of the role of masculinity threat. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 17(1), 108.
- International Women's Day: Calls to Action, Protests and Words of Praise. (2017, March 8). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://nytimes.com/>
- Jones, K. B. (2016, February 2). When Being Trans Is Not Trans Enough. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://huffingtonpost.com/>
- Kahn, J. S. (2009). *An introduction to masculinities*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Keen, S. (1991). *Fire in the belly: On being a man*. New York: Bantam.
- Keiller, S. W. (2010). Masculine norms as correlates of heterosexual men's attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 11(1), 38.
- Kimmel, M. (1997). Integrating men into the curriculum. *Duke J. Gender L. & Pol'y*, 4, 181.
- Laker, J. A., & Davis, T. (Eds.). (2011). *Masculinities in higher education: Theoretical and practical considerations*. Routledge.
- Legal Gender Recognition in Ireland. (2015). Retrieved from <http://teni.ie/>
- Levant, R. F. (1996). The new psychology of men. *Professional psychology: Research and practice*, 27(3), 259.
- Levant, R. F., & Pollack, W. S. (1995). *A new psychology of men*. Basic Books.
- Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L. S., Celentano, E., & Cozza, T. M. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*.
- Licciardello, O., Castiglione, C., Rampullo, A., & Scolla, V. (2014). Social Dominance Orientation, Cross-group Friendship and Prejudice towards Homosexuals. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4988-4992.
- Madon, S. (1997). What do people believe about gay males? A study of stereotype content and strength. *Sex Roles*, 37(9-10), 663-685.
- Martínez, C., Vázquez, C., & Falomir-Pichastor, J. M. (2015). Perceived Similarity With Gay Men Mediates the Effect of Antifemininity on Heterosexual Men's Antigay Prejudice. *Journal of homosexuality*, 62(11), 1560-1575.

- McGeeney, E., & Harvey, L. (2015). Cisgender—living in the gender assigned at birth. In *The Palgrave handbook of the psychology of sexuality and gender* (pp. 149-165). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2001). Attachment theory and intergroup bias: evidence that priming the secure base schema attenuates negative reactions to out-groups. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *81*(1), 97.
- Mohr, J. J., & Rochlen, A. B. (1999). Measuring attitudes regarding bisexuality in lesbian, gay male, and heterosexual populations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *46*(3), 353.
- Mosse, G. L. (1996). The image of man. *The creation of modern masculinity*, 102.
- Nadal, K. L., Rivera, D. P., & Corpus, M. J. H. (2010). Sexual orientation and transgender microaggressions: Implications for mental health and counseling. *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact*, 217-240.
- 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*(7-8), 521-531.
- Norton, A. T., & Herek, G. M. (2013). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward transgender people: Findings from a national probability sample of US adults. *Sex roles*, *68*(11-12), 738-753.
- Ó Caollaí, E., & Hilliard, M. (2015, May 23). Ireland becomes first country to approve same-sex marriage by popular vote. *The Irish Times*. Retrieved from <http://irishtimes.com/>
- O'Neil, J. M., Denke, R., & Blazina, C. (2016). Gender Role Conflict Theory, Research, and Practice: Implications for Understanding the Human–Animal Bond. In *Men and Their Dogs* (pp. 11-45). Springer International Publishing.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal*, *60*(4).
- O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the gender role conflict scale new research paradigms and clinical implications. *The counseling psychologist*, *36*(3), 358-445.
- O'Neil, J. M., & Egan, J. (1992). Men's and women's gender role journeys: A metaphor for healing, transition, and transformation.
- O'Neil, J. M., Good, G. E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In *Parts of this chapter were presented at the 102nd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA, Aug 1994.*. Basic Books.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex roles*, *14*(5-6), 335-350.
- Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *10*(3), 175.

- Parrott, D. J. (2009). Aggression toward gay men as gender role enforcement: Effects of male role norms, sexual prejudice, and masculine gender role stress. *Journal of personality*, 77(4), 1137-1166.
- Parrott, D. J., Adams, H. E., & Zeichner, A. (2002). Homophobia: Personality and attitudinal correlates. *Personality and individual differences*, 32(7), 1269-1278.
- Parrott, D. J., Peterson, J. L., Vincent, W., & Bakeman, R. (2008). Correlates of anger in response to gay men: Effects of male gender role beliefs, sexual prejudice, and masculine gender role stress. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 9(3), 167.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2008). The satisfaction with life scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(2), 137-152.
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11–32). New York: Basic Books.
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology and its correlates. *The gender and psychology reader*, 308-326.
- 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 and Social Psychology*, 92(6), 1040.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 67(4), 741.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 845-880.
- Przybyla, H. M. (2017, February, 7). Hillary Clinton says ‘future is female’ in new video. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday.com/>
- Reeser, T. W. (2010). Introduction: The Study of Masculinity. *Masculinities in Theory: An Introduction*, 1-16.
- Riggle, E. D., Whitman, J. S., Olson, A., Rostosky, S. S., & Strong, S. (2008). The positive aspects of being a lesbian or gay man. *Professional psychology: Research and practice*, 39(2), 210.
- Roffee, J. A., & Waling, A. (2016). Rethinking microaggressions and anti-social behaviour against LGBTIQ+ youth. *Safer Communities*, 15(4), 190-201.
- Rubio, R. J., & Green, R. J. (2009). Filipino masculinity and psychological distress: A preliminary comparison between gay and heterosexual men. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 6(3), 61-75.
- Salvati, M., Ioverno, S., Giacomantonio, M., & Baiocco, R. (2016). Attitude toward gay men in an Italian sample: Masculinity and sexual orientation make a difference. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 13(2), 109-118.

- Sánchez, F. J., & Vilain, E. (2012). "Straight-acting gays": The relationship between masculine consciousness, anti-effeminacy, and negative gay identity. *Archives of sexual behavior*, *41*(1), 111-119.
- Sánchez, F. J., Bocklandt, S., & Vilain, E. (2009). Gender role conflict, interest in casual sex, and relationship satisfaction among gay men. *Psychology of men & masculinity*, *10*(3), 237.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Skidmore, W. C., Linsenmeier, J. A., & Bailey, J. M. (2006). Gender nonconformity and psychological distress in lesbians and gay men. *Archives of sexual behavior*, *35*(6), 685-697.
- Snellman, A., Ekehammar, B., & Akrami, N. (2009). The Role of Gender Identification in Social Dominance Orientation: Mediating or Moderating the Effect of Sex? 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *39*(4), 999-1012.
- Solomon, K. (Ed.). (2013). *Men in transition: Theory and therapy*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Steinberg, S. R. (2009). *Diversity and multiculturalism: A reader*. Peter Lang.
- Sue, D. W. (Ed.). (2010). *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sugano, E., Nemoto, T., & Operario, D. (2006). The impact of exposure to transphobia on HIV risk behavior in a sample of transgendered women of color in San Francisco. *AIDS and Behavior*, *10*(2), 217.
- Taywaditep, K. J. (2002). Marginalization among the marginalized: Gay men's anti-effeminacy attitudes. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *42*(1), 1-28.
- Tebbe, E. N., & Moradi, B. (2012). Anti-transgender prejudice: A structural equation model of associated constructs. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *59*(2), 251.
- Tee, N., & Hegarty, P. (2006). Predicting opposition to the civil rights of trans persons in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *16*(1), 70-80.
- Theodore, A., Maguire, D., Sandy, R., & Bellis, A. (2015). The role of masculine norms in heterosexual men's attitudes towards lesbians.
- Theodore, P. S., & Basow, S. A. (2000). Heterosexual masculinity and homophobia: A reaction to the self?. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *40*(2), 31-48.
- Thomas, R. N., & Blakemore, J. E. O. (2013). Adults' attitudes about gender nonconformity in childhood. *Archives of sexual behavior*, *42*(3), 399-412.
- Thompson Jr, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *29*(5), 531-543.
- Thompson Jr, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities.

- Thompson, E. H., Pleck, J. H., & Ferrera, D. L. (1992). Men and masculinities: Scales for masculinity ideology and masculinity-related constructs. *Sex roles, 27*(11-12), 573-607.
- Tompkins, T. L., Shields, C. N., Hillman, K. M., & White, K. (2015). Reducing stigma toward the transgender community: An evaluation of a humanizing and perspective-taking intervention. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 2*(1), 34.
- Valdes, F. (1995). Queers, sissies, dykes, and tomboys: deconstructing the conflation of "sex," "gender," and "sexual orientation" in Euro-American law and society. *California Law Review, 83*, 1-1.
- Valdes, F. (1996). Unpacking hetero-patriarchy: tracing the conflation of sex, gender & (and) sexual orientation to its origins. *Yale JL & Human., 8*, 161.
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 95*(6), 1325.
- Vincent, W., Parrott, D. J., & Peterson, J. L. (2011). Effects of traditional gender role norms and religious fundamentalism on self-identified heterosexual men's attitudes, anger, and aggression toward gay men and lesbians. *Psychology of men & masculinity, 12*(4), 383.
- Warriner, K., Nagoshi, C. T., & Nagoshi, J. L. (2013). Correlates of homophobia, transphobia, and internalized homophobia in gay or lesbian and heterosexual samples. *Journal of homosexuality, 60*(9), 1297-1314.
- Wellman, J. D., & McCoy, S. K. (2014). Walking the straight and narrow: Examining the role of traditional gender norms in sexual prejudice. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(2), 181.
- Wester, S. R., & Vogel, D. L. (2002). Working with the masculine mystique: Male gender role conflict, counseling self-efficacy, and the training of male psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*(4), 370.
- Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L., O'Neil, J. M., & Danforth, L. (2012). Development and evaluation of the Gender Role Conflict Scale Short Form (GRCS-SF). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(2), 199.
- Whitley Jr, B. E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(1), 126.
- Wilkinson, W. W. (2004). Authoritarian Hegemony, Dimensions of Masculinity, and Male Antigay Attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5*(2), 121.
- Willoughby, B. L., Hill, D. B., Gonzalez, C. A., Lacorazza, A., Macapagal, R. A., Barton, M. E., & Doty, N. D. (2010). Who hates gender outlaws? A multisite and multinational evaluation of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale. *International Journal of Transgenderism, 12*(4), 254-271.
- Wilson, M. S., & Liu, J. H. (2003). Social dominance orientation and gender: The moderating role of gender identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(2), 187-198.
- Winter, N. J. (2010). Masculine republicans and feminine democrats: Gender and Americans' explicit and implicit images of the political parties. *Political Behavior, 32*(4), 587-618.

- Winter, S., Webster, B., & Cheung, P. K. E. (2008). Measuring Hong Kong undergraduate students' attitudes towards transpeople. *Sex Roles, 59*(9-10), 670-683.
- Wong, Y. J., Ho, M. H. R., Wang, S. Y., & Miller, I. S. (2016). Meta-Analyses of the Relationship Between Conformity to Masculine Norms and Mental Health-Related Outcomes.
- Wright Jr, L. W., Adams, H. E., & Bernat, J. (1999). Development and validation of the homophobia scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 21*(4), 337-347.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Survey Cover Letter

Dear Participant:

I would like to enlist your help, and ask for 10-15 minutes of your time.

My name is Susie Glynn and I am a student at Dublin Business School. I am conducting research as part of my thesis in the Department of Psychology that explores men's attitudes toward topical issues about gender, relationships, and social matters. Participation involves completing an anonymous survey, which asks some initial demographic information, and questions seek your views toward gender, your experiences relating to others, and societal issues.

While the survey asks some questions that might cause some minor negative feelings, the questionnaires have been used previously in research. If any of the questions do raise difficult feelings for you, contact information for support services is included on the final page.

You are invited to take part in this research.

Participation is completely voluntary and so there is no obligation to take part.

You can withdraw at any time before submitting your answers.

Participation is confidential. Your answers are anonymous.

Thus responses cannot be attributed to any one participant. For this reason, it will not be possible to withdraw from participation after the survey has been submitted.

The survey is administered by Google Forms and the results will be stored anonymously on a secure web server. Survey results will only be retained until completion of the thesis, at which point all data will then be deleted.

As this research is being conducted as part of my studies, it will be submitted for examination. The study may be published on the DBS online thesis database. No individual responses or surveys will be identified in any reports on this study.

For further information about the research, please contact me at
My supervisor can also be contacted at

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Points to note:

- by submitting the survey you are consenting to participate in the study.
- participation is completely anonymous.
- you can withdraw at any time before submitting answers.
- the survey asks 53 questions and should take no more than 10 -15 minutes to complete.
- your participation is valued.

Appendix B: Survey Conclusion Page

Thank you for your participation!

If you feel that answering this survey has raised some issues for you, please consider contacting the support services listed below, or speak to a friend, family member or professional.

Samaritans

Phone: 01 8727700

Available 24 hours a day, 365 days a year

LGBT Helpline Ireland

Phone: 1890 929529

Available: every evening

Please consider sharing the survey link with others who may wish to participate in this research: <https://goo.gl/forms/3fsPFO5ee8K7FZ0z1/>

Your help is appreciated.

Appendix C: Demographic Questionnaire

1. I confirm that I am male, living in Ireland, and aged 18+
Please check box to confirm

2. What age are you?

3. What nationality are you?

4. Please choose one of the following - I am:

Heterosexual

Non-heterosexual

5. Please indicate your level of education

Second level

Third level

Masters

PhD

Other

Appendix D: Anti-femininity subscale from the Male Role Norms Scale
(Thompson & Pleck, 1986)

After each statement, please indicate the number that best indicates how much you disagree or agree with the statement.

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Somewhat agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree

1. It bothers me when a man does something I consider “feminine.”
2. A man whose hobbies are cooking, sewing, and going to the ballet probably wouldn’t appeal to me.
3. It is a bit embarrassing for a man to have a job that is usually filled by a woman.
4. Unless he was really desperate, I would probably advise a man to keep looking rather than accept a job as a secretary.
5. If I heard about a man who was a hairdresser and a gourmet cook, I might wonder how masculine he was.
6. I think it’s extremely good for a boy to be taught to cook, sew, clean the house, and take care of younger children.
7. I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love scene in a movie.

Appendix E: Transphobia Scale (Nagoshi et al., 2008)

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements, ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 7 (completely agree).

1. I don't like it when someone is flirting with me, and I can't tell if they are a man or a woman.
2. I think there is something wrong with a person who says that they are neither a man nor a woman.
3. I would be upset, if someone I'd known a long time revealed to me that they used to be another gender.
4. I avoid people on the street whose gender is unclear to me.
5. When I meet someone, it is important for me to be able to identify them as a man or a woman.
6. I believe that the male/female dichotomy is natural.
7. I am uncomfortable around people who don't conform to traditional gender roles, e.g., aggressive women or emotional men.
8. I believe that a person can never change their gender.
9. A person's genitalia define what gender they are, e.g., a penis defines a person as a man, a vagina defines a person as being a woman.

Appendix F: Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994)

Which of the following objects or statements do you have a positive or negative feeling towards? Beside each statement, select a number from '1' to '7' which represents the degree of your positive or negative feeling.

Very positive (7), positive (6), slightly positive (5), neither positive nor negative (4), slightly negative (3), negative (2), and very negative (1).

1. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.
2. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.
3. It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.
4. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
5. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
6. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.
7. Inferior groups should stay in their place.
8. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.
9. It would be good if groups could be equal.
10. Group equality should be our ideal.
11. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.
12. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.
13. Increased social equality is beneficial to society.
14. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.
15. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.
16. No one group should dominate in society.

Appendix G: Gender Role Conflict Scale- Short form
(GRCS-16; Wester, Vogel, O'Neil, & Danforth, 2012)

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

1. Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
2. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.
3. Affection with other men makes me tense.
4. I like to feel superior to other people.
5. Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me.
6. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.
7. Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.
8. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.
9. Hugging other men is difficult for me.
10. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.
11. I strive to be more successful than others.
12. I do not like to show my emotions to other people.
13. My work or college often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).
14. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.
15. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.
16. Overwork and stress caused by a need to achieve on the job or in college affects/hurts my life.