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ABSTRACT

Established feminist identity and attitudes have been widely related to positive individual mental health and well-being aspects for women. However, Fischer and Good (2004) suggest that feminist identity may result in challenges in relationships due to judgment from others. One question is whether feminist women want to and do engage in romantic relationships with those who also reject traditional gender norms. The current project used the Downing and Roush (1985) feminist identity development model consisting of five feminist attitude dimensions, as well as feminist self-identification, to explore the relation of feminist identity to women’s perceptions of ideal and actual partners’ conformity to nine masculine norms developed by Mahalik et al. (2003). Further, the relation between women’s feminist identity and attitudes, their perceptions of their current partners’ conformity to masculine norms, and relationship satisfaction was explored. A sample of 170 emerging adult college women in other-sex romantic relationships of at least three months were given measures of feminist identification and attitudes, their ideal partners’ conformity to masculine norms, their perceptions of their current partners’ conformity to masculine norms, and relationship satisfaction. Individuals with established feminist identities were found to prefer partners who did not conform to Power Over Women, Heterosexual Self-Presentation, Emotional Control, Self-Reliance, and Playboy norms, and perceived their current partners as not conforming to norms of Power Over Women, Heterosexual Self-Presentation, and Primacy of Work.
However, individuals with developing feminist identities perceived their partners as conforming to several masculine norms. Women’s ideal partners’ conformity to masculine norms correlated with their perceptions of their actual partners’ conformity, and, regardless of women’s feminist identity and attitudes, their perceptions of their partner’s conformity to masculine norms negatively predicted relationship satisfaction. This study extends previous research that suggests that women with feminist attitudes and identities prefer more egalitarian partners who do not conform to masculine norms by examining existing relationships. These findings indicate the importance of examining how feminist variables relate to romantic relationships. They also suggest that discussion of feminist values and conformity to masculine norms may be important in exploring relationship satisfaction in therapy.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Feminist identity, one particular way that women develop their own personal sense of identity related to their gender, brings with it a variety of potential desired and undesired aspects related to their own well-being and relationships with others (Fischer & Good, 2004). One area that can be affected by identifying as a feminist is relationships with men, where feminist women may experience hostility directed at them from others (Downing & Roush, 1985; Fischer & Good, 2004; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Rudman & Phelan, 2007). However, the research on feminist women’s relationships with men focuses mainly on sexual assertiveness and relationship attitudes, and consistently calls for further exploration of feminist identity and attitudes in existing long-term romantic relationships (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Fitz & Zucker, 2014; Schick, Zucker, & Bay-Cheng, 2008; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Rudman & Phelan, 2007; Yoder, Perry, & Saal, 2007). Given the potential for more nontraditional attitudes related to gender as well as the potential for denigration from others, it seems likely that feminist women may engage in romantic relationships differently than nonfeminist women.

This chapter will provide an introduction to the current project, which examined women’s other-sex romantic relationships in relation to their feminist identity and
attitudes. More explicitly, the aim of the study was to explore how women’s feminist identity development and identification relate to their ideal partner’s and their perceptions of their actual partner’s conformity (or nonconformity) to masculine norms. First, the Downing and Roush (1985) Feminist Identity Development Model will be described. Second, this will be placed in the context of ambivalent sexism theory and the broader idea of interdependence in relationships between men and women. Third, the interpersonal correlates of feminist identity and attitudes will be briefly explored, especially those with a focus on romantic relationships. Fourth, the concept of conformity to masculine norms will be discussed, again with special attention to interpersonal relationships. Finally, a description and rationale for the current project will be provided.

**Gender and Feminism**

Gender is a widely used method of social categorization in the United States and throughout the world, often used as a way to distinguish between people and to assign social status and power (Moradi & Yoder, 2011). As individuals change in their perceptions of the gender-related power structure in the United States, they may have shifting ideas of what stereotypes and expectations are related to men and women, and in turn what they themselves are or should be (Diekman & Eagly, 2000). This concept of responding to shifting expectations suggests the process of developing how one wants to be in relation to his or her gender is a complex and dynamic one, based on a variety of social factors and individual responses to such factors. With this in mind, research on how one develops and then enacts that identity in relation to one’s external context seems warranted. Feminist identity development dimensions (Downing & Roush, 1985)
represent one very specific way in which women develop, referring particularly to how they develop responses to sexism. Though there are a variety of ways to define feminism, all movements of feminism have in common a general expectation to address gender inequality and end sexism (hooks, 2000).

The feminist identity development model proposed by Downing and Roush (1985) holds a definition of feminism consistent with this and specifically addresses both how women develop their feminist ideas within themselves as well as within their larger context. This model remains the most widely used model of feminist identity development today (Fischer & DeBord, 2012). It was originally presented by the authors as a sequence of stages through which women move as they develop their awareness of sexism and gender restrictions. The five dimensions Downing and Roush proposed, in order, are Passive Acceptance, Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, and Active Commitment. In Passive Acceptance, the authors suggest a woman remains unaware of and accepting of traditional gender norms, including gender-related oppression, and she may see traditional norms as a positive. During Revelation, they state a woman experiences instances of sexism that can no longer be denied or ignored, which results in a tumultuous and often painful, resentful experience of becoming aware of power dynamics. They argue that Embeddedness-Emanation represents the response to this phase, which initially results in embedding oneself into communities of other women and avoidance of men, as much as this is possible, and then results in carefully rebuilding connections with men. Synthesis is a dimension in which one defines oneself and others less by what is traditionally consistent or inconsistent with gender norms but instead by unique characteristics and strengths, according to the authors. Finally, they
state that Active Commitment involves extending this attitude to utilize those strengths in a way to combat oppression and take action regarding issues a woman deems important.

More recently, reviews of the Downing and Roush (1985) model have suggested that, rather than stages, considering these areas as dimensions or styles to which women adhere is more appropriate (Hyde, 2002; Moradi & Subich, 2002a; Moradi, Subich, & Phillips, 2002a, 2002b). Moradi et al. (2002b), for example, suggest that women can be high or low in any of the five dimensions, representing different patterns of feminist identity dimensions, and typically do not fall neatly into one “category” or another. As such, they argue that statistical methods used with this model should consider women’s placement in each dimension and not just categorize them. Furthermore, the feminist identity development model has been criticized for its lack of inclusion of self-identification as part of feminist identity (Moradi et al., 2002b). Researchers have noted that feminist self-identification seems to be a separate, though related, process from feminist attitudes and because of this should also be included in research using the Downing and Roush model (Aronson, 2003; Liss, Hoffner, & Crawford, 2000; Liss & Erchull, 2010; McCabe, 2005; Quinn & Radtke, 2006; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010).

Beyond the model as a representation of one’s own feminist development, Downing and Roush (1985) suggested that these dimensions are marked by different levels of relationships with men. During Passive Acceptance, women engage in more traditional relationships with men, and during Revelation, women may experience anger toward men and may deliberately move against gender norms to engage in specifically non-traditional relationships with men. By definition, the Embeddedness-Emanation dimension involves first withdrawing from and then tentatively moving back into
relationships with men. Finally, the last two dimensions represent engaging with both men and other women based on their distinctive qualities, and gender becomes less of a focus. Despite this being a focus of the model, minimal research has actually examined such aspects of relationships with men, with much of what has been done focusing more on desired qualities in male partners, early dating behaviors, attitudes toward men, and desire for egalitarian relationships (e.g., Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1997; Rickard, 1989; Yoder et al., 2007). However, the idea of how women navigate actual, long-term other-sex relationships in the context of their feminist identity development seems an important one. This paucity in the research forms the basis for the current study.

In the next section, this rationale will be further developed by placing the idea of feminist identity and attitudes in the context of overall relationships between men and women. Special attention will be paid to how behaviors that are consistent or inconsistent with traditional gender norms may be received in cross-sex relationships.

Sexism and Interdependent Relations Between Men and Women

What makes sexism particularly unique among types of prejudice is the idea that men and women essentially need each other in order to further society and therefore must cooperate with one another, a tenet of ambivalent sexism theory put forth by Glick and Fiske in 1996 and further supported by the same authors in 1997 and 2001. In their initial presentation of the theory, Glick and Fiske (1996) proposed that unlike other forms of prejudice, such as racism, where hostility of the group members in power toward the oppressed group can be maintained by keeping distance and avoiding contact, sexism cannot work in this manner. They suggested men are indeed in a position of structural
power, but women maintain a sort of dyadic power wherein men oftentimes need them for developing relationships, intimacy, and certainly childbearing. Because of this, traditional manners of denigration of the outgroup cannot be used without something to compensate for this. They argued in this first description of the theory in 1996 that for this reason, sexism consists of two components. First, there is a component of hostile sexism, whereby men (and women) can express feelings of anger and resentment toward women who do not conform to traditional roles, who do not accept traditional paternalistic behaviors of men, and who “use” sexuality to manipulate men within other-sex relationships. They also argued that on the opposing side, men (and women) may experience the component of benevolent sexism, which dictates that people feel positively toward women who fit into traditional roles, allow men to protect and take care of them, and engage in nurturing and intimate relationships with men. These two aspects result in simultaneous warmth toward and rewarding of women who stay within restricted roles, and animosity toward and punishing of women who move beyond such roles.

Glick and Fiske (2001) further elaborated on the purposes of ambivalent sexism for men. First, with ambivalent sexism, men are able to justify the oppression of women because women are viewed as the “weaker” sex and need to be taken care of. Second, they are able to maintain a structure of power in that women are rewarded for not questioning the status quo, and punished for stepping outside of it, thus the chances are reduced that power roles will be violated. Third, it allows men to engage in positive relationships with women without backlash, and thus get (primarily relational and emotional) needs met that are not traditionally met by other men. If only hostile sexism existed, women would likely feel reluctant or defiant in participating in such a system.
But, with the addition of the benevolent aspect, women may perceive themselves as gaining benefits from a system that places women on a pedestal, and may be more likely to willingly participate in the system. In fact, while hostile sexism is generally seen as negative, the authors argued that oftentimes aspects of benevolent sexism are seen as romantic and desirable, and therefore they can appear to balance each other out and tend to go together. One study completed across 19 countries suggests that hostile and ambivalent sexism are indeed positively correlated, and both are predictors of a country’s gender inequality, suggesting that this is not a phenomenon limited to the United States (Glick et al., 2000).

One aspect of ambivalent sexism that has been well-supported is the idea that romantic desires and ideals are related to level of adherence to ambivalent attitudes toward men and women (Chen, Fiske, & Lee, 2009; Lee, Fiske, Glick, & Chen, 2010; Sibley & Overall, 2011; Travaglia, Overall, & Sibley, 2009). For example, Travaglia et al. (2009) found that women higher in benevolent sexism sought male partners higher in status and resources, and men who endorsed hostile sexism placed a higher value on attractiveness in their female partners, thus showing conformity to more traditional norms of romance. Lee et al. (2010) also found that men and women higher in hostile and benevolent sexism sought partners who expressed traits consistent with gender norms, such as warmth for women and strength for men. Furthermore, they specifically argue that sexism is essentially allowed in romantic relationships because it can be endorsed by women as well, stating that “benevolent ideologies placate its (female) endorsers into accepting partners who reinforce the subordinated role” (p. 594). This research base provides a general understanding for how benevolent and hostile sexism can predict
partner choices, and how acceptance of sexism from a female partner can allow for the other partner to hold a dominant position in an other-sex relationship. However, it also creates another question: What happens when women do not accept sexism? How is an other-sex romantic relationship in a patriarchal society maintained when the female partner does not “buy into” the status quo?

This is the question that the current project seeks to answer. In relation to this project, perhaps the most important argument that Glick and Fiske (1996) make is regarding the general impact of ambivalent sexism on the harmonious maintenance of cross-sex relationships; for a patriarchal society to be upheld, women must remain traditional in their roles, and thus women who seek to challenge traditional roles may be punished. They suggest that this occurs both at a structural level and at an individual, relational level. The current study aims to explore this in relation to the area of feminist identity and attitudes, which may represent a specific type of opposition to traditional gender norms.

Though certainly nontraditional gender-related attitudes and behaviors are not the same construct as feminist identity and attitudes, there are relations between them (Baucom & Sanders, 1978; Mahalik et al., 2005; McCabe, 2005; Robnett, Anderson, & Hunter, 2012; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2005; Toller, Suter, & Trautman, 2004). For example, Toller et al. (2004) found that for men, lower levels of traits stereotypically associated with masculinity were associated with higher levels of feminist identification and more positive attitudes toward the women’s movement. For women, higher levels of traits stereotypically associated with masculinity were associated with some (though not all) measures including aspects of feminist self-identification and attitudes toward the
women’s movement. These findings suggest that endorsing traits that are outside of gender norms for both men and women is at least somewhat related to feminist identity variables. Further, Saunders and Kashubeck-West (2006) found specifically that those higher in more advanced feminist identity dimensions were more likely to fall into an “androgynous” category where they are high in both stereotypically masculine and feminine traits.

Though stepping outside of traditional gender roles may be freeing and allow for challenging of the current male-dominated power structure, according to ambivalent sexism theory, this would also result in hostility and punishment from others including potential heterosexual male partners (Glick & Fiske, 1996). In fact, this has been supported in the idea that several stereotypes and demeaning attitudes exist related to feminists and even discourage individuals from identifying as feminists (Ramsey et al., 2007; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007, 2009; Stone & McKee, 2000; Suter & Toller, 2006). Fischer and Good (2004) further suggest that there are primarily individual benefits for holding feminist attitudes, but there can also be disadvantages in the form of interpersonal conflict and disagreement. This research base suggests, then, that women who identify as feminists have to navigate a difficult terrain in holding interpersonal relationships while also dealing with potential punishment from others for not holding more traditional attitudes. The current study seeks to explore this conundrum of how women who hold a strong feminist identity (and thus step outside traditional roles) maintain their values in other-sex romantic relationships within a patriarchal society.

The next section will explore the research that currently exists in the area of interpersonal relationships and feminist attitudes and self-identification. Since the
current study focuses on feminist identity development and romantic relationships, specific attention will be paid to that particular domain of interpersonal functioning.

**Interpersonal Correlates of Feminist Identity**

As stated earlier, Fischer and Good (2004) argue that though holding a feminist identity and attitudes is associated with a variety of positive things for an individual, it also holds the potential for negative interpersonal correlates. Indeed, there are a variety of beneficial correlates of feminist attitudes and identification; researchers have found that more advanced dimensions of feminist identity and feminist identification positively correlate to aspects that include psychological well-being, self-esteem, empowerment, self-efficacy, and autonomy (e.g., Carpenter & Johnson, 2001; Cunningham, 2012; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Fischer & Good, 1994; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder, Snell, & Tobias, 2012; Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011). On a more negative side, dimensions of feminist awareness similar in nature to the Revelation dimension of the Downing and Roush (1985) model are associated with more unpleasant outcomes such as psychological distress, lack of empowerment, and anger (Fischer & Good, 2004; Moradi & Subich, 2002b; Murnen & Smolak, 2009; Yoder et al., 2012). However, these all relate to individual psychological functioning and not interpersonal relationships.

Regarding general interpersonal correlates, more advanced feminist identity development dimensions, attitudes, and self-identification have been negatively related to self-silencing and positively related to confronting sexism, egalitarianism, and seeking friends with similar feminist values (Leaper & Arias, 2011; Rose & Roades, 1987; Witte & Sherman, 2002; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2011; Yoder et al., 2012). These relate to general interpersonal styles and not necessarily those of other-sex romantic
relationships, per se (although certainly these styles likely manifest themselves in such relationships). However, other-sex romantic relationships should be considered separately from general interpersonal styles, mainly because as suggested previously, the relational power dynamics are different in cross-sex relationships (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Furthermore, feminism itself is designed to end sexist oppression and essentially change the power balance related to gender (hooks, 2000; Downing & Roush, 1985), and thus may create conflict between those who hope to hold onto the current structure of power and those who do not.

In examining romantic relations more directly, there has been little focused on aspects beyond sexual relationships, where it has been supported that feminists engage in more assertive sexual behavior (Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Fitz & Zucker, 2014; Schick et al., 2008; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2012). This does support that feminists behave differently from traditional gender norms in this area. However, this clearly represents only one aspect of romantic relationships and ignores larger areas of romantic functioning. It also does not explain how this nontraditional behavior impacts long-term relationships, especially since sexual behavior can take place outside of romantic relationships.

Research regarding perceptions of cross-sex relationships for feminists suggests a stereotype exists that feminists are uninterested in romantic relationships, are “man-haters,” or are otherwise unfit for romantic relationships (e.g., Anderson, Kanner, & Elsayegh, 2009; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). That said, no research actually supports that women who are feminists are anti-male or have worse romantic relationships, and in fact, feminist beliefs and identification may be associated
with enhanced romantic relationships and more complex and individualized attitudes toward men (Anderson et al., 2007; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1997; Rudman & Phelan, 2007). These findings in combination with ambivalent sexism theory bring up the question of how, if such stereotypes exist and if women are indeed punished for engaging in nontraditional behaviors, women manage this dilemma.

One potential area lies in the idea of romantic partner qualities. It is possible that if women’s male partners also violate gender norms, feminist women may be able to avoid negative interpersonal consequences and instead find reward and fulfillment in their partners. Similarity of various characteristics including beliefs and values has long been supported to be an important factor in interpersonal attraction and therefore long-term partner choice (e.g., Byrne, London, & Reeves, 1968; Kerckhoff & Davis, 1962; Stroebe, Insko, Thompson, & Layton, 1971). A partner who holds similar attitudes related to gender roles may be of particular importance for feminist women who unfortunately may be met with hostility from those who do endorse hostile sexist attitudes (Glick & Fiske, 1997). The current study examines the possibility that women who hold a feminist identity and also are in an other-sex relationship both want a partner who does not conform to masculine norms and perceive their actual partner as endorsing fewer traditionally masculine beliefs and behaviors.

Gender differences in partner qualities have been explained from an evolutionary perspective related to sexual selection, a social-cultural perspective related to what we are socialized to desire, or a social role approach that is essentially a combination of both (e.g., Archer, 1996; Buss, 2003; Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Rudman & Glick, 2008). These approaches, however, look at differing partner characteristics from a
between-group difference perspective that compares men and women in their romantic ideals. The current study is focused less on overarching differences in heterosexual partners, but more on within-group variations and individual differences in feminist identity and attitudes that relate to qualities in a partner.

Research on such partner qualities and feminist attitudes and identification is generally quite limited, and leaves some gaps in an understanding of what feminist relationships look like (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Rickard, 1989; Rudman & Phelan, 2007). For example, Backus and Mahalik (2011) examined the Downing and Roush (1985) model in relation to desires for a partner who conforms to masculine norms, and found more advanced dimensions were negatively related to desire for such conformity, but this failed to answer the question of whether this manifests in actual partner differences. Rickard (1989) found similar results where nontraditional behaviors were associated with more advanced dimensions of feminist identity development in early dating relationships, but again, this does not represent serious relationships. In one piece of literature that actually did take into account serious relationships, Rudman and Phelan (2007) found that individuals’ own endorsement of feminist beliefs and identification positively correlated to their perception of their partners’ feminist beliefs and identification. Further, they found that males’ feminist identity in other-sex relationships was related to a variety of desirable relationship qualities. However, the focus in this study was less on the relation between partner qualities and more on relationship health, and it also measured feminist variables in relatively simplistic terms. This research will be explored in more depth in the following chapter, but it provides an important
understanding of the shortcomings of the current literature on feminist identity and romance.

What is of particular interest in this study is if women in other-sex relationships, based on their level of feminist identity and attitudes, want or are in relationships with different types of partners, namely partners with more or less conformity to traditionally masculine norms. The next section will describe the set of masculine norms that will be examined in this study.

Conformity to Masculine Norms: A Multidimensional Approach

Masculinity (and femininity) have historically been measured in psychology in a unidimensional manner through measures such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmrich, & Stapp, 1975). In other words, one falls somewhere on the continuum of not masculine to masculine. However, near the time when these measures were developed, Brannon (1976) suggested there were actually four different components to the male gender role, including a desire to avoid femininity, an emphasis on status and success, a desire to remain self-reliant, and an endorsement of aggressive and risky behaviors. According to this understanding of masculinity, one could be “masculine” in certain areas and not in others, therefore supporting a more multidimensional construction. In addition, more recent approaches to study in this area consider masculinity not just a basic, inherent quality, but rather a reflection of cultural pressures to either believe in or enact particular masculine norms; this is reflected in more recent constructs including male gender role conflict, traditional masculinity ideology, and conformity to masculine norms (Levant et al., 1992; Levant et al., 2007; Mahalik et al., 2003; O’Neil, 1981, 1986; Pleck, 1995).
The construct of interest for this project is Mahalik et al.’s (2003) conformity to masculine norms. The authors’ goal in their research was to develop a scale that measured actual adherence to, and not belief in or stress arising from, masculine gender expectations (Mahalik et al., 2003). The authors identified and named 11 different masculine norms that individuals may or may not enact: Self-Reliance, Disdain for Homosexuals, Primacy of Work, Pursuit of Status, Dominance, Power Over Women, Winning, Emotional Control, Risk-Taking, Violence, and Playboy. Parent and Moradi (2009) then shortened this scale to use in research, resulting in the elimination of the Pursuit of Status and Dominance subscales, and the renaming of the Disdain for Homosexuals subscale to the Heterosexual Self-Presentation subscale.

Using the full CMNI, conformity to certain masculine norms is associated with a variety of different correlates, including increased alcohol use, decreased help-seeking for mental and physical health, and increased aggression (Amato, 2012; Berke, Sloan, Parrott, & Zeichner, 2012; Boman & Walker, 2010; Cohn & Zeichner, 2006; Levant, Wimer, & Williams, 2011; Levant, Wimer, Williams, Smalley, & Noronha, 2009; Liu & Iwamoto, 2007; Mahalik, Lagan, & Morrison, 2006; Mahalik & Rochlen, 2006; Mahalik, Levi-Minz, & Walker, 2007). Similar results have been found using shortened versions of the measure, primarily the CMNI-46 (Iwamoto, Cheng, Lee, Takamatsu, & Gordon, 2011; Levant & Wimer, 2014; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007; Vogel, Heimerding-Edwards, Hammer, & Hubbard, 2011). It is noteworthy that there are certain exceptions to this and the relationships are complex, with different subscales showing different types of correlations to criterion variables; for example, the Emotional Control subscale has been positively related to avoiding anger and stress using the CMNI-46 and the CMNI
and avoiding substance use using the CMNI-46, the Primacy of Work subscale has been related to avoiding anger and stress and preventive self-care using the CMNI, and the Winning subscale has been associated with avoiding substance use using the CMNI (Levant & Wimer, 2014; Levant et al., 2011). This suggests that examining conformity to individual norms may present a more complete picture of their correlates.

More specific to relational aspects, conformity to masculine norms measured with the full CMNI has also been associated with increased sexism, increased intimate partner violence, and decreased relationship satisfaction (Burn & Ward, 2005; Chitkara, 2011; Hunt & Gonsalkorale, 2014; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Tager, Good, & Brammer, 2010), and Fox and Tang (2013) found a relationship between the CMNI-46 and online gaming sexism. Of particular note, Burn and Ward (2005) found that male partner conformity to masculine norms was negatively related to relationship satisfaction for both male and female partners in other-sex relationships, indicating that such conformity could in fact have an impact on those in relationships with men.

Though this research will be examined in more detail in the following chapter, this provides a strong basis for understanding why women desire or are in other-sex relationships with partners who do or do not conform to masculine norms, and what characteristics in women may be related to such partner attributes. Furthermore, it provides a basis for why this is important, if indeed there are negative correlates of conformity to masculine norms.

Prior to discussing what the current project will do, it is important to establish clear definitions of constructs. The following section will provide such definitions to give context for the current study.
Definitions of Key Constructs

Conformity to masculine norms represents the idea that individuals can choose to behave in accordance to particular norms culturally associated with masculinity; it does not address whether individuals hold the belief that men should behave a particular way, nor does it address whether an individual feels distress or pressure over doing so, but merely whether or not someone engages in behaviors that are stereotypically considered to be masculine (Mahalik et al., 2003).

Feminism is defined as a social movement designed to address gender inequality and eliminate sexism (hooks, 2000). This refers specifically to the movement and philosophy as a whole.

Feminist attitudes refer to beliefs in line with the goal of ending sexism and achieving gender equality, regardless of whether an individual identifies with the feminist movement (e.g., Eisele & Stake, 2008; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004).

The feminist identity development model created by Downing and Roush (1985) describes the way women’s feminist identity changes over time, from a place of acceptance of traditional gender norms to a complex understanding of gender and Active Commitment to changing oppressive social structures. It is comprised of five different constellations of beliefs and behaviors related to women’s responses to sexism. Moradi et al. (2002b) suggest this should be examined as dimensional rather than a stage model, and Zucker and Bay-Cheng (2010) specifically refer to this as one particular understanding of feminist attitudes, not identification.

Feminist self-identification refers to the choice of an individual to adopt a feminist social identity or label oneself as a feminist, and feminist identity refers to that
particular social identity, regardless of whether an individual holds attitudes in line with feminism or not (e.g., Eisele & Stake, 2008; Liss & Erchull, 2010; Zucker, 2004).

The next section will explain how this project will add understanding to the literature bases previously discussed and bring such research on different aspects of gender norms and women’s identity together.

**Summary of the Current Study**

As stated, much of the research on feminist identity and attitudes has focused on individual correlates and positive outcomes (e.g., Carpenter & Johnson, 2001; Cunningham, 2012; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Fischer & Good, 1994; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2012; Yoder et al., 2011). The current study expands the research to the interpersonal realm and focuses more specifically on how feminists navigate their romantic relationships when they may be rejected for their nontraditional beliefs (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Furthermore, the current project builds on previous research regarding feminist variables and romance by extending it beyond sexual behaviors, examining actual (in addition to ideal wishes for) relationships beyond the initial dating stage, and considering both feminist identity development dimensions and feminist self-identification. This is not done in the early dating phase research by Rickard (1989), the research on ideal partners by Backus and Mahalik (2011), and the research on general feminist attitudes and identification and relationship satisfaction by Rudman and Phelan (2007).

Furthermore, there are presumably impacts of being in a relationship with a male partner who does or does not conform to masculine norms, most notably in men’s attitudes toward and interactions with women and intimate partners (Burn & Ward, 2005;
Chitkara, 2011; Fox & Tang, 2013; Hunt & Gonsalkorale, 2014; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Tager et al., 2010). However, the research is lacking on if and how individual differences in women’s feminist attitudes and identification relate to whether or not their partner engages in such conformity. The current study sheds light on this area.

This issue is of particular importance in counseling psychology due to counseling psychology’s attention to strengths, social justice, and how issues of culture and gender affect individuals’ experiences (Atkinson, Wampold, & Worthington, 2006; Ivey, 1979; Packard, 2009). Feminist identity has been related to a variety of empowering, agentic, and independent types of traits (Cunningham, 2012; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2012), all of which represent personal strengths. The current study examines a specific way individuals may continue to empower themselves in the interpersonal realm: engaging in relationships that fit well with their own values to maximize their personal well-being. The feminist movement is also a part of challenging oppression and seeking social justice (Enns & Fischer, 2012; hooks, 2000; Yoder et al., 2012; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010), and determining how women may navigate such potentially difficult social change efforts in a way that enhances their own agency and well-being is vital. Finally, this study fits well within the aforementioned focus on an individual’s unique cultural experience within their environment. This is a clear exploration of how women’s diverse gender-related attitudes may relate to how others perceive them and how they empower themselves to create a positive interpersonal environment.

There are four specific research questions of interest. First, how do a woman’s feminist identity development and feminist attitudes relate to her desire for a partner who
conforms to masculine norms? Second, how do a woman’s feminist identity
development and feminist attitudes relate to her perceptions of her actual partner’s
conformity to masculine norms? Third, is there a relationship between a woman’s ideal
partner’s conformity to masculine norms and her actual partner’s perceived conformity to
masculine norms? The last question involves the quality of the relationship as a correlate
of these partner qualities. Specifically, does partner’s conformity to masculine norms
moderate the relationship between a woman’s feminist identity/attitudes and her
relationship satisfaction? Feminist identity and attitudes will be measured using the
Downing and Roush (1985) dimensions of feminist identity development, as well as
feminist self-identification. Women will rate conformity to masculine norms in their
ideal and actual partner based on a model of masculine norms developed by Mahalik et
al. (2003) and refined by Parent and Moradi (2009). Finally, relationship satisfaction will
be examined via a global, unidimensional measure developed by Hendrick (1988).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter will provide a background of the literature on feminist identity development and feminist attitudes, with particular attention to their relationship to different types of romantic experiences, in addition to providing a brief overview of conformity to masculine norms and its correlates. First, the definitions of the development of feminist identity will be described. This will include a summary of the Downing and Roush (1985) feminist identity development model, as well as how it is measured, and its strengths and weaknesses. Next, various correlates of feminist identity and attitudes will be discussed, followed by an exploration of literature regarding feminist variables and romantic outcomes. These ideas will then be framed within a discussion of conformity to masculine norms and relationship correlates. Finally, the current study including its rationale and hypotheses will be described.

The Feminist Identity Development Model

Though feminism has since split into a variety of systems of belief, and as such is difficult to define, there is general agreement that all types of feminism have in common the intent “to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression” (hooks, 2000, p. 1). Based on this definition, feminism then rests on the premises that sexism exists and, through various forms of action, can be changed. A woman’s potential feminist identity is a
personal constellation of beliefs that may make up part of her attitudes and expectations regarding her gender (Downing & Roush, 1985).

Given that psychotherapy and psychological research have historically catered to the male experience, the Downing and Roush (1985) model of feminist identity development stemmed from a need to individualize therapy to address the unique identity development of women, and specifically refers to the process of becoming aware of and responding to sexism. Today, this is the primary model used within the literature to explore women’s development of a sociopolitical gender identity (Fischer & DeBord, 2012). Erchull et al. (2009) assert that though the process through which a woman develops her feminist identity may have shifted with social changes, the model remains relevant for young women in the current time period.

The model consists of five dimensions based on the Cross model of Black identity development (1971), and Downing and Roush (1985) originally intended for women to be classified into these “stages.” However, they suggested that the process of progression through the stages could be different for individuals, and might involve returning or recycling through stages, or stagnating at a particular point. This allowed for some flexibility in individual experience while also suggesting that women would be in just one stage at any given point in time. The five dimensions can be measured using three different scales: the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS; Rickard, 1989), the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS; Bargad & Hyde, 1991), and the most commonly used Feminist Identity Composite (FIC; Fischer et al., 2000). These will be detailed more throughout the chapter, particularly in the section related to measurement of the model.
The first dimension, Passive Acceptance, suggests that a woman lacks awareness of or is in denial of all levels of sex-related prejudice and discrimination (Downing & Roush, 1985). During this point in development, women tend to lack knowledge of sexism and may see traditional gender roles as beneficial to men and women. It is important to note that this could suggest a range of psychological processes regarding sexism, including not being aware of sexism, ignoring sexism, or actively denying sexism exists. Supporting this conceptualization of Passive Acceptance, Moradi and Subich (2002b) examined the feminist identity development dimensions, reports of lifetime and recent experience of sexist events, and psychological distress in a sample of 191 women, predominantly White and almost evenly split between college undergraduates and university faculty and staff. When controlling for demographic variables, faculty vs. student status, and social desirability, they found using a stepwise regression analysis that higher Passive Acceptance scores negatively predicted report of perceived sexist events over the lifespan. They furthermore found an interaction between Passive Acceptance and perceived recent sexist events such that those higher in Passive Acceptance were more distressed when reporting higher numbers of perceived sexist events, compared to those lower in Passive Acceptance who reported less distress, suggesting perhaps that Passive Acceptance makes sexist events harder to understand or manage.

The second dimension, Revelation, is marked by intense experiences that contradict a woman’s attitude that sexism does not exist (Downing & Roush, 1985). During this time, a woman is confronted with such intense discrimination or prejudice that she essentially must recognize the existence of sexism. This dimension is affectively marked by anger over these events and the larger social context, as well as guilt for
having participated in and perpetuated sexism in the past. Downing and Roush (1985) note that this dimension can be particularly difficult because it requires trusting one’s own perceptions regarding the way women are treated, when women are typically socialized to question their own interpretation of events in favor of the perceptions of others. Moradi and Subich (2002b) support this with findings that Revelation scores predict report of lifetime and recent sexist events. In addition, it has been supported that this dimension is associated with higher levels of anger and distress (Erchull et al., 2009; Fischer & Good, 2004). More specifically, Fischer and Good (2004) examined a sample of 191 undergraduate women, the majority of whom identified as White, to determine relationships between the feminist identity development dimensions, overall psychological distress, and state anger. They found using path analyses that when controlling for social desirability, there was both a direct relationship between Revelation and overall psychological distress, as well as a relationship mediated by anger.

The third dimension that Downing and Roush (1985) propose, Embeddedness-Emanation, consists of two separate processes. During embeddedness, women immerse themselves into the woman-oriented subculture while withdrawing from the dominant male-oriented culture. This might include joining women’s groups or seeking out female artists and musicians. Emanation marks the start of developing a more integrated, complex, and healthy view of gender, as well as carefully rebuilding connections with men. This conceptualization of Embeddedness-Emanation as a desire to be around and preference for other women, particularly like-minded women, has been supported in research (Bargad & Hyde, 1991; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1994; Rickard, 1990). Henderson-King and Stewart (1994), for example, examined feminist identity
development dimension scores, group identification, and feelings about women and feminists in a sample of 234 primarily White undergraduate women. Using correlational analyses, they found a strong positive relationship between Embeddedness-Emanation scores and both group identification with feminists and feelings about feminists. It is noteworthy that the correlation between Embeddedness-Emanation and group identification with women, though significant, was much weaker than these relationships, and the correlation between Embeddedness-Emanation and feelings about women as a whole was not significant. This suggests that women higher in this dimension may seek to surround themselves not with just any women, but with women of a similar mindset.

Downing and Roush’s (1985) fourth dimension, Synthesis, involves moving beyond gender role expectations to build a unique and individual identity. A woman begins to see herself as having many strengths and attributes, some of which may be consistent with prescribed gender roles and some of which may not be. At this point, a woman becomes more confident and comfortable with her strategies of responding to oppression, and has a range of approaches to dealing with it, and she also becomes more comfortable with her own unique identity. Additionally, Downing and Roush suggest this extends into her view of others; she recognizes their unique characteristics as well. This, too, is supported by research with Synthesis being related to such factors as gender-related self-esteem, flexibility in gender roles, and recognition of others’ skills regardless of gender (Carpenter & Johnson, 2001; Rickard, 1989, 1990). In one example of this, Carpenter and Johnson (2001) examined the feminist identity development dimensions and different types of self-esteem related to identity as a woman in a sample of 122 college women, about three-quarters of whom were White. They found using linear
regression analyses that women higher in Synthesis reported higher private self-esteem related to being a woman, and that this did not differ for White and non-White participant groups.

The final dimension, Active Commitment, includes women who “select issues carefully based on their unique talents and the possibility of both personal gratification and effecting societal change” (Downing & Roush, 1985, p. 702). At this point, individuals have a sense of their identity as a woman/feminist, know their strengths, and choose to actively utilize those strengths to challenge patriarchal social structures. It is important to note that while many women throughout the feminist identity development process may be involved in feminist causes, this dimension is differentiated by the source that drives the involvement. Women in the Revelation dimension, for example, may be acting out of anger or guilt, but women in Active Commitment are driven by their own interests and strengths to seek change, both to benefit women as a whole and for personal fulfillment (Downing & Roush, 1985). In the same study that found a relation between self-esteem and Synthesis, Carpenter and Johnson (2001) found that Active Commitment also predicted higher levels of private self-esteem related to gender identity. Active Commitment also positively relates to factors such as involvement with women’s rights organizations, personal empowerment, and psychological well-being (Cunningham, 2012; Fischer et al., 2000; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006).

As women shift through the different attitudes and dimensions, Downing and Roush (1985) suggest this may overlap with shifts of ideas as to what gender means and what is appropriate for women. Rickard (1989) further elaborates on this point to add to the richness of the model, suggesting that Passive Acceptance and Revelation are
dimensions that are defined by gender duality. In Passive Acceptance, traditional gender duality is accepted, and men and women are viewed as very different from each other. In the Revelation dimension, women are reacting against gender norms instead of with them, but their actions are still dictated strongly by definitions of traditional gender norms. In the Embeddedness-Emanation dimension, however, she suggests that women begin to accept a “multiplistic view of the world” (Rickard, 1989, p. 217). In the later dimensions, women begin to see gender as more complex and less in terms of what is socially considered to be masculine and feminine.

Rickard (1989) supports this with her research; she examined 63 heterosexual college women categorized into Passive Acceptance, Revelation, and Synthesis stages. They monitored their dating behaviors for three weeks to determine the frequency with which both they and their male partners engaged in stereotypically masculine and feminine behaviors. Some of the stereotypically male behaviors included asking for the date, holding the door, initiating physical contact, paying compliments, and paying expenses. The only behavior labeled feminine was entering the door first. She calculated separate one-way ANOVAs with the independent variable being the stage into which one was categorized and the dependent variables being the frequency with which women and their partners performed each of the behaviors. Those in Passive Acceptance as well as their dating partners were more likely to engage in dating behaviors consistent with traditional gender roles. Participants in the Revelation stage were least likely to engage in the stereotypically feminine behavior, and in most areas least likely to report that their male dating partner had engaged in stereotypically masculine behaviors. However, those in the Synthesis stage tended to endorse engaging in more stereotypically masculine
actions than those in Passive Acceptance, but typically similar amounts to those in Revelation. But, in terms of their reports of their male partners’ actions, they tended to report fewer stereotypically masculine behaviors than those in Passive Acceptance but more than those in Revelation. Rickard proposes that this is likely due to the emerging complexity of views of gender in later stages of feminist identity development, where a woman acts in accordance with her strengths and allows others to act in accordance with their strengths rather than relying on external gender expectations to dictate behavior.

Further, Rickard (1989) suggests that feminist identity development manifests in different ways, including attitudes, behaviors, and feelings. In other words, a woman with a strong feminist identity might show it with feelings of anger toward sexism, behaviors of engaging in action against sexism, and attitudes that reflect equality between men and women. Feminist identity may influence a variety of different aspects of the self. For example, Fischer and Good (2004) supported the emotional component with the aforementioned findings regarding anger and distress in the Revelation dimension. Using bivariate correlational analyses, Yoder, Perry, and Saal (2007) examined different dimensions of feminist identity and egalitarian relationship attitudes in a sample of 165, mainly White, college women, and found endorsement of these attitudes positively related to more advanced dimensions of feminist identity development. Finally, Rickard, herself, supported the behavioral component with findings regarding dating behaviors that vary by dimension.

The next section will explore the advantages and disadvantages of the feminist identity development model. These will briefly be explored, framed within a discussion
of competing models. Finally, the rationale will be provided for why the Downing and Roush (1985) model has been selected as the basis for the current project.

**Strengths and Drawbacks of the Feminist Identity Development Model**

The initial strength of the feminist identity development model was that it represented a movement toward exploring the unique psychological development of women in a time when psychotherapy methods were viewed as more one-size-fits-all (Downing & Roush, 1985). The model addressed how women might move through their exploration of the reality of sexism in a way that wasn’t done previously, and held implications for both research and practice. It created a basis for future exploration of women’s experiences, and also provided considerations for what a therapist might consider in working with female clients (McNamara & Rickard, 1989).

Further, Moradi, Subich, and Phillips (2002b) argue the most important strength of the model is that it allows for depth that might not be considered in a simple feminist-not a feminist definition of feminist identity, when prior to the Downing and Roush (1985) model, feminist identity was researched primarily in a dichotomous way. In looking at a wide range of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors regarding feminism, the model gets more at the complexities of how a woman considers her identity without strictly assuming feminist identities look the same for everyone. Because of this, the model accounts for women who hold attitudes consistent with feminism but may not actually identify as a feminist. It also allows for those who identify as feminist to have different experiences regarding what that means for them.

However, there are some critiques that merit discussion. An especially noteworthy one is that most of the research has been done with white, middle-to-upper-
class women, and as such may not apply to women who do not fit into that category (Fischer & DeBord, 2012; Moradi, Subich, & Phillips, 2002a, 2002b; Vandiver, 2002). While the model allows feminist identity to look different to individual women, it is less useful in looking at how feminist identity might be different for different groups of women.

The idea that feminist identity, as well as specific feminist identity development processes, may vary based on other identity aspects has been supported by research (e.g., Aronson, 2003; Blue & Berkel, 2010; Boisnier, 2003; Cole & Zucker, 2007; White, Strube, & Fisher, 1998). For example, Aronson (2003) qualitatively examined the meaning of feminism in a socioeconomically diverse sample of 42 women transitioning to adulthood, in which one-third were women of color, and most women worked full-time. She found that women of color more often added qualifications to their feminist identity, and asserted that perhaps feminism as it is currently understood does not adequately represent the needs or values of all feminist women.

Two studies looking at measurement of the Downing and Roush (1985) model have found mixed results in the appropriateness of the measures for women of color (Blue & Berkel, 2010; White et al., 1998). White et al. (1998) found in a sample of 109 African American women from the community that the FIDS (Bargad & Hyde, 1991), one of the aforementioned three main measures of the model, had lower than desirable internal consistency for some subscales. This could represent an issue with either measurement or with whether or not the dimensions fit together in the same way for a range of women. However, Blue and Berkel (2010), in examining the relationship between feminist identity development, negative affect, and eating pathology in 100
African American college women, found the opposite using the FIC (Fischer et al., 2000), another previously noted measure of the model. They found high levels of internal consistency within the subscales, lending support that the dimensions are measured appropriately with that scale. But, unlike what they had expected based on European American women, they found using a logistic regression analysis that only negative affect and none of the feminist identity development dimensions contributed to eating pathology. They suggested this could mean the current model of feminist identity development is missing a part of the process for African American women, or it could mean feminist identity development dimensions manifest in different outcomes for African American women. Beyond these studies on African American women, no studies could be found that examine the model specifically for women of other ethnic backgrounds.

Hansen (formerly Downing, 2002) defends against this critique by stating that when the model was developed, different threads of feminism that are more inclusive had not yet been explored. This model was based on the culture of the time, and does represent an important movement away from male-oriented psychology to a psychology that considers the needs of women. Moradi et al. (2002b) also suggest that getting at intersecting identities of women is particularly challenging overall, due to the endless combinations and specificity of identities encompassed within women as an overarching group, and focusing only on feminist political identity still has value to diverse groups of women.

A related critique from Vandiver (2002) is that feminism as a movement has changed considerably since the Downing and Roush (1985) model. The political
concerns of women may be different, and even the relevance of the term, “feminism,” may have changed due to shifting attitudes and progress for women. The culture of psychology has changed to become more inclusive, and this has been reflected in definitions of feminism. As such, she argued that the model may not be as relevant as it once was. In fact, the Synthesis dimension in particular may pose some problems in that it is not predictive of feminist self-identification, and scores are generally high for this dimension for all women (Erchull et al., 2009; Liss & Erchull, 2010; Liss, O’Connor, Morosky, & Crawford, 2001). However, Moradi et al. (2002a) and Hyde (2002) suggest the model is in fact a dimensional model and not a stage model, and can be measured and analyzed as such, in a way that it matters less what order the stages occur. This is the way in which the current study proposes to use the model.

In addition to exploring the benefits and critiques of the Downing and Roush model (1985), it is important to examine the alternatives. The primary alternative is the womanist identity development model (Ossana, Helms, & Leonard, 1992). Ossana et al. (1992) suggested that the feminist identity development model assumes that in order to develop a healthy identity as a woman, one must develop particular political attitudes around feminism and women’s rights. These authors proposed a womanist model that is based less on political acceptance of feminist ideals and more on the flexible process of development of one’s identity as a woman. They suggest the feminist identity development model can be one way in which this process works out, but the womanist model represents a wider range of choices that women might make in response to exploring their roles within society.
The womanist model encompasses four stages or dimensions (Ossana et al., 1992). The first is the Pre-encounter stage, in which women participate in traditional gender roles and expectations and are unaware of how their behaviors value men and devalue women. The second is the Encounter stage, in which women begin to question traditional gender roles and the associated power structure that comes with them. This stage stems from coming into contact with new information or ideas regarding what it means to be a woman. The third is the Immersion-Emersion stage, which in the early part involves idealization of women, especially those who push the boundaries of what is expected of women, and rejection of male-defined notions of womanhood. The later part of this stage involves connecting strongly with other women and searching for a more complex definition of womanhood. Finally, the last is Internalization, in which a woman creates her definition of womanhood separate from societally imposed definitions, based on her own attributes and the sources of knowledge about womanhood that she has found in other women.

There are some benefits to this model. First, as pointed out by Ossana et al. (1992), it allows for women to develop a more flexible identity without having to adopt a particular type of identity to reach later stages of the model (i.e., the feminist political identity or activist role). The Downing and Roush (1985) model suggests that Active Commitment to political causes is an important part of a woman’s identity development, but this may not be the case for all women.

It is also argued that the womanist identity development model is more applicable to women as a whole, and not just White women (e.g., Boisnier, 2003; Carter & Parks, 1996; Letlaka-Rennert, Luswazi, Helms, & Zea, 1997; Ossana et al., 1992). Boisnier
used the Womanist Identity Attitudes Scale (WIAS; Ossana, 1986; Ossana et al., 1992) and the FIDS (Bargad & Hyde, 1991) in a sample of 64 White and 29 Black college women to determine processes of identity development. Using independent samples t-tests, she found stronger agreement in Black women than White women with the womanist Immersion-Emersion scale, and the opposite with the FIDS Synthesis scale, suggesting that when considering racial identity, women may identify more strongly with one model or the other. Also, White women showed more differentiated scores across dimensions than Black women for both scales, but Black women had more differentiated scores on the WIAS than the FIDS. There were some limitations with this study, however. First, the small sample size may have limited the author from fully exploring how each model functioned in Black and White women. Second, the WIAS showed low internal consistency, particularly for the Encounter stage (.26) and the Internalization stage (38), which makes it difficult to draw any solid conclusions from this measure. Third, Black or White women agreeing more strongly with subscales of one model as opposed to the other does not necessarily represent a better fit of said model, but perhaps just a different experience. In another example, using canonical correlation, Carter and Parks (1996) found in a sample of 218 college students that womanist identity attitudes were related to mental health variables for White women, but not for Black women. This is a blow to the argument that womanist identity processes are similar among different groups of women, whereas feminist identity development processes are not.

As would be expected by the model, womanist identity attitudes have been related consistently to self-esteem, particularly lower levels of Pre-encounter, Encounter, and Immersion-Emersion; and higher levels of Internalization (Boisnir, 2003; Ossana et al.,
However, studies examining the link between womanist identity attitudes and gender-related attitudes (e.g., egalitarianism, perceptions of gender bias) have shown mixed results with regard to what is expected, with some stages correlating well to what they are expected to correlate with and others correlating in the opposite direction (Boisnier, 2003; Hoffman, 2006; Moradi, Yoder, & Berendson, 2004; Ossana et al., 1992). Considering gender is such a central focus of this model, it is problematic that such relationships are not stronger and in the expected directions.

One reason for that may be that the primary measure for the womanist identity development model is the WIAS (Ossana et al., 1992), and in her literature review, Moradi (2005) noted that this measure consistently has psychometric difficulties. For example, Moradi et al. (2004) found subscale alphas between .31 and .76, and found low to negative item total correlations for individual items on the WIAS. Overall, the measurement of the womanist identity development model appears to be problematic.

Though not a competing model, per se, feminist self-identification is another widely used way of measuring feminist identity (Moradi et al., 2002b). As stated, one of the advantages of the Downing and Roush (1985) model is that it moves beyond a simple yes-or-no definition of feminist identity. As such, it may allow for more flexibility as to what one’s feminist identity actually entails in terms of attitudes. However, a related downside is that it does not actually include whether women identify as feminist or not.

Feminist identification is a complex process that is different from simply holding feminist attitudes (Aronson, 2003; Quinn & Radtke, 2006; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010). In the previously described qualitative study, Aronson (2003) found that though across
the board, women tended to agree to some extent with feminist goals, women also tended
to describe themselves in multiple ways around feminist identity. Some identified as
feminist without reservation, while some identified as feminist with some qualification
around what that meant for them. Others did not identify as feminist but held many
ideals consistent with feminism, and some others were uncertain of where they fell.
Finally, the others had not thought about whether or not they identify as feminist, often
citing that there were far more real concerns for them to think about (e.g., single-
parenting, finances). This variability in identification is not accounted for by the feminist
identity development model.

Furthermore, Quinn and Radtke (2006) suggest that one reason feminist
identification is complex is because challenges arise with identifying as feminist and with
not identifying as feminist. In a qualitative analysis, these authors examined 18 graduate
students, primarily European Canadian and in psychology, on their attitudes regarding
feminism. They found that in conversations about feminism, women frequently shifted
their views on feminism based on the attitudes and opinions of the other person, showing
a major theme of untenability of feminist or nonfeminist identity. The authors argue that
feminism carries with it many stereotypes and attitudes, which make it difficult to hold a
feminist identity without taking on some kind of judgment from others. However, to
choose not to identify as a feminist implies that one does not believe in equal rights for
women. Because of this, women shifted back and forth in conversations, and often
moved to a place of “lifestyle feminism” where one could live their feminist values
without identifying as a feminist. This appeared to be how women balanced the
difficulty of either being seen as extremist or anti-equality.
Despite a distinction between feminist self-identification as a choice to describe oneself as a feminist, and feminist attitudes as thoughts and feelings regarding gender equality, there is support that feminist identification relates to attitudes (Liss, Hoffner, & Crawford, 2000; Liss & Erchull, 2010; McCabe, 2005). Using a sample of 71 college women, about two-third of whom identified as White, Liss et al. (2000) compared feminists, nonfeminists, and those who didn’t know if they were or were not a feminist on their agreement with different types of feminist attitudes (e.g., radical feminism, liberal feminism, cultural feminism) and conservatism using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). They found support that these three general groups hold different types of attitudes, with feminists being higher than nonfeminists in all areas of feminist attitudes except for cultural feminism, and those who didn’t know being in between these groups but not significantly different from either. Conversely, nonfeminists were higher than feminists on conservatism, with those who didn’t know falling in between again. So, though they are different constructs, identification and attitudes overlap.

However, attitudes and identification do not entirely overlap, evidenced by a problem called the “I’m not a feminist, but…” phenomenon, where an individual states he or she is not a feminist and then proceeds to share an attitude that aligns with feminist values (e.g., Cowan, Mestlin, & Masek, 1992; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Zucker (2004) found support for this standpoint in a study of 333 college-educated women diverse in age but primarily European American. In evaluating how feminist attitudes and feminist identification align, she broke women down into three groups: feminists, nonfeminists, and egalitarians. The egalitarian women represented the “I’m not a feminist, but…” idea by holding what the author proposed are
three cardinal beliefs of feminism without identifying as feminists. Feminists represented those who both endorsed the beliefs and endorsed the label. Finally, nonfeminists rejected at least one belief and did not endorse the label. She found using a MANOVA that though egalitarians endorsed similar feminist beliefs as those who identified as feminists, in some ways they showed similar attitudes and behaviors related to feminism and in some ways they showed different attitudes and behaviors. Post-hoc univariate F tests showed that egalitarians endorsed higher levels of Passive Acceptance and lower levels of Active Commitment and feminist activism than feminists; their scores in these areas were not significantly different from those of nonfeminists. However, their levels of Revelation were comparable to feminists and higher than levels of nonfeminists. In other ways, they were significantly different from both groups; they showed higher levels of Embeddedness-Emanation, power discontent, rejection of discrimination, positive feelings about feminists, and positive attitudes about feminism and the women’s movement than nonfeminists, but lower levels than feminists on these variables.

As Quinn and Radtke (2006) suggested, this phenomenon may be a way for women to avoid the negatives of being seen as a feminist, and also hold the beliefs that are associated with feminism. Thus, if the Downing and Roush (1985) model does not include feminist identification, it may be missing out on a complex and vital process that adds more nuance to understanding feminist attitudes (Aronson, 2003; Quinn & Radtke, 2006; Zucker, 2004; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010). That said, this can easily be remedied by including feminist identification as an additional measure in conjunction with examining feminist identity development.
Overall, while there are limitations and alternative models or measurements, the feminist identity development model remains the best option for the current study for several reasons. First, despite its limitations, it is the most commonly used model of feminist attitude dimensions and therefore the most well-researched (Fischer & DeBord, 2012). This allows for a stronger literature base upon which the current study can extend. This has also led to several different methods of measurement including the aforementioned FIS (Rickard, 1989), the FIDS (Bargad & Hyde, 1991), and the currently used FIC (Fischer et al., 2000).

Second, with regard to the model’s limitations in addressing the needs of women diverse in background and political orientation, the current measure for the womanist model of identity development has arguably not remedied this problem, possibly due to poor psychometric properties (Boisnier, 2003; Carter & Parks, 1996; Moradi et al., 2004; Moradi, 2005). Furthermore, though Ossana et al. (1992) suggest the requirement for adopting a feminist political identity is a weakness and perhaps may be under certain circumstances, it is actually a strength for this particular study. The primary focus of this study is the impact of adopting feminist political attitudes and identification on interpersonal relationship choices. As such, the Downing and Roush model seems a more appropriate model to use.

Finally, while the model does not include feminist self-identification, this again is a critique that can be countered by also including a measure of feminist self-identification. There are several examples of utilizing the model in this way (e.g., Cunningham, 2012; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011). By doing so, both attitudes and identification can be effectively accounted for in statistical analysis.
The following section will discuss in more detail the different measures of feminist identity development, and the rationale for selecting a measure for the current study.

**Measurement of Feminist Identity Development**

Moradi et al. (2002b) explored the measurement of feminist identity development, and pointed out two ways scores on measures have generally been used. The first method, used more often in earlier research on the model (e.g., Rickard, 1989; Rickard, 1990; Vaughn, Lansky, & Rawlings, 1996), categorizes women into different groups based on their high scores. This is consistent with viewing feminist identity development as a pure stage model; women fall into one stage at a time. An example of this approach is found in a study of women’s preferences for female or male artists (Rickard, 1990), where 100 college women were classified into stages based on being above the median for the standardization sample for one dimension and below the median for all others. Demographic information was not provided in this study. Also, with a sample of 440 women, primarily White, single, heterosexual college students, Vaughn et al. (1996) used this approach to examine change in positive affect, negative affect, and sexual arousal in response to reading male- or female-dominated sexual scenarios, though they did not detail how they determined categories.

A major limitation with categorization that Moradi et al. (2002b) note is the heterogeneity within each category based on differing constellations of subscale scores. For example, a woman who scores extremely high in the Revelation scale, moderately high on Active Commitment, and low on all the other scales may be vastly different from a woman who scores relatively low on everything, but for whom Revelation is the
highest. But, according to this method and based on the specific process of categorization in a given study, they both could be placed in the same category. Relatedly, Moradi et al. (2002b) note methodological and consistency problems in this approach since different authors might determine a participant’s stage in different ways. For example, a cutoff score might be used to be sure respondents score at least moderately high, but then this can eliminate many respondents who meet no cutoff score. Also, the determination of cutoff may be difficult, and individuals could meet multiple cutoff scores. Authors might require that a certain discrepancy exist between one score and the other subscales, but similarly, if this discrepancy is not met, many respondents could be thrown out, and the decision of what is a reasonable discrepancy may vary from study to study.

These difficulties in categorization can lead to a loss of participants who do not clearly fit into a stage or uneven numbers in different groups; in the above-mentioned study by Rickard (1990), 30 of 130 women were unable to be categorized, and in the Vaughn et al. (1996) study, 39 of 440 participants were eliminated due to being “undifferentiated,” and Passive Acceptance had almost double the number of the other stages. In addition, Blue and Berkel (2010), discussed previously, did not use categorization for analysis, but noted that the vast majority of their participants would fall into the Synthesis category. A final limitation with this approach, and perhaps the most important, is that no evidence exists to support that this is a stage model (Moradi et al., 2002b), and therefore to treat it as a categorical stage model is not consistent with research.
The second approach Moradi et al. (2002b) discussed was the idea of looking at each dimension independent of the others as a variable. This was done by Henderson-King and Stewart (1997), who regressed feminist identity dimension scores for 234 primarily White college women separately onto several attitudinal predictor variables. Zucker (2004) also used this approach in the previously mentioned study comparing feminist, nonfeminist, and egalitarian women, by using a univariate ANOVA as a post-hoc test for a MANOVA to look at differences in scores on each feminist identity dimension. Finally, Bargad and Hyde (1991) examined changes in each individual dimension score for 184 female students, mainly White, in women’s studies classes.

This approach solves the issue of women’s scores in all dimensions needing to be considered; however, it does not allow for simultaneous consideration of all dimensions. For example, in the Henderson-King and Stewart (1997) study, there was no predictive value of feelings about men for the Synthesis dimension, but feelings about men negatively predicted Revelation scores and positively predicted Passive Acceptance scores. From the data, it was not possible to look at women who had both high Synthesis and Passive Acceptance scores, or high Revelation and Synthesis scores, which may have yielded richer information. Similarly, although Zucker (2004) did examine the scores together through the use of a MANOVA, her post-hoc tests examined scores on individual dimensions. She may have been able to further explore the differences between the three groups of women she examined by looking at their constellations of scores on the dimensions. Additionally, Bargad and Hyde (1991) may have further been able to understand how scores tend to change together had they considered all dimensions together.
Because of these methodological concerns with either categorization or running separate analyses for each dimension, Moradi et al. (2002b) suggest a third option where all of an individual’s subscale scores are taken into consideration together. This can be done with regression analysis where all are entered as a block, or with techniques such as profile analysis. This is more consistent with the evolving idea that feminist identity development is less of a traditional stage model and more of a unique constellation of particular feelings, thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors around feminism. As previously mentioned, Hyde (2002) specifically suggests that the stages are more like dimensions of feminist identity, which should be considered as such.

One example of this approach comes from the aforementioned study by Moradi and Subich (2002b), where they regressed psychological distress onto perceived sexist events and the five feminist identity development dimensions. Another, more complex, use of scores was illustrated in an article from Yoder, Snell, and Tobias (2012), who examined the relationship of feminist variables to well-being variables using canonical correlation in a sample of 215 primarily White college women. Through this method, they were able to determine different constellations of feminist identity dimension scores and how they covaried with different types of personal and interpersonal well-being measures. It is also noteworthy that canonical correlation helps with some of the critiques of the model, particularly of many women scoring highly on the Synthesis dimension, since it essentially gives information on how various constellations of scores on the dimensions come together to relate to other variables. Overall, these methods allow one to determine the relationship of a particular dimension to other variables while taking into account an individual’s scores on other dimensions.
In summary, there are several approaches to using scores, but the one that is best supported by research on the Downing and Roush (1985) model as dimensional and not purely a stage model is to use analyses that consider all the scores together, and not separately (Moradi et al., 2002b). This allows one to consider how scores covary instead of simply looking at one score at a time. For this reason, the current study follows these best practices by using canonical correlation methods.

Regarding measurement, several measures of feminist identity development have been proposed. The FIS, initially developed and used in the literature by Rickard (1989), and later revised, is described by Fischer et al. (2000) as a 37-item measure of the first four dimensions of Passive Acceptance, Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, and Synthesis. These items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to agree. Rickard (1989) noted that she does not include Active Commitment due to considering it more of a behavioral measure of feminist identity dimensions rather than a more internal measure. It is important to note that this aspect of the FIS has been criticized due to lack of empirical support for leaving this out as a separate dimension (Moradi & Subich, 2002a). The FIDS (Bargad & Hyde, 1991), proposed as a way to measure all of the five dimensions, is an instrument with 39 items also measured on a 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Finally, the FIC (Fischer et al., 2000) combines these two measures in a way that will be described next.

Using a primarily White sample of 191 undergraduate college women, Fischer et al. (2000) sought to explore the psychometric properties of the earlier two measures to enhance rationale for their increasing use. These authors found that the FIS and FIDS had lower internal consistency for subscales than would be desired, and much correlation.
between subscales. Additionally, when factor analyzed, the FIDS especially did not appear to represent the five dimensions of Downing and Roush’s model, resulting in a three-factor solution of Passive Acceptance, Revelation, and Active Commitment. The FIS resulted in the expected four factor solution, given that the FIS only measures four dimensions, but a few items loaded on unexpected factors. For both measures, many items did not load at all. Finally, in a content analysis where judges without exposure to the two scales but with exposure to the feminist identity development model attempted to place items into their appropriate categories, 82% of the FIS items and 92% of the FIDS items were placed into the right categories. Individual item percentages ranged from 0% to 100%. Overall, these findings suggested that these two measures, the common measures used for researching feminist identity development, were lacking in their ability to do so accurately.

Fischer et al. (2000) noted that the two scales seemed to complement each other, with Passive Acceptance and Active Commitment being the strongest subscales for the FIDS, and Revelation and Embeddedness-Emanation being superior for the FIS. Because of this, the authors then took the strongest items from both measures, which were determined by a number of criteria including a minimum item total correlation of .30, the highest item total correlation with the subscale which the item represents, a highest factor loading of .40, and correct categorization from at least 60% of judges. The 39 items that met these criteria were then analyzed to create the FIC. In a factor analysis, the authors found that 34 items loaded onto a five-factor solution, and none cross-loaded, accounting for a total of 36% of the variance. This was higher than either of the other two measures.
In a sample of 295 college women and community members, again primarily White, Fischer et al. (2000) then tested the convergent and discriminant validity of the new combined measure. They found solid convergent validity when correlating the feminist identity development dimensions with other identity models, perceptions of sexist events, and involvement in women’s organizations. Most of the correlations were as expected. They found less support for discriminant validity when correlating the measure’s dimension scores with social desirability, in that Passive Acceptance and Revelation were slightly negatively correlated with social desirability and Synthesis was slightly positively correlated to it. However, these correlations, though significant at the .05 level, were relatively low, with .16 being the strongest. Overall, the measure showed strong convergent validity and discriminant validity that was weaker, but still present. Further, a confirmatory factor analysis found excellent fit of the data to the five-factor feminist identity development model.

Moradi and Subich (2002a) attempted to replicate these findings by examining the three measures. They used the same sample of 159 undergraduate women and 86 faculty and staff women, over three-quarters White, for all three measures, looking for internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and validity. They found that the FIC had the best internal consistency for subscales, whereas the other two measures struggled in this area. The FIS had strong test-retest reliability for all subscales, although the FIC was strong in most areas except for the Active Commitment scale. In terms of validity, generally the discriminant, convergent, and content validity were strong for all the measures. It was of note that there was less support for a linear model than expected, given that subscales for subsequent dimensions did not have as strong correlation as one might expect for a true
stage model. This is further support for the model’s use as a dimensional and not a stage model.

Finally, it was noteworthy in the study by Moradi and Subich (2002a) that using CFA, the model did not provide an excellent fit for the data for any of the measures, but both the FIDS and the FIC met one recommended guideline for good fit using the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), with the value for the FIDS being .071 and the value for the FIC being .068. These two measures did not show acceptable fit in any other fit indices, which included the chi-square (311.57 for the FIDS, 263.37 for the FIC), the chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio (2.19 for the FIDS, 2.11 for the FIC), the goodness-of-fit index (.89 for the FIDS, .89 for the FIC), the adjusted goodness-of-fit index (.85 for the FIDS, .85 for the FIC), the non-normed fit index (.84 for the FIDS, .87 for the FIC), the comparative fit index (.87 for the FIDS, .89 for the FIC), and the standardized root mean square residual (.085 for the FIDS, .067 for the FIC).

In summary, Moradi and Subich (2002a) found that all of the measures had some areas that were stronger than others, but the FIC stood out in internal consistency, suggesting its subscales are highly cohesive. The FIC was therefore recommended by the authors as the scale of choice to measure feminist identity development.

The FIC has continued to be used as the primary measure of feminist identity development to explore relations between feminist attitude dimensions and other constructs such as feminist self-labeling, psychological well-being, disordered eating, and sexuality (e.g., Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Erchull & Liss, 2013; Liss & Erchull, 2010; Sabik & Tylka, 2006; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2011; Yoder et al., 2012). It is often used in conjunction with self-
identification measures in order to account for the lack of inclusion of feminist self-
identification in the feminist identity development model (Cunningham, 2012; Yakushko,
2007; Yoder et al., 2011). This is the way it is used in the current study.

The next section will expand the discussion beyond the Downing and Roush
(1985) model to discuss the general correlates of feminist identity and attitudes that occur
within the individual.

**Intrapersonal Correlates of Feminist Identity and Attitudes**

Now that the background and prominent issues with the feminist identity
development model and measurement have been discussed, some correlates will be
brought to light, beginning with those related to individual well-being and mental health.
As a broad overview of the current thought on this topic, Fischer and Good (2004) make
the point that “feminism and feminist identity may be thought of as sometimes providing
direct and indirect benefits to a woman’s well-being and sometimes creating difficulties,
particularly interpersonal ones” (p. 437). The primary area of interest in this section will
be the specific ways in which benefits and difficulties exist within an individual – the
intrapersonal outcomes – when adopting a feminist identity or feminist attitudes.

Overall psychological well-being appears to be related positively to feminist
attitudes, feminist self-identification, and more advanced dimensions of identity
development (Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2011).
In one illustration of this, Yakushko (2007) examined an internet sample of 691 women
diverse in age but relatively homogeneous in race, sexual orientation, and education
level. Using cluster analysis of scores on the FIC and feminist self-identification, she
found three clusters of women: those who held feminist values who scored low on
Passive Acceptance and higher on more advanced dimensions, those with moderate values who scored somewhere in between the other two groups, and those with traditional values who scored higher on Passive Acceptance and lower on more advanced dimensions. With regard to overall psychological well-being, she found that the first two groups scored significantly higher than the last group. She suggested that in a general sense, feminist identity and attitudes may relate to the way that women feel about their lives.

Another broad area to consider is self-esteem; several studies have found that more developed feminist attitudes and feminist self-identification relate differentially to self-esteem (Carpenter & Johnson, 2001; Fischer & Good, 1994; Smith, 1999; Yoder et al., 2012). For example, in the previously described study by Carpenter and Johnson (2001), they found that with regard to collective self-esteem, or the sense of self-esteem that one derives from belonging to a particular group, the more advanced feminist identity dimensions of Synthesis, Active Commitment, and Embeddedness-Emanation have been found to be positive predictors. Also, in a sample of 232 primarily White college women, Smith (1999) examined types of self-esteem related to gender identity based on feminist group membership. Using a MANOVA, she found a significant difference between feminists, antifeminists, and noncommitted individuals. The individual univariate F tests showed that both feminists and antifeminists had higher self-esteem related to their group membership than noncommitted individuals, and antifeminists had higher self-esteem related to their public identity, but feminists had the highest levels of private self-esteem. At least on a personal level, it seems self-esteem is positively related to feminist identity and attitudes.
In terms of more specific aspects of well-being, a variety of other factors are linked to more advanced feminist identity and attitudes, including personal empowerment, personal growth, personal self-efficacy, autonomy, and purpose in life (Cunningham, 2012; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2012). Perhaps the most recent and detailed examination of specific well-being outcomes is from the previously described study by Yoder et al. (2012). The authors used canonical correlation to examine the relationship between dimensions of feminist identity development, feminist attitudes, and a range of different well-being variables. The first function that accounted for the most variance was labeled established feminism, and showed a positive relationship between more advanced feminist identity dimensions and higher self-acceptance, autonomy, personal growth, self-esteem, egalitarianism, personal empowerment, sexual refusal, and collective member esteem. This also suggests the opposite is true for those high in Passive Acceptance and holding more negative attitudes toward feminism – essentially, anti-feminists. These factors as well as those initially described in this paragraph seem to have an underlying dimension of independence and personal development, and taken together seem to suggest that women who develop their feminist attitudes and identities may develop more of an agentic identity for themselves.

Yoder et al. (2012) do bring to light two main exceptions to the benefits of holding feminist attitudes and identity. Their second function, termed “awakening feminism,” was characterized by moderately high scores in Embeddedness-Emanation and Active Commitment, as well as positive attitudes toward the feminist movement, but mainly much higher scores in Revelation. This constellation was negatively linked to a
host of well-being aspects, including autonomy, personal growth, self-acceptance, self-esteem, and personal empowerment. This general finding that Revelation, a dimension defined emotionally by anger and confusion with early awareness of sexism, is negatively related to well-being outcomes is consistent with other research (Cunningham, 2012; Fischer & Good, 1994, 2004; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006). It seems from this consistent finding that initially, development of feminist attitudes may be quite painful, with some payoff after moving past the initial stage of awareness.

The second exception lies in the third function, which Yoder et al. (2012) coined “woman-identified traditionalism.” This function was primarily characterized by high levels of Passive Acceptance, paired with seeming indifference toward feminism as a whole; rather than being “anti-feminist,” these women appeared to mainly identify with traditional attitudes without specific feelings about the women’s movement. This was moderately related to self-acceptance, self-esteem, agency, action identification, personal empowerment, collective member esteem, and collective identity esteem. Similarly, in her study on well-being, Yakushko (2007) found no difference between women with feminist attitudes, women with moderate attitudes, and women with traditional attitudes on such factors as environmental mastery, relationships with others, self-acceptance, and satisfaction with life. Thus, while adopting feminist values may promote particular well-being outcomes, other aspects related to life satisfaction and contentedness with one’s experiences may not be quite so affected.

Finally, in addition to well-being outcomes, additional research has suggested that feminist attitudes provide a slight protective factor against eating disorders, more advanced dimensions of feminist identity development protect against psychological
distress, and the Revelation dimension of feminist identity development is related to higher levels of distress and anger (Fischer & Good, 2004; Moradi & Subich, 2002b; Murnen & Smolak, 2009). It may not just be the positive side of things that are affected by feminist values, but painful outcomes as well.

This section detailed the benefits and challenges of adopting a feminist identity and attitudes for the individual. It follows that if such intrapersonal correlates exist, then there could be a variety of relational correlates as well. These interpersonal correlates, specifically those related to romance, are of primary interest in the current project. The next section will explore the existing research on feminist identity and attitudes and one’s relational experiences in general, as well as more specifically one’s romantic relationships.

**Gender, Feminist Identity, and Romance**

While little research has been done on interpersonal factors and feminist identity aside from romantic relationship qualities, Fischer and Good (2004) suggest that adopting a feminist identity is highly likely to have interpersonal consequences. For example, they note the increase of anger and psychological distress in those high in the Revelation dimension, and argue that this could impact relationships with others especially when others are dismissive of anger. Furthermore, feminism is focused on seeking equality and challenging male privilege, which may impact the way women interact with men in their lives (Downing & Roush, 1985; Hansen, 2002). When connecting these ideas to a heterosexual romantic context, then, it makes sense that if a female partner is in the process of developing awareness of sexism and patriarchy, she may be experiencing
strong emotion to which she needs her partner to be responsive. If he is not, this may create conflict.

This section will explore the relationship between feminist identity and attitudes and those potential interpersonal correlates, creating the heart of the basis for the current project. Specifically, attitudes and stereotypes about feminists will be explored, followed by relational correlates of feminist variables, mainly surrounding romantic relationships.

**Stereotypes About Feminists**

A variety of negative stereotypes exist about feminists, including that they are anti-male, unattractive, non-heterosexual, unable to be in relationships, extreme, trouble-making, and whiners (Anderson, Kanner, & Elsayegh, 2009; Liss et al., 2000; Ramsey et al., 2007; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2009; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Rudman & Phelan, 2007; Stone & McKee, 2000; Suter & Toller, 2006; Twenge & Zucker, 1999).

Considering such stereotypes could give some insight into how individuals may interact with feminists.

To elaborate on what types of stereotypes individuals associate with feminists, Twenge and Zucker (1999) asked a sample of 210 undergraduates, 24% of whom identified as a racial minority, where feminists would rate on a variety of traits. Generally, feminists were rated in a neutral to slightly positive manner with specific traits considered “typical” of feminists including aspects such as intelligent, serious, assertive, outspoken, and liberal. However, there were some negative evaluations as well including tense, egotistical, radical, and anti-male. Furthermore, the authors examined a second sample of 135 undergraduates in which about half were Asian or Asian American, 40% were Caucasian, and 10% were African American. In this second study, participants
were asked to write a story about a fictional character, either Michael or Michelle, each of whom identified as a feminist. About half wrote stories that were considered positive, but about 35% wrote stories with negative evaluations. Specifically for Michelle, evaluations considered negative by the authors included things such as easily becoming angry and preaching to the nearest person, worshipping Satan, and neglecting hygiene. For Michael, the fictional male feminist, evaluations the authors considered negative included ideas of him denouncing his masculinity or crossdressing. Notably, some mentioned that Michelle was in a steady relationship, but others noted she could not keep a boyfriend.

The anti-male stereotype described in this study is perhaps the most relevant to the current project. Clearly, if someone is believed to dislike men, it could impact the way others (particularly men) interact with them. Research as to whether feminists actually dislike men has been minimal, but has yielded conflicting results (Anderson et al., 2009; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1997; Rudman & Phelan, 2007). Using ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) as a backdrop, Anderson et al. (2009) studied the premise that feminists as opposed to nonfeminists would hold more hostility toward men. Their sample was an ethnically diverse group of 488 college students, about two-thirds of which were women. Using a MANOVA, they found that feminists held less hostility toward men, as well as less benevolence toward men, than nonfeminists. The authors suggest that feminist women may be less dependent on traditional gender roles, and may therefore feel less reliant on and dominated by men, leading to less resentment and hostility toward men as a whole, and less endorsement of attitudes that men should take a protector role. Furthermore, these results imply that women who
identify as feminists may judge men on a more individual basis rather than by relying on
gender stereotypes. Henderson-King and Stewart (1997) contradicted this, though, in a
study of the impact of various predictor variables on feminist identity attitudes. They
found in their sample of 234 undergraduate women, about three quarters of whom were
White, that feelings about men positively predicted Passive Acceptance scores,
negatively predicted Revelation scores, and did not predict Synthesis scores.

Perhaps an explanation for the differences in findings between Henderson-King
and Stewart (1997) and Anderson et al. (2009) lies in the measurement of feminist
variables as well as the measurement of attitudes toward men. Henderson-King and
Stewart utilized the Downing and Roush (1985) model as opposed to simple feminist
identification, and the very nature of the Revelation dimension is defined as having
increased hostility toward men, while Synthesis is defined by considering unique
attributes of people as opposed to focusing on their gender (Downing & Roush, 1985).
These nuances would not be picked up through examining feminist identification.
Furthermore, considering Anderson et al. utilized measures of hostile attitudes toward
men and benevolence attitudes toward men, whereas Henderson King and Stewart
utilized a feelings thermometer of reading individuals’ positive feelings toward men, it
seems possible that Henderson-King and Stewart (1997) may be picking up on the
benevolence aspect with Passive Acceptance, as opposed to the hostility aspect. The
findings are not necessarily contradictory, but examine different aspects of feminist
identity and attitudes toward men. Furthermore, regardless of the truth of the stereotype,
several authors have supported the notion that such a stereotype exists and in fact
influences whether or not women are even willing to identify as feminists (Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Aronson, 2003; Anderson et al., 2009; Stone & McKee, 2000).

More specifically regarding stereotypes around relationships, Rudman and Fairchild (2007) completed a series of studies that examined what individuals believe about feminists and romance. In the first study, 99 heterosexual college students diverse in ethnic background looked at photos of plain and attractive women, and were asked to rate them in attractiveness, perceived dating popularity, likelihood that they later identified as a lesbian, and likelihood that they grew up to be a feminist. Using MANOVAs with independent variables of participant gender, participant feminist identity, and target attractiveness, the authors found that plain women compared to attractive women were more likely to be labeled as unattractive, feminist, and lesbian. Furthermore, they found an interaction such that female participants who identified as feminists were more likely to rate the attractive targets as feminists. The authors suggested women who are viewed as more attractive might be seen as romantic partners for males, which then leads individuals to make the assumption that they are heterosexual and nonfeminist, supported by a mediational regression analysis that suggested that the relationship between attractiveness and feminism could be fully accounted for by participants’ ratings of either sex appeal or likelihood of becoming a lesbian.

The second study Rudman and Fairchild (2007) completed examined how holding attitudes about feminists related to feminist and gender equality attitudes in a sample of 236 heterosexual, ethnically diverse college students. Participants completed measures of feminist orientation, perception that feminist identity relates to romantic conflict, and endorsement of the stereotype that feminists are lesbians. Male participants were more
likely to endorse both the romantic conflict and lesbian stereotypes; notably, with regard to the romantic conflict index used, from a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree), the average for the four items for men was 6.02, indicating a mild level of agreement with it in the group overall. That said, women, too, showed some level of endorsement of each stereotype. In regression analyses, endorsement of the stereotype of romantic conflict was a negative predictor for both men and women of feminist orientation, and endorsement of the stereotype about lesbianism was not a unique predictor. Similar results were found for prediction of support for women’s rights, though for men endorsement of the romantic conflict stereotype was found to be only marginally significant at .08.

Finally, the third study conducted by Rudman and Fairchild (2007) examined self-reported endorsement of stereotypes regarding feminists and higher levels of sexual and romantic conflict, and how these related to feminist orientation and support for women’s rights. The sample consisted of 173 heterosexual, ethnically diverse college students. In this study, they found that men reported higher levels than women of endorsement of sexual conflict stereotypes, and similar levels to women of endorsement of romantic conflict stereotypes. Both of these were negatively correlated to feminist attitudes and support for women’s rights for both men and women.

Overall, Rudman and Fairchild (2007) suggest that several stereotypes exist, particularly in those without a feminist orientation, which suggest the notion that feminists are believed to have difficulty with other-sex romantic relationships. This places women who identify as feminist in a potentially difficult position if they are dating someone who does not hold similar views; on one end of the spectrum of choices, they
may hide their feminist identity, and on the other end, they may be subject to potential negative judgments about the group to which they belong.

Now that stereotypes that could have interpersonal influences have been explored, the next section will describe the findings on feminist identity and attitudes and various relationship attitudes, values, and beliefs. These constructs will be explored in relation to both gender and gender role orientation, as well as feminist orientation more specifically.

**Values and Attitudes Regarding Romance**

There is support that feminism relates to gender and gender role orientation (Baucom & Sanders, 1978; McCabe, 2005; Robnett, Anderson, & Hunter, 2012; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Toller, Suter, & Trautman, 2004), thus outcomes that relate to these particular variables may also apply to feminist identity. Broadly, gender, gender role attitudes, and various romantic desires and values have been linked for some time (Cimbalo & Novell, 1993; Cunningham & Russell, 2004; Moore, Kennedy, Furlonger, & Evers, 1999; Sedikides, Oliver, & Campbell, 1994; Smith, Byrne, & Fielding, 1995). Specifically, men tend to rate sexual aspects and appearance more importantly than women, while women may rate commitment, intimacy, romantic behaviors, and family more importantly (Cimbalo & Novell, 1993; Cunningham & Russell, 2004; Sedikides et al., 1994). This suggests that regardless of actual gender role orientation, there are some variations in what men and women may want. When considering gender role attitudes and orientation, another layer becomes apparent; behaviors and traits associated with femininity have been linked with higher levels of romantic attitudes and a desire for commitment and status, while behaviors and traits associated with masculinity have been linked with higher value placed on appearance,
and individuals who are especially conforming to gender norms were found in one study to report that intense conformity to gender norms in a partner was more attractive (Cunningham & Russell, 2004; Moore et al., 1999; Smith et al., 1995). Gender and gender role orientation, then, may relate to what someone wants and hopes for in a romantic partner.

The described research gives some information regarding what individuals may value, but does not address what individuals may actually expect – concepts that could be different. For example, in an effort to directly compare desires or values and actual expectations, Askari, Liss, Erchull, Staebell, and Axelson (2010) examined 358 students and community members, diverse in age but primarily identifying as Caucasian. Using two separate mixed ANOVAs with an independent within-subjects variable of ideal versus expected chore involvement, and a between-subjects variable of participant gender, they examined differences in their two dependent variables of childcare chores and household chores. They found that women hoped to do slightly more than half of the housework and childcare in their future partnerships, but expected to do much more than that. Men, on the other hand, hoped to and expected to do about half. Additional research has supported that gender and gender role orientation may influence what will actually happen in their romantic relationships, namely in that men and more masculine individuals tend to have higher expectations of breadwinning whereas women and more feminine individuals expect to spend more time working around the house (Askari et al., 2010; Erchull, Liss, Axelson, Staebell, & Askari, 2010; Ganong & Coleman, 1992; Ganong, Coleman, Thompson, & Goodwin-Watkins, 1996; Kaufman, 2005; Stone & McKee, 2000). Based on this research, expectations may differ from actual hopes and
desires, and expectations may also differ as a function of gender and gender role orientation.

However, McCabe (2005) and Saunders and Kashubeck-West (2006) both note that feminist identity and gender role orientation are two separate constructs that should be considered as unique predictors. For that reason, feminist identity and attitudes may have similar correlates to the aforementioned research, but may add an additional level of understanding. A few studies have linked more advanced feminist identity dimensions and feminist identification to egalitarian relationship attitudes and seeking partners with less conformity to masculine norms (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2011; Yoder et al., 2012), suggesting that feminists may hope for and expect a more equal distribution of power in their romantic relationships. The study on conformity to masculine norms and feminist identity development dimensions done by Backus and Mahalik (2011) will be explored in more detail later in this chapter, due to its direct relevance to the current study.

This section discussed the various expectations and attitudes around romance that relate to gender, gender role orientation, and feminism. The next section will explore the research that has been done on actual relationship behaviors and outcomes.

**Behaviors and Experiences in Romantic Relationships**

The links between gender and romantic attitudes and expectations have been explored, but whether these translate into actual differences in real relationships is another thing entirely. Whereas the last section explored the relation of gender and gender role orientation to different relationship correlates first, followed by feminist influences on those correlates, this section will explore a variety of different relationship
domains in the context of their relationship to gender, gender role orientation, and especially feminist identity and attitudes. First, general dating behaviors will be explored, followed by sexual behaviors, and finally relationship health and outcomes.

One particular area of interest around gender and romantic relationships involves dating and expression types of behaviors, where both gender and gender role orientation have been found to relate to displaying stereotypically masculine and feminine behaviors, as well as stereotypically gendered styles of love expression (Coleman & Ganong, 1985; DeLucia-Waack, Gerrity, Taub, & Baldo, 2001; Rickard, 1989; Witte & Sherman, 2002). In looking directly at feminist identity and dating behaviors, as described earlier, Rickard (1989) found in a sample of 63 heterosexual college women that women in Passive Acceptance reported more feminine behaviors for themselves and more masculine behaviors for their partners in early stages of dating. Women in Revelation reported more masculine behaviors for themselves and fewer masculine behaviors for their partners. Finally, women in the Synthesis stage did not show significantly different masculine behaviors for themselves than women in Revelation, but showed significantly more than those in Passive Acceptance. Regarding their dates, they reported their dates engaged in fewer stereotypically masculine behaviors than the dates of women in Passive Acceptance, but significantly more than the dates of women in Revelation. Again, this indicates that with regard to dating, women higher in more advanced dimensions of feminist identity may be more likely to see their own and their partners’ unique strengths rather than strengths related to or opposed to gender.

Beyond dating, sexual behaviors represent another realm of relational outcomes. The traditional feminine role and conformity to it has been related to sexual compliance
and submissiveness, low sexual autonomy, and lower sexual satisfaction for all involved (Impett & Peplau, 2003; Sanchez, Crocker, & Boike, 2005; Sanchez, Kiefer, & Ybarra, 2006). Since feminism is about challenging traditional gender roles and finding more flexible ways to engage, feminist identity and attitudes may impact sexual behaviors as well, and in fact research has found that feminist variables are related to factors such as sexual satisfaction, autonomy, refusal, and assertiveness (Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Fitz & Zucker, 2014; Schick, Zucker, & Bay-Cheng, 2008; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2012). In one example of this research, Yoder et al. (2007; described earlier) found that women who endorse higher levels of Passive Acceptance reported lower sexual assertiveness, sexual initiation, and use of protection. Consistent with the expectation that women move beyond traditional roles in more advanced dimensions, women may also move beyond sexual roles.

Finally, relationship health represents one more area where gender can be considered. Ickes (1993) suggests that traditional roles may have been advantageous historically, but have since become unimportant, creating a desire in many to want to move toward more egalitarian roles. However, VanYperen and Buunk (1991) contradicted this idea in their research with a sample of 364 Dutch men and women recruited from the community. They found using two ANOVAs with independent variables of gender and type of gender role attitudes that those with egalitarian attitudes had higher levels of relationship uncertainty and lower levels of relationship satisfaction, supporting the notion that perhaps those who step outside traditional gender roles may experience some difficulty in doing so.
Related specifically to feminist identity, in the limited research done on romantic behaviors and outcomes, it seems male partner feminist attitudes and identification is particularly important as a predictor of relationship health (Dupler, 2010; Rudman & Phelan, 2007). For example, in a study that will be examined in more depth later in the chapter, Rudman and Phelan (2007) found that women’s feminist attitudes and identity were generally unrelated to various relationship outcomes, while having a feminist male partner was a positive predictor of relationship health. Consistent with this finding, Dupler (2010) examined a sample of 107 mainly White college men, of whom 57 were in relationships of longer than six months. Using independent samples t-tests, she found that men in relationships were more likely to report egalitarian attitudes consistent with having a higher level of feminist consciousness, but not more likely to engage in behaviors such as challenging misogynist jokes. She also found using bivariate regression analyses that in men in relationships, feminist consciousness predicted relationship quality, but not relationship stability or equality. Furthermore, feminist self-identification and feminist behaviors predicted none of these relationship outcomes. That said, she noted as a limitation the small sample size and the fact that she used limited measures primarily used with women to measure feminist variables. Another important note in this research is that for both Rudman and Phelan (2007) and Dupler (2010), the participants’ level of feminist identification was positively correlated to their partner’s feminist identification. Additional research on this topic is quite limited.

Finally, beyond feminist identity and attitudes, another area of interest for this study is the correlates of conformity to masculine norms. In the next section, conformity to masculine norms will briefly be defined and differentiated from other masculinity-
related variables. Then, its correlates will be discussed, with particular attention to those aspects concerning romantic relationships.

**Conformity to Masculine Norms**

Gender role norms are various types of social expectations that are learned by individuals in order to meet standards of masculinity and femininity, and conformity to them suggests that an individual is likely to enact these norms (Mahalik et al., 2003). Conformity to masculine norms represents a distinct construct from other aspects of masculinity, as well as personality and self-esteem measures (Parent, Moradi, Rummell, & Tokar, 2011). For example, traditional masculinity ideology, commonly measured by the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI; Levant et al., 1992) and the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R; Levant et al., 2007) describes endorsement of beliefs related to how men should be, rather than whether or not an individual actually behaves in a way that is consistent with such beliefs (Pleck, 1995). Another related construct is male gender role conflict, frequently measured by the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O’Neil, 1986), which refers to the negative consequences of the restrictiveness of masculine norms as opposed to simple conformity to norms (O’Neil, 1981). The reason that conformity to masculine norms was chosen as the construct of interest in the current study is because of the requirement that women rate their male partners on what they observe in terms of traditional versus nontraditional behaviors. Conformity to masculine norms does focus more heavily on potentially observable behaviors related to enactment of roles, rather than possibly unstated endorsement of traditional beliefs or psychological consequences of felt pressure to conform (Mahalik et al., 2003). As such, this seems most appropriate for the current project.
The initial measure of conformity to masculine norms was the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI, Mahalik et al., 2003). The authors conceptualized the construct of conformity to masculine norms as multidimensional, consisting of a variety of different types of norms to which different men may conform at different levels, rather than as a general conformity to norms as a whole. They developed the items, subscales, and ideas for this measure based on current literature, in-depth focus groups, and pilot studies. Using exploratory factor analysis with their initial items, they developed a 94-item measure which included 11 different subscales of Winning, Risk-Taking, Violence, Power Over Women, Dominance, Playboy, Disdain for Homosexuals, Primacy of Work, Emotional Control, Pursuit of Status, and Self-Reliance, with subscale alphas ranging from .72 to .91 and the total scale alpha being .94. They found strong convergent validity through expected correlations with similar types of masculinity-related constructs.

In addition to this, Parent and Moradi (2009) used the original items to develop a short form called the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46). They initially did a confirmatory factor analysis of the full 94 items, and then used that information to reduce it to a short form where only items with .60 factor loadings and above were maintained. This resulted in the elimination of two subscales, Pursuit of Status and Dominance, which have been shown to be problematic in internal consistency, validity, and reliability in other studies (Amato, 2012; Iwamoto, Liao, & Liu, 2010; Liu & Iwamoto, 2007; Mahalik et al., 2003; Mahalik & Rochlen, 2006; Mahalik, Levi-Minzi, & Walker, 2007; Smiler, 2006). They compared the original subscales and their revised, short subscales in internal consistency as well as correlation between the short form and
the original form. The alphas were all in good to excellent range and the correlations with the original subscales ranged from .89 to .98, suggesting that the two forms are quite comparable.

In a second study to examine the structure, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of the CMNI-46, Parent and Moradi (2011) administered the measure to a sample of 255 college men relatively diverse in ethnicity, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. They found acceptable to good fit using a confirmatory factor analysis, with strong factor loadings for most items and minimal cross-loadings. They found Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .78 to .89 for the subscales. With regard to validity, correlations were all significant and in the expected direction with convergent validity indicators including other masculinity-related scales and subscales as well as traditional marriage role attitudes, and only the Playboy subscale had more than a small effect size correlation with a social desirability measure. In addition, Parent et al. (2011) found minimal relations with personality and self-esteem constructs. Given the similar psychometric properties found by Parent and Moradi (2009) of the short form, as well as the improvement in removing two of the subscales that seemed to have some difficulties, the current study used the CMNI-46.

In terms of the correlates of conformity to masculine norms both as a whole and as various specific dimensions, one area researched is that of health behaviors, and conformity to particular norms has been found to be protective in some cases and a risk factor in others, using both the CMNI and shortened versions of the CMNI (Boman & Walker, 2010; Hamilton & Mahalik, 2009; Levant & Wimer, 2014; Levant, Wimer, & Williams, 2011; Mahalik, Burns, & Syzdek, 2007; Mahalik, Lagan, & Morrison, 2006;
Mahalik, Walker, et al., 2007). Both Liu and Iwamoto (2007) using the CMNI and Iwamoto, Cheng, Lee, Takamatsu, and Gordon (2011) using the CMNI-46 found relations between various types of conformity to masculine norms and increased alcohol use, and Mahalik and Rochlen (2006) found using the CMNI that conformity predicted increased likelihood of drinking in response to depression. With regard to psychological distress and depression, conformity to masculine norms measured by the CMNI-46 has been shown to predict this in at least particular groups of men, such as high risk-takers and Asian American men (Iwamoto et al., 2010; Wong, Owen, & Shea, 2012). Finally, conformity to masculine norms has been negatively related to help-seeking behaviors when measured by the CMNI and a 22-item version of the CMNI (Levant, Wimer, Williams, Smalley, & Noronha, 2009; Mahalik & Rochlen, 2006; Vogel, Heimerdingerg-Edwards, Hammer, & Hubbard, 2011).

It is important to mention that conformity to certain masculine norms can relate to positive health behaviors as well (Hammer & Good, 2010; Levant & Wimer, 2014; Levant et al., 2011; Mahalik & Rochlen, 2006). On positive notes, Mahalik and Rochlen (2006) found using the CMNI that conformity to masculine norms predicted likelihood of using exercise to cope with depression, and Hammer and Good (2010) found using the CMNI that Risk-Taking, Dominance, Primacy of Work, and Pursuit of Status were positively related to personal strengths including courage, autonomy, endurance, and resilience. Furthermore, Levant and Wimer (2014) used the CMNI-46 and Levant et al. (2014) used the CMNI to suggest that in some ways, conformity to norms of Emotional Control, Winning, Risk-Taking, and Primacy of Work may serve as buffers against certain health issues. These correlates of conformity to masculine norms as well as the
norms, themselves, may represent areas that are more or less desirable in a romantic partner.

Conformity to masculine norms measured by both the CMNI and the CMNI-46 has also been related positively to various types of prejudices and prejudicial behaviors, including sexism and homophobia (Fox & Tang, 2013; Hunt & Gonsalkorale, 2014; Keiller, 2010; Smiler, 2006; Smiler & Gelman, 2008). Hunt and Gonsalkorale (2014), for example, examined gender harassment behaviors in a final sample of 74 heterosexual, Australian college men. In this study, participants were to interact with two confederates (another man and a woman) on a computer chat system and select jokes to send to the confederates. Jokes were paired such that participants had options to send sexist jokes or non-sexist jokes. In addition to measuring conformity to masculine norms with the CMNI as a predictor variable of number of sexist jokes sent, the participants’ masculinity was either threatened beforehand or not threatened, and the male confederate was either encouraging of sexist jokes or rejecting of sexist jokes. Using multiple linear regression with these three predictor variables, the authors found that both encouragement from the male confederate and participant conformity to masculine norms positively predicted the number of sexist jokes sent. In addition, they found a three-way interaction such that when their masculinity had been threatened, men high in conformity to masculine norms were especially responsive to the encouragement or discouragement of the male confederate and sent either more or fewer sexist jokes accordingly. If indeed men who show conformity to masculine norms engage in more sexist behaviors and hold more sexist attitudes, it follows that women who are in the process of developing resistance to sexism may be affected by being in relationships with them.
With regard to interpersonal outcomes, violent and aggressive behaviors, including intimate partner violence, and more acceptance of relationship aggression have generally been positively linked to conformity to masculine norms, mainly using the CMNI (Amato, 2012; Berke, Sloan, Parrott, & Zeichner, 2012; Chitkara, 2011; Cohn & Zeichner, 2006; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Miller et al., 2014; Tager, Good, & Brammer, 2010). Locke and Mahalik (2005), for example, examined conformity to masculine norms, alcohol use, athletic involvement, rape myth acceptance, and sexually aggressive behaviors in a sample of 254 mainly heterosexual, mainly white college men. Using a canonical correlation, they found in their first function that rape myth acceptance and higher levels of sexual aggression were related to more problematic alcohol use and a number of the subscales of the CMNI, including Power Over Women, Playboy, Disdain for Homosexuals, Dominance, Violence, and Risk-Taking. In the second function, they found a relationship between low rape myth acceptance, high sexual aggression, high problematic alcohol use, and high Risk-Taking, suggesting different types of relationships among the multiple variables depending on the particular constellation of conformity to masculine norms. Using the CMNI, Tager et al. (2010) found that total conformity, Emotional Control, Dominance, Self-Reliance, and Power Over Women all relate positively to abusive behavior, and Chitkara (2011) found that conformity to masculine norms is related to intimate partner violence attitudes as well. This seems particularly relevant to the current project, given the focus on extremely problematic behaviors in romantic relationships.

Though research specific to relationship quality and conformity to masculine norms is limited, a few additional studies have found that general conformity or
conformity to specific norms have positive relationships with acceptance for and justifying attitudes toward extrarelational involvement, and negative relationships with life satisfaction in stay-at-home fathers, positive relations with others, and self and partner relationship satisfaction in other-sex relationships (Burn & Ward, 2005; Chuick, 2009; Rochlen, McKelley, Suizzo, & Scaringi, 2008; Tager & Good, 2005). It is noteworthy here that Rochlen et al. (2008) used a 22-item shortened version of the CMNI. In the first major study in this area, Burn and Ward (2005) examined conformity to masculine norms and relationship satisfaction in a sample of 307 mainly White college students, 25 of whom were excluded from the analyses because of a lack of romantic relationship history. In the female participants, they were asked to rate their partner’s or past partner’s conformity to masculine norms, and in males, they were asked to rate their own. When looking at bivariate correlations with relationship satisfaction for women, the total conformity score as well as all of the subscales except for Pursuit of Status showed negative relationships. For men, total conformity as well as the subscales of Dominance, Playboy, Risk-Taking, Violence, and Power Over Women all showed negative relationships. In a subsequent hierarchical regression analysis, all subscales (and not the total score) were entered as predictor variables of relationship satisfaction for both men and women, and the only unique predictor for both groups was the Playboy subscale. The authors called for additional research examining how other factors play into this equation.

A second study examined 213 primarily White stay-at-home fathers and measured parental self-agency, parental self-efficacy, social support, relationship satisfaction, life satisfaction, and conformity to masculine norms using a shortened 22-item version as
well as the full Primacy of Work subscale (Rochlen et al., 2008). Though they found a bivariate negative correlation between relationship satisfaction and the total score from the shortened CMNI, conformity did not emerge as a unique predictor when entered into a multiple regression with parental self-agency, parental self-efficacy, and different types of social support. A similar pattern emerged in a multiple regression analysis predicting psychological well-being. However, conformity to masculine norms was a significant and unique predictor of life satisfaction. Primacy of Work was negatively correlated to significant other support, but was not significantly correlated to anything else and was not included in the multiple regression analyses. These findings by Burn and Ward (2005) and Rochlen et al. (2008) on relationship satisfaction do appear to contradict each other, but there are two potential reasons for this. First, Rochlen et al. (2008), themselves, note that men in their studies are already defying the role of breadwinner, thus they may already be skewed toward conforming less toward masculine norms, which could impact the analysis. Second, there appeared to be measurement issues with the use of the significantly shortened scale – for example, their Cronbach’s alpha for the total score was .60 – and they call for use of a lengthened scale to further explore this area.

Overall, all of these aspects have the potential to affect not only men who conform to masculine norms, but women in other-sex relationships with them. Though the other outcomes are important as well, two aspects of this research are especially of interest in formulating the current project. First, there does seem to be the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and both sexist and aggressive behaviors and attitudes (Amato, 2012; Berke et al., 2012; Chitkara, 2011; Cohn & Zeichner, 2006; Fox & Tang, 2013; Hunt & Gonsalkorale, 2014; Keiller, 2010; Locke & Mahalik, 2005;
Miller et al., 2014; Smiler, 2006; Smiler & Gelman, 2008; Tager et al., 2010). As stated, this clearly could impact a woman who is trying to establish her own power within a relationship and move against sexism through development of a feminist identity, and at the more extreme end could very clearly impact one’s safety within a relationship. In addition, they could be difficult indirectly in dealing with their consequences for a partner. In addition, the research on relational correlates at this point is somewhat sparse, but potentially promising in linking men’s conformity to masculine norms with some problematic attitudes and lower relationship satisfaction, including the satisfaction of women in relationships with them (Burn & Ward, 2005; Chuick, 2009; Rochlen et al., 2008; Tager & Good, 2005). As such, it seems important to understand how women’s qualities may relate to their partners’ qualities, thus forming the basis for the current study.

Now that the variables have been explored, the next section will describe the current study in more detail. Furthermore, the rationale will be detailed.

**Summary of and Rationale for the Current Project**

As detailed throughout this chapter, the Downing and Roush (1985) model as well as additional measures of feminist attitudes and identity have typically been linked to individual well-being and distress constructs. In addition, several researchers have purported that feminist identity likely has interpersonal correlates as well, especially given the number of stereotypes described about feminists and the idea that the feminist identity development model in particular involves varying types of interactions with men and women (e.g., Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Downing & Roush, 1985; Fischer & Good, 2004; Rudman & Phelan, 2007; Yoder et al., 2012). Fischer and Good (2004) note
specifically that feminist identity and attitudes may result in interpersonal difficulties due to the idea of feminist women moving beyond expected feminine roles and the potential backlash to that. However, despite these claims, little research has been done that actually examines women with various types of feminist attitudes in their romantic relationships, with much of what is in the literature base focusing on either limited aspects of relational behavior such as early dating behaviors or attitudes and values around relationships, rather than examining actual ongoing relationships (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Rickard, 1989; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2011; Yoder et al., 2012). The current study aims to add to the current understanding of how feminist variables relate to aspects of heterosexual women’s romantic lives, particularly the aspects of long-term relationships and relationship satisfaction.

This relates well to several central values of counseling psychology. First, counseling psychology places an emphasis on the whole person, including how individuals use their strengths to positively impact their mental health (Atkinson, Wampold, & Worthington, 2006; Ivey, 1979; Packard, 2009). If indeed feminist identity can be related to some desirable agentic types of traits but also some potential difficulties upon exploring issues of oppression (Cunningham, 2012; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Fischer & Good, 1994, 2004; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2012), then identifying ways in which individuals move toward the benefits and away from distress is extremely important. Exploring how feminist attitudes and identity exist within interpersonal relationships may represent an essential part of this.

The second counseling psychology value to which this is related is that of social justice and advocacy (Atkinson et al., 2006; Ivey, 1979; Packard, 2009). The very
definition of feminism rests on the premise of social justice and challenging the current system which is oppressive to women (Downing & Roush, 1985; Enns & Fischer, 2012; hooks, 2000; Yoder et al., 2012; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010). However, as stated, acknowledging oppression may also be distressing (Downing & Roush, 1985; Cunningham, 2012; Fischer & Good, 1994, 2004; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006, Yoder et al., 2012). Furthermore, challenging the existing system can result in punishment and hostility from others (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001; Fischer & Good, 2004). This study represents an exploration of how individuals, again, buffer themselves from that distress and move to a place of fulfillment.

This study also relates to a third essential value of counseling psychology, that of a focus on an individual’s interaction with their environment, with specific attention to issues of oppression and diversity (Atkinson et al., 2006; Ivey, 1979; Packard, 2009). Rather than focusing solely on personal feminist attitudes and identity (the individual), or solely on others’ reactions to them (the environment), this study is primarily about how the two interact and come together. Beyond this, feminist attitudes and identity are clearly related to gender-related behaviors and challenging gender-related oppression (Baucom & Sanders, 1978; Downing & Roush, 1985; hooks, 2000; Mahalik et al., 2005; McCabe, 2005; Robnett, et al., 2012; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Toller et al., 2004). The goal is to explore how this identity exists within a larger context and affects one’s experiences within relationships.

The main rationale for this study is drawn from studies by Backus and Mahalik (2011) and Rudman and Phelan (2007), both of which examined the variables of interest in the current project. To be more specific, Backus and Mahalik examined the
relationships between the feminist identity development dimensions and desire for conformity to masculine norms in a partner. Their sample consisted of 183 heterosexual college women at a private university, ages 18 to 22, 149 of whom identified as White American. They utilized the FIC to measure feminist identity development dimensions and the full 94-item CMNI. For the CMNI, women responded as they would want their ideal partner to respond. For their main analyses, they reported 12 separate regression analyses, with the 12 criterion variables being the total CMNI score desired for an ideal partner and the ideal scores for each of the 11 subscales, and the predictor variables being women’s scores on the 5 subscales of the FIC.

In the first analysis, Backus and Mahalik (2011) found that 20% of the variance in the total CMNI was predicted by feminist identity development scores. Specific unique predictors included Passive Acceptance, Synthesis, and Active Commitment, with Passive Acceptance positively predicting and the latter two negatively predicting desire for conformity to traditional masculinity in a partner. For the subsequent analyses, the authors used a Bonferroni correction due to the large number of analyses being run, and found that feminist identity scores significantly predicted scores for eight of the eleven CMNI subscales: Emotional Control, Risk-Taking, Violence, Power Over Women, Dominance, Playboy, Self-Reliance, and Disdain for Homosexuals. More specifically, women higher in Passive Acceptance reported lower scores for the Risk-Taking subscale in an ideal partner, and higher scores for Emotional Control, Power Over Women, Dominance, Self-Reliance, and Disdain for Homosexuals. Revelation was significant only for the Emotional Control subscale, which it negatively predicted. Embeddedness-Emanation was not a significant predictor of any of the subscales. Women higher in
Synthesis scores reported higher scores for their ideal partner for the Risk-Taking subscale, and lower scores for the Emotional Control, Power Over Women, Playboy, and Self-Reliance subscales. Finally, Active Commitment negatively predicted scores on the Risk-Taking, Violence, Power Over Women, Dominance, Playboy, and Self-Reliance subscales.

The main idea that Backus and Mahalik (2011) add to the literature is the idea that various subsets of heterosexual women may seek different qualities in a partner, and feminist identity may contribute to what differentiates these subsets. This is particularly valuable information, given the various correlates of conformity to masculine norms and, indeed, some of the masculine norms themselves, such as the Playboy norm, the Power Over Women norm, and the Violence norm, that could potentially be problematic for relationships. They specifically argue that feminist identity development dimensions could be one set of protective factors (of many) against unsatisfying, unhealthy, or even at the extreme violent relationships. As such, further exploration of how feminist identity and attitudes relate to selection of such behaviors in a partner seems warranted.

However, there are two large drawbacks to this study that will be remedied in the current project. First, the authors themselves note the limitation that they examined ideal partners and not actual partners, and what one ideally desires and what one actually experiences in reality may be different things. If indeed the authors are correct in their assumption that desiring a male partner who does not conform to masculine roles is protective, it can only be so if it results in actually being in a relationship with such a partner. To remedy this, the current study examines women in self-reported serious relationships in addition to what qualities women would want in their ideal partner.
Additionally, they did not examine feminist self-identification, which as previously discussed represents an additional dimension of gender-related attitudes that is separate from feminist attitudes and identity dimensions. The current study includes this variable as well to further understand how aspects of feminist identity and attitudes can relate to romantic relationships.

The second piece of literature forming the rationale for the current project is that of Rudman and Phelan (2007). The authors conducted a pair of studies examining self and partner’s feminist identity and attitudes in relation to relationship health, which included relationship quality, relationship stability, and agreement about gender equality. In the first study, a final sample of 156 female and 86 male introductory psychology students was maintained after excluding for analysis those not in a relationship and those not exclusively heterosexual. The sample was relatively ethnically diverse, with 56% identifying as European American, 25% identifying as Asian American, 6% identifying as African American, and 6% identifying as Hispanic American. To measure their own and their partner’s feminist identities, they were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 6 their agreement with two statements, one stating, “I am a feminist,” and the other stating, “My partner is a feminist” (Rudman & Phelan, 2007, p. 789). In addition, they were asked to rate their own warmth and their perception of their partner’s warmth toward feminists and career women. To measure relationship health, they developed a measure with 12 items and used a principal components analysis to determine the three subscales. Relationship quality items focused on communication, conflict, and enjoyment, while relationship stability items related to whether or not one had any thoughts about ending the relationship. The two gender equality items related to agreement about roles and
general agreement about gender relations. They rated each of the 12 items on how often they occurred from 1 to 6.

When examining bivariate correlations, for women, Rudman and Phelan (2007) found strong positive relationships between their own feminist identity and their reported partner’s feminist identity, as well as their partner’s feminist identity and both relationship quality and relationship stability, suggesting the potential benefit of having a partner high in feminist identity for women. For men, there was also a strong positive correlation between their own feminist identity and their partner’s feminist identity, and additionally a positive relationship between their own feminist identity and relationship equality, again supporting that having a male partner high in feminist identity in an other-sex relationship may be associated with desirable relationship outcomes.

In addition, Rudman and Phelan (2007) completed a total of six hierarchical regression analyses, which included criterion variables of relationship quality, relationship equality, and relationship stability, separately for both men and women. Predictor variables for each included relationship length, feminist identity, and partner’s feminist identity in the first step; the interaction of feminist identity by partner’s feminist identity in the second step; and relationship length interaction terms in the third step. In all three analyses for women, partner’s feminist identity emerged as a significant predictor, suggesting that having a male partner who is perceived to hold a feminist identity again is related with favorable relationship qualities. Additionally, for women, their own feminist identity emerged as a significant negative predictor of relationship equality, so essentially after controlling for partner’s feminist identity, women’s feminist identity actually resulted in worse outcomes. Though no other significant unique
predictors of any of the relationship variables emerged for men, there was a similar pattern for men in relationship equality, in that their own feminist identity was a positive predictor, and their partner’s feminist identity, again after essentially controlling for their own feminist identity, was a negative predictor. It is possible that a woman’s feminist identity works in two different ways based on these analyses; in one sense, she may be more likely to select a partner who is especially high in feminist identity and thus have a relationship high in equality, but in another sense, should she not be with a partner who supports feminist views, there may be more disagreement about equality.

For the second Rudman and Phelan (2007) study, adult participants were recruited from a variety of websites and directed to an online survey. Out of an initial sample of 471, 208 women and 81 men remained after eliminating participants not in a relationship or not exclusively heterosexual. In the remaining sample, 72% identified as White, and they ranged in age and education level. The same measures were used, with the addition of one more question about gender equality and three items related to sexual satisfaction. When examining bivariate correlations, similar to the first study, they found that for both men and women, participants’ own feminist identity and their reported partner’s feminist identity were strongly positively correlated. For men, no correlations between their own feminist identity or their partner’s feminist identity and the relationship variables were significant. For women, however, their own feminist identity was again unrelated to relationship variables, but their partner’s reported feminist identity was positively and significantly related to relationship quality, relationship equality, relationship stability, and sexual satisfaction.
Rudman and Phelan (2007) then performed eight separate hierarchical regression analyses were then run, with the criterion variables being the four relationship factors for both men and women. Predictor variables were the same main and interaction variables as in the first study. For men, they found that partner’s feminist identity positively predicted both relationship stability and sexual satisfaction, and that relationship length negatively predicted sexual satisfaction. For women, they found an interesting pattern. First, relationship length negatively and uniquely predicted all the relationship variables except equality. Second, they found that partner’s feminist identity was a unique positive predictor of all relationship variables. Third, one’s own feminist identity emerged as a unique negative predictor of all relationship variables. However, due to the fact that there was no significant zero-order correlation between own feminist identity and the relationship variables, the authors investigated whether one’s own feminist identity was acting as a suppressor variable that, when controlled for through a regression analysis, results in higher predictive value for an additional variable (partner’s feminist identity), but does not necessarily have predictive value on its own. They noted that when a suppressor variable is entered into a regression with an accurate predictor variable, it often emerges as a negative predictor when in fact this is a statistical artifact, and it is unrelated.

To explore whether this was the case in their analyses, Rudman and Phelan (2007) performed an additional analysis that created a variable for a residualized score of partner’s feminist identity, which essentially is free of all variance shared with one’s own feminist identity. When entering this cleaner form of partner’s feminist identity as a predictor along with own feminist identity in four additional regression analyses, one’s
own feminist identity became a nonsignificant predictor, suggesting in fact that it was a suppressor variable. As such, results seemed quite similar to the first study for women, wherein a male partner’s feminist identity was a strong predictor of relationship health and one’s own feminist identity was not a significant predictor, but one’s own feminist identity strongly related to one’s partner’s feminist identity.

Finally, Rudman and Phelan (2007) examined common stereotypes of feminists being single and unattractive and identifying as lesbians found by Rudman and Fairchild (2007). To do so, they used the data from both samples related to feminist identity, demographics, and a few additional items related to attractiveness. They found no support for these stereotypes beyond a small but significant negative correlation between feminist identity and heterosexuality for men only, and in fact they found that in women, feminist identity was actually slightly but significantly positively related to being in a relationship.

Rudman and Phelan (2007) represent the first known attempt to deeply explore feminists’ romantic relationships. They specifically call for additional research on this topic. Furthermore, their findings provide initial support for two things that warrant further investigation in the current project. First, the idea that one’s own feminist identity relates to partner’s perceived feminist identity may indicate that feminist variables may also relate to other types of gender-related constructs in partners, such as conformity to masculine norms. Additionally, while the authors did not find that women’s own feminist identity related to relationship health, they did find support that partner characteristics did, thus providing support to further explore how gender-related attitudes in heterosexual women’s partners may relate to additional relationship outcomes.
That said, there are two potential weakness of this study, both lying in the way Rudman and Phelan (2007) measured feminist attitudes, which was by asking the degree to which one identified as a feminist and the degree to which they believed their partner identified as a feminist, and also asking about warmth toward feminists and career women. These provide additional guidance for the current project. One weakness is that, though it is a strength that they accounted for identification as a feminist, they did not take into account any variations in feminist identity development dimensions. Considering the different links between each identity dimension and various interpersonal and intrapersonal variables – for example, the generally negative aspects associated with the Revelation dimension – taking into account the particular manifestation of feminist identity might have added additional insight to the findings. The current study attends to both identification and identity development aspects instead of simply identification and warmth. A second weakness is that partner’s feminist identity was measured by having participants rate their own estimation of their partners’ internal and potentially unknown attitudes. Certainly measuring internal attitudes in others is a challenge in research, and it may be more valid to measure external, observable behaviors rather than attitudes that may be unexpressed. Although the current study does not examine partner’s feminist identity, it examines aspects related to a partner that have to be rated by the participant. One reason that conformity to masculine norms is a strong construct to examine is because it can be easily observed and rated by a partner.

To summarize, these two studies by Backus and Mahalik (2011) and Rudman and Phelan (2007) suggest a few things that are particularly important for further research. First and foremost, both pairs of authors clearly state that additional research into
feminist women’s other-sex romantic relationships is warranted, particularly research that looks into actual relationships and not just desired relationships. Second, both sets of findings support that feminist variables may relate to partner qualities, specifically in desiring or actually being in relationships with partners with nontraditional gender beliefs. Third, both articles suggest that feminist variables may, at least indirectly, relate to positive relationship health variables.

To expand upon the previous literature, the current project examines women who are in self-identified long-term relationships to explore how their feminist identity and attitudes relate to their ideal and actual partners’ perceived conformity to masculine norms. Additionally, given that mere conformity to masculine norms and feminist identity and attitudes (or lack thereof) do not necessarily suggest relationship health (or lack thereof), relationship satisfaction will be explored in relation to these variables. There are a few things that make this study particularly unique that allow it to add substantially to the literature base. First, it takes into account both feminist identity dimensions as conceptualized by the Downing and Roush (1985) model, which show differential relations to a variety of constructs, and it also takes into account feminist identification. Since these are clearly different constructs, this represents a deeper analysis of how feminist variables relate to romantic relationships, an analysis that is currently lacking in the current literature. Second, the current study examines a reality-based aspect not present in much of the literature on feminist identity. That is, this study focuses both on existing and ideal long-term relationships instead of merely women’s thoughts, feelings, and desires related to romance, and it also focuses on visible partner behaviors rather than internal attitudes that are more difficult to accurately rate by an
outside observer. Third, the current study combines both the aspect of partner qualities and relationship health by examining both aspects and how they relate to feminist attitudes and identity.

Now that the rationale for the project has been explored, the next section will elaborate on research questions and hypotheses.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

There were three main research questions in the current study, and hypotheses related to each (see Table 2.1). First, do women’s feminist identity development scores and feminist self-identification relate to their desire for partners who conform to masculine norms? Because canonical correlation is the analysis used to answer this question, the hypotheses were framed as the sets of variables that were expected to relate, and what direction they were expected to relate. It was expected that the ideal partner conformity findings would be similar to the Backus and Mahalik (2011) findings, since the question is similar. Based on Yoder et al. (2012), it was also expected that three general constellations of feminist variables would arise. Hypothesis 1a was that low Passive Acceptance and high Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification would be related to low ideal partner conformity to the subscales of Emotional Control, Violence, Power Over Women, Playboy, and Self-Reliance. As is the case with canonical correlation, this means that the opposite would be suggested as well. Hypothesis 1b was that a second function would emerge that would be characterized by high levels of Revelation, which would be related to low ideal partner conformity to the subscales of Emotional Control, Violence, and Power Over Women. Again, the opposite would also be suggested. Hypothesis 1c was that a third function would emerge that
would be characterized by high levels of Passive Acceptance and moderate levels of egalitarian identity (nonfeminist while endorsing equality items) without strong associations to other dimensions of the feminist identity development model, and this would be associated with high ideal partner scores in Emotional Control and low partner scores in Risk-Taking.

There were general but not specific hypotheses associated with the second and third research questions, because they have not been studied yet and were exploratory questions. The second research question was as follows: when examining women in long-term relationships, how do their feminist identity development scores and feminist self-identification relate to their reported scores on their partners’ perceived conformity to various masculine norms? Hypothesis 2 was that women’s scores on feminist variables would relate to partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms. For the third question, does ideal partner’s conformity relate to actual partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms? Hypothesis 3 was that the two would indeed significantly relate to each other.

For the final research question, there were both general and specific hypotheses. This question was: does partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms (as measured by the total score) moderate the relationship between women’s feminist identity (as measured by feminist identity development scores and feminist self-identification) and relationship satisfaction? It was hypothesized that there would be an interaction, such that for those with partners who are perceived to be high in conformity to masculine norms, Passive Acceptance, nonfeminist identification, and egalitarian identification would be positively related to relationship satisfaction, and Revelation, Embeddedness-
Table 2.1
*List of Research Questions and Hypotheses*

**Question 1**: When examining women in long-term relationships, how do their feminist identity development and feminist self-identification relate to their ideal partners’ conformity to masculine norms?

**Hypothesis 1**: Feminist identity development and feminist self-identification will relate to women’s ideal partners’ conformity to masculine norms.

- **Hypothesis 1a**: Low scores on Passive Acceptance and high scores on Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification will be related to low ideal partner conformity to the subscales of Emotional Control, Violence, Power Over Women, Playboy, and Self-Reliance.

- **Hypothesis 1b**: High scores on Revelation will be related to low ideal partner conformity to the subscales of Emotional Control, Violence, and Power Over Women.

- **Hypothesis 1c**: High scores on Passive Acceptance, low feminist self-identification, and high scores on egalitarian identity without strong associations to other dimensions of feminist identity development will be related high ideal partner conformity to Emotional Control, and low partner conformity to Risk-Taking.

(continued)
Table 2.1 (continued)
List of Research Questions and Hypotheses

Question 2: When examining women in long-term relationships, how do their feminist identity development and feminist self-identification relate to their actual partners’ perceived conformity to masculine norms?

Hypothesis 2: Feminist identity development and feminist self-identification will relate to women’s actual partners’ perceived conformity to masculine norms.

Question 3: When examining women in long-term relationships, is there a relationship between their ideal partner’s conformity to masculine norms and their actual partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms?

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant relationship between women’s ideal partner’s conformity to masculine norms and their actual partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms.

Question 4: Does partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms moderate the relationship between women’s feminist identity variables and women’s relationship satisfaction?

Hypothesis 4: Partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms will moderate the relationship between women’s feminist identity variables and women’s relationship satisfaction.

(continued)
Hypothesis 4a: For women whose partners are perceived to be high in conformity to masculine norms, Passive Acceptance, nonfeminist identity, and egalitarian identity will be positively related to relationship satisfaction, and Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification will be negatively related to relationship satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2b: For women whose partners are low in perceived conformity to masculine norms, Passive Acceptance, nonfeminist identity, and egalitarian identity will be negatively related to relationship satisfaction, and Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification will be positively related to relationship satisfaction.

Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification would be negatively related to relationship satisfaction. However, when perceived conformity to masculine norms in a partner is low, the opposite relationships were expected, with Passive Acceptance, nonfeminist identification, and egalitarian identification being negatively related to relationship satisfaction and the remaining variables being positively related to relationship satisfaction.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter will provide an overview of the specific steps of the current project. First, the sample will be described. Second, the measures for each construct will be detailed. Third, the procedure will be explained. Finally, a description of the statistical analyses and associated hypotheses will be given.

Participants

Prior to data collection, minimum sample sizes necessary to detect significant results for the main statistical analyses were determined. For the multiple linear regression analysis, an a priori power analysis using G*Power 3 statistical software (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007; Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) was completed. To find a medium effect size for a significant $R^2$ deviation from zero, with an alpha of .05 and power of .80, it was calculated that a sample of at least 139 participants would be required. For canonical correlation analysis in the social sciences, Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) suggest that, for each input variable, at least ten cases should be used. The canonical correlation consisted of seven feminism-related variables and nine masculinity-related variables for a total of sixteen input variables, thus a minimum sample size of 160 would be required. The more stringent requirement was used for this
study, and a sample of at least 160 women from The University of Akron providing usable data was recruited.

To participate, students were required to be between age 18 and 24 and in an other-sex romantic relationship of at least three months. To determine an appropriate minimum length, research with the Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988), later described as a measure in this study, was reviewed, and three months was generally consistent with what was used in other research (Humphreys, Wood, & Parker, 2009; Logan & Cobb, 2013; Slatcher & Vazire, 2009; Strauss, Morry, & Kito, 2012). A college student sample was selected for this study for multiple reasons relating to what is typical of traditional college-age students. First, research suggests that feminist identity is experienced differently across generations (Duncan, 2010; Erchull et al., 2009; Zucker & Stewart, 2007). Because of this, a decision was made to focus on one particular age group rather than multiple age groups, and the age requirement for participation was added. Second, those who are of traditional college age, often called emerging adults, are in the process of both developing their values, including feminism-related values, and also developing their romantic relationships and attachments (Arnett, 2000, 2006, 2007; Fincham & Cui, 2011; Nelson & Barry, 2005). As such, this could represent an important and particularly unique time period that merits research due to the variability in how relationships and gender are experienced. Third, beyond mere emerging adulthood, college years are typically a time of exposure to a range of new ideas and perspectives, some of which may include feminist perspectives, and a time of personality development (Astin, 1993; Sanford, 1956; Rest, 1988).
Data were collected from a total of 273 participants. Participants were excluded if they were not between the ages of 18 and 24, if they did not identify as female, or if they were not in a relationship of at least three months with someone identifying as a male. After cleaning and screening the data, 103 participants were removed for a final sample of 170 participants. The mean age of participants was 20.33 (SD = 1.67). The number of months in their current relationship ranged from 3 to 92, with a mean of 22.31 months (SD = 18.33). The majority of the sample (85.3%) indicated that they identified as European American/White, with the second largest group (9.4%) identifying as African American/Black and the third largest group (4.7%) identifying as biracial. Also, the majority of the sample (90.6%) identified as heterosexual, with remaining participants identifying as bisexual or pansexual. The largest group of students identified as seniors in undergraduate academic standing (35.9%), and 97.6% were recruited directly via psychology courses or The University of Akron HPR psychology subject pool. Additional data on demographics is provided in Table 3.1.

**Measures**

In this section, measures for each of the variables of interest – feminist self-identification, feminist identity development dimensions, conformity to masculine norms, and relationship satisfaction – will be described.

**Feminist Self-Identification**

To measure feminist self-identification, the Feminist Beliefs and Behavior (FBB; Zucker, 2004; See Appendix D) was utilized, which includes self-labeling as well as agreement with what is termed the “three cardinal beliefs of feminists” (p. 426). Participants were first asked to indicate their agreement with the following statement: “I
Table 3.1
Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American/White</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/Hispanic</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/multiracial</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not specified)</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: specified pansexual</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: specified post-secondary</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship exclusivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (completely exclusive)</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (moderately exclusive)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology course</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s studies course</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: HPR system</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (not specified)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 170*
consider myself to be a feminist.” They were told their answer to this question would
direct them to one of two question sets of equal length, thus indicating a consequence for
their response to encourage a thoughtful and honest answer. Then, all participants were
directed to Zucker’s (2004) three beliefs, which include: “Girls and women have not been
treated as well as boys and men in our society,” “Women and men should be paid equally
for the same work,” and “Women’s unpaid work should be more socially valued.” Based
on the combination of feminist self-labeling and agreement with the three cardinal
beliefs, participants were categorized into three different groups: feminists who label
themselves as such and indicate agreement with all three beliefs, nonfeminists who do not
label themselves as feminists and indicate disagreement with at least one belief, and
egalitarians who do not self-label as feminist but do indicate agreement with all three
beliefs. Participants who did not fit into these groups (i.e., those who endorsed a feminist
identity but did not indicate agreement with all three beliefs) were not included in
analyses.

This measure, though relatively new, has found distinctions between feminists,
nonfeminists, and egalitarians, suggesting that indeed it does allow for a categorical way
of determining how both attitudes and identification play a role in women’s behaviors,
thoughts, and feelings (Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Fitz, Zucker, & Bay-Cheng, 2012;
Yoder et al., 2011; Zucker, 2004; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010). This was selected over
continuous measures because many have argued specifically that a forced-choice measure
is more accurate due to stronger association with public identification as a feminist and
involvement in feminist activism (e.g., Liss et al., 2001; Nelson et al., 2008; Yoder et al.,
2011). This is particularly relevant for the current study due to the importance of public
acknowledgment of a feminist identity, since that could activate various stereotypes in a romantic partner that would not be activated by privately identifying as a feminist.

**Feminist Identity Development Dimensions**

To measure feminist identity development dimensions, the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC; Fischer et al., 2000; see Appendix C) was used. The FIC consists of 33 items designed to measure the five dimensions of the Downing and Roush (1985) Feminist Identity Development Model. Participants were asked to indicate their agreement with each item on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). The Passive Acceptance subscale is composed of seven items, an example of which is, “I don’t see much point in questioning the general expectation that men should be masculine and women should be feminine.” The Revelation subscale consists of eight items including, “I feel angry when I think about the way I am treated by men and boys.” The Embeddedness-Emanation subscale is comprised of four items such as, “I am very interested in women’s studies.” The Synthesis subscale contains five items, one of which is, “I feel like I have blended my female attributes with my unique personal qualities.” The Active Commitment subscale has nine items such as, “It is very satisfying to me to be able to use my talents and skills in my work in the women’s movement.” Scores for each subscale can be averaged for a subscale score. Per recommendations of Moradi and Subich (2002a; 2002b) and Hyde (2002), the scales were used as dimensions instead of a stage model, since they have not been supported as a linear path through which women move.

As described in the previous chapter, the FIC was developed by Fischer et al. (2000) as a combination of the most psychometrically sound items of the two initial
measures of feminist identity development: the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS; Rickard, 1989) and the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS; Bargad & Hyde, 1991). Items were selected based on item-total correlation for subscales, factor loadings, and accurate categorization by judges familiar with the model but unfamiliar with the scales. In the initial data from which the items were selected, Cronbach’s alphas on the subscales ranged from .71 for Synthesis to .86 for Embeddedness-Emanation, suggesting solid internal consistency. After initial item selection, they performed a subsequent analysis of the items with a sample of 316 women, the vast majority of whom were White, from which 92 community residents and 203 college students were retained for final analysis. Internal consistency was reasonable, with Cronbach’s alphas for each subscale as follows: .75 for Passive Acceptance, .80 for Revelation, .84 for Embeddedness-Emanation, .68 for Synthesis, and .77 for Active Commitment.

Validity indicators were also examined with this set of data (Fischer et al., 2000). Convergent validity was strong, with the majority of hypothesized relationships being significant between subscales of the FIC and stages of ego identity development, perceptions of sexist events, and involvement with women’s organizations. More specifically, Passive Acceptance was positively correlated to identity foreclosure \((r = .48, p < .01)\), and negatively correlated to perception of lifetime sexist events \((r = -.17, p < .01)\) and involvement in women’s organizations \((r = -.12, p < .05)\). Revelation was positively correlated to perception of recent sexist events \((r = .43, p < .01)\) and lifetime sexist events \((r = .45, p < .01)\), as well as involvement in women’s organizations \((r = .18, p < .01)\). Embeddedness-Emanation was also positively correlated to perception of recent sexist events \((r = .15, p < .05)\) and lifetime sexist events \((r = .27, p < .01)\), as well as
involvement in women’s organizations ($r = .27, p < .01$). Synthesis was positively correlated with perception of lifetime sexist events ($r = .15, p < .05$). Finally, Active Commitment was positively correlated to identity achievement ($r = .24, p < .01$), perception of recent ($r = .19, p < .01$) and lifetime sexist events ($r = .33, p < .01$), and involvement in women’s organizations ($r = .38, p < .01$). There were three nonsignificant hypothesized relationships; neither Passive Acceptance nor Synthesis showed a significant relationship with perception of recent sexist events ($r = -.05, r = .08$, respectively), and Synthesis did not show a significant relationship with involvement in women’s organizations ($r = .11$).

Discriminant validity was confirmed using social desirability measures as well (Fischer et al., 2000). Self-deceptive enhancement showed a weak negative relationship to both Passive Acceptance ($r = -.14, p < .05$) and Revelation ($r = -.16, p < .01$), a weak positive relationship to Synthesis ($r = .13, p < .05$), and no significant relationship to Embeddedness-Emanation ($r = .02$) or Active Commitment ($r = .09$). Impression management showed a weak negative relationship with Revelation ($r = -.12, p < .05$) and no significant relationship to Passive Acceptance ($r = .02$), Embeddedness-Emanation ($r = -.02$), Synthesis ($r = -.01$), or Active Commitment ($r = .06$). Additionally, confirmatory factor analysis suggested excellent fit of the data to the Feminist Identity Development Model using five different fit indices ($\chi^2/df = 1.94$, GFI = .96, NNFI = .95, CFI = .96, SRMR = .046$).

Moradi and Subich (2002a) further supported psychometric data for the FIC when examining a sample of 159 college women and 86 female faculty members, primarily identifying as White. They found acceptable internal consistency for each subscale,
ranging from .73 on Synthesis to .84 on Embeddedness-Emanation. Furthermore, for the FIC, only two items (6%) had lower than .30 correlations with their subscales, compared to 15% and 19% for other measures of feminist identity. The subscales showed acceptable test-retest reliability ratings of .65 to .80 for all subscales except Active Commitment, which showed a rating of .36.

With regard to discriminant validity, Moradi and Subich (2002a) found that no subscales showed significant relationships with social desirability. In examining convergent validity, Passive Acceptance showed a negative relationship to appraisal of sexist events as stressful \((r = -.20, p < .01)\), and no significant relationship to report of recent or lifetime sexist events \((r = -.07 \text{ and } r = -.16, \text{ respectively})\). Revelation showed a positive relationship to report of recent sexist events \((r = .38, p < .001)\), report of lifetime sexist events \((r = .36, p < .001)\), and appraisal of sexist events as stressful \((r = .33, p < .001)\). Embeddedness-Emanation showed positive relationships with each of the three areas as well \((r = .19, p < .01; r = .34, p < .001; r = .35, p < .001; \text{ respectively})\). Unexpectedly, Synthesis showed no relationship to report of recent or lifetime sexist events \((r = .05 \text{ and } r = .15, \text{ respectively})\), but did show a positive relationship to appraisal of stressfulness of sexist events \((r = .18, p < .01)\). Finally, Active Commitment showed positive relationships to report of recent sexist events \((r = .22, p < .01)\), report of lifetime sexist events \((r = .30, p < .001)\), and appraisal of sexist events as stressful \((r = .33, p < .001)\). Furthermore, self-esteem showed a positive correlation with both Synthesis \((r = .28, p < .001)\) and Active Commitment \((r = .19, p < .01)\).

In examining a confirmatory factor analysis, all items for the FIC loaded on their assigned subscales with minimal cross-loadings (Moradi & Subich, 2002a). Though
most fit indices did not meet recommended cutoffs for acceptable fit, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) met the recommended cutoff (χ² = 263.37, χ²/df = 2.11, GFI = .89, AGFI = .85, NNFI = .87, CFI = .89, RMSEA = .068, SRMR = .067).

Conformity of Actual Partner to Masculine Norms

To measure participants’ perceptions of their partners’ conformity to masculine norms, the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46; Parent & Moradi, 2009) was used. This scale consists of 46 items that measure men’s behavioral degree of conformity to nine different masculine norms. The Winning subscale consists of six items such as, “In general, I will do anything to win.” The Emotional Control subscale consists of six items including, “I tend to keep my feelings to myself.” The Risk-Taking subscale contains five items such as, “I enjoy taking risks.” The Violence subscale has six items, an example of which is, “Sometimes violent action is necessary.” The Power Over Women subscale consists of four items including, “Women should be subservient to men.” The Playboy subscale, which consists of four items, includes items such as, “I would feel good if I had many sexual partners.” The Self-Reliance subscale consists of five items, one of which is, “It bothers me when I have to ask for help.” The Primacy of Work subscale has four items including, “My work is the most important part of my life.” Finally, the Heterosexual Self-Presentation subscale consists of six items, an example of which is, “I would be furious if someone thought I was gay.” Scores can be averaged to create subscale and total scale scores.

Parent and Moradi (2009) initially developed the CMNI-46 as a short form of the full Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003). The original CMNI is a 94-item scale which assesses adherence to 11 different masculine
norms, including eight of the nine listed above as well as Pursuit of Status, Dominance, and a subscale called Disdain for Homosexuals which was renamed for the short version as Heterosexual Self-Presentation. The description of subscales for both measures are included in Appendix F. The shortened version was developed due to potential convergent validity issues with the original, namely related to the two dropped subscales, and the burdensome length of the full inventory. To develop it, Parent and Moradi administered the 94 items of the CMNI to a primarily heterosexual, ethnically diverse sample of 229 college men from a Canadian university. Using maximum likelihood estimation, they completed a confirmatory factor analysis to determine if the initial model was an appropriate fit, and found that all CMNI items loaded onto their expected factors. Though most indicators showed acceptable fit of the 11-factor model for all 94 original items, the comparative fit index (CFI) suggested unacceptable fit, which the authors suggested may show a problem with including 11 subscales in the long or short form ($\chi^2 = 7089.30, \text{CFI} = .71, \text{RMSEA} = .055, \text{SRMR} = .0774$).

To create a shorter version, Parent and Moradi (2009) eliminated all items that did not have a loading of at least .60 on their factors. This also led to dropping both the Pursuit of Status and Dominance subscales, since most of their items would not have been retained. In addition, they examined subscale length and dropped three additional items from the Emotional Control subscale, and one additional item from the Disdain for Homosexuals subscale, in order to make subscales more uniform in length at four to six items. Ultimately, this resulted in the retention of 46 items. To further support their decisions of which items to remove, they noted that the items they dropped generally mirrored the lowest-loading factors in the initial Mahalik et al. (2003) exploratory factor
analysis that formed the basis for the original CMNI. The final nine subscales as well as the total CMNI-46 showed adequate to excellent Cronbach’s alphas, with the total scale alpha being .88, and the subscale alphas ranging from .77 for Primacy of Work to .91 for Disdain for Homosexuals/Heterosexual Self-Presentation. All fit indices showed acceptable fit of the model ($\chi^2 = 1414.30$, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .046, SRMR = .0591). Finally, the authors suggested in their discussion the renaming of the Disdain for Homosexuals subscale to the Heterosexual Self-Presentation scale to be consistent with what the content of the scale actually reflects, and to reflect more sensitive language.

In addition to their initial exploration of the scale in 2009, Parent and Moradi (2011) conducted a study on additional psychometric properties of the CMNI-46. With a sample of 255 ethnically diverse college men, most of whom identified as heterosexual and of traditional college age, the authors completed a CFA using maximum likelihood estimation. They found acceptable fit of the data to the model, and they found that all items loaded significantly onto their assigned subscale with minimal cross-loadings ($\chi^2 = 1337.18$, $\chi^2/df = 1.47$, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .04, SRMR = .06). Regarding internal consistency, the subscale Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .78 on Winning to .89 on both Emotional Control and Heterosexual Self-Presentation, with the total CMNI-46 alpha at .85.

Parent and Moradi (2011) also explored convergent validity using the other masculinity-related attitude scales. Significance levels were not reported, but they found positive correlations between all expected convergent validity indicators and subscales of the CMNI-46. Small effect sizes were found for the relationship between Winning and a masculinity expectation focused on determination, agency, and success ($r = .28$), as well
as the relationship between Self-Reliance and another measure of self-reliance \((r = .24)\). Medium effect sizes were found for the relationships between Emotional Control and concealing emotions \((r = .49)\), Primacy of Work and importance of breadwinning \((r = .38)\), Risk-Taking and attitudes toward violence and adventure \((r = .43)\), Winning and toughness \((r = .33)\), and Violence and toughness \((r = .30)\). Large effect sizes were found for the relationships between Violence and attitudes toward violence and adventure \((r = .63)\), Heterosexual Self-Presentation and homophobia \((r = .82)\), Playboy and attitudes toward sex \((r = .59)\), and Power Over Women and attitudes toward traditional gender roles in marriage \((r = .94)\). Additionally, they found solid discriminant validity, with most CMNI-46 subscales showing negative correlations to social desirability in the no effect size range of .19 or under. The exceptions to this were small effect sizes for the correlations of -.20 with Winning and -.28 with both Risk Taking and Power Over Women, as well as a medium effect size for the negative correlation of -.48 with the Playboy subscale.

Taken together, the evidence from the initial 2009 study from Parent and Moradi and their follow-up study in 2011 creates a strong case for the use of the CMNI-46. As stated in their 2009 article, it remedies some of the issues with the long form of the CMNI, and is also more manageable for participants to complete. Finally, the data from 2011 suggests solid convergent and discriminant validity, as well as a solid fit of the data from the instrument to the nine-factor model. Both studies suggest strong internal reliability as well.

For the current study, since the goal was to assess partner behaviors, clear instructions were given to answer the statements as they would apply to one’s partner
instead of oneself. The wording of each statement was changed to reflect one’s partner’s behaviors rather than one’s own; for example, “He would be furious if someone thought he was gay.” To assess for partner behaviors, participants were asked to judge how strongly they agreed with each statement, using four unnumbered indicators (strongly disagree to strongly agree). In addition, to bring a romantic partner clearly to mind, the measure was preceded by the following directions: “Bring to mind your current romantic partner. Imagine what they look like, and think about how they make you feel. Put their initials in the following box.” This attempt to bring to mind details of a partner is similar to the approach used by several researchers to fully activate the cognitive schema related to a friend or romantic partner (Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2003; Gillath & Hart, 2010; McKinley & Randa, 2005). After participants completed this, they were directed to the actual measure.

Though the current study does require changing the wording slightly and rating the behavior for someone else rather than oneself, this follows a similar approach to that taken by Burn and Ward (2005) to examine women’s perceptions of their partners’ conformity to masculine norms. Additionally, Backus and Mahalik (2011) asked individuals to rate how they would prefer their ideal partners to answer the questions on the original CMNI, thus representing another instance of use of the measure for rating the behavior of someone other than oneself.

**Conformity of Ideal Partner to Masculine Norms**

To measure how one would rate their ideal partner’s conformity to masculine norms, a modified version of the CMNI-46 (Parent & Moradi, 2009) was again utilized. Like the directions for ratings of actual partners, the participant was asked to imagine
their ideal romantic partner. Specifically, they were told, “Bring to mind your **ideal romantic partner**. This should be an imaginary person, the person who has the traits that you would find perfect to date in every way. Think about what that person would be like.” They were then directed to the actual measure. The directions clearly indicated that the participant should answer in a way that reflected their desire for their ideal partner. The wording was changed to reflect the hypothetical nature of this as well; for example, “His work would be the most important part of his life.” This, too, is similar to the approach taken by Backus and Mahalik (2011).

**Relationship Satisfaction**

To measure participants’ relationship satisfaction, the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988; see Appendix E) was used. On this seven-item scale, which measures global relationship satisfaction, participants were asked to indicate their feelings on a five-point Likert-type scale, for which the individual descriptions of markers vary by item. For example, one question is, “How well does your partner meet your needs?” and participants can indicate their answer from (A = *poorly* to E = *extremely well*). Another question, this one reverse-scored, is, “How often do you wish you hadn’t gotten into this relationship?” and participants can indicate a response from (A = *never* to E = *very often*). Together, these seven items create a general, unidimensional measure of how satisfied one is with their relationship. Item scores can be averaged for an average relationship satisfaction score.

Hendrick (1988) initially created the scale to expand on previous measures, and administered it to 235 undergraduate students, 117 of whom were female and 118 male. Additional demographic information was not provided. She found using an exploratory
principal components analysis that the best solution was a one-factor solution accounting for 46% of the variance, supporting the unidimensional nature of the measure. She also found positive relationships, significant at the .05 level, between the RAS and commitment ($r = .55$), relationship investment ($r = .45$), passionate love ($r = .60$), altruistic love ($r = .36$), idealistic sexuality ($r = .24$), self-esteem ($r = .24$), disclosure to partner ($r = .41$), and ability to elicit self-disclosure from others ($r = .21$). Additionally, she found negative relationships between the RAS and presence of alternative partners ($r = .21$) as well as game-playing love ($r = .30$). Overall, this suggests solid convergent and discriminant validity.

Hendrick (1988) then completed a second study, using 57 dating couples, for whom demographic information was not provided. This study also used a principal components analysis to find a one-factor solution accounting for 57% of the variance, and found similar relationships to convergent and discriminant validity measures. Specifically, there was a positive relationship between the RAS and passionate love ($r = .50$), altruistic love ($r = .21$), and self-esteem ($r = .27$), and a negative relationship between the RAS and game-playing love ($r = -.53$), all significant at the .05 level. Other measures used in the first study for validity were not included in this follow-up. In addition, she examined their relationship to a multidimensional relationship satisfaction measure and found strong correlations between the total of the RAS and the subscales and total score for the other measure, ranging from .51 to .83. Finally, she examined the relationship between partners’ scores on each item, and found they ranged from .24 to .67, with almost all being significant at the .05 level. For the total RAS, the correlation between partners’ scores was .62. Regarding predictive validity, she examined this by
recontacting 30 couples after one semester to examine their RAS scores and current relationship status. Using an ANOVA, she found a difference significant at the .0001 level in RAS scores between those who were still dating ($M = 4.34$) and those who were not ($M = 3.33$), $F(1, 29) = 28.41$. Further, she found that using individual scores, she could accurately predict 91% of those who were still with their partners and 57% of those who were no longer dating their partners. Using both the male and female scores, she was able to increase accuracy by predicting 86% of those who were no longer dating.

**Relationship Status**

To be sure participants were eligible to participate in the study, they were required to complete a measure for inclusion to determine whether they were in a romantic relationship (See Appendix B). Because of the difficult and individualized nature of defining what constitutes a romantic relationship (Furman & Collins, 2009; Furman & Hand, 2006; Jackson, 1999; Jerves, Rober, & Enzlin, 2013), both Jackson (1999) and Jerves et al. (2013) recommend that researchers provide a clear definition of a romantic relationship for the purpose of the study. The definition that was utilized in this study is that of Brown, Feiring, and Furman (1999), which includes three components: it is mutually recognized and a dyadic connection with one another; it is voluntary; and it includes companionship and some sort of physical intimacy (for example, kissing). Participants were provided with this definition and asked if they were in a relationship according to these guidelines. In addition, to exclude those who were perhaps in physical intimacy without any acknowledged relationship beyond friendship, participants were asked to indicate their agreement with two items: “I currently consider my partner my boyfriend/fiancé/husband,” and, “My partner currently considers me his
girlfriend/fiancée/wife.” Finally, they were asked to indicate if they had been in their relationship for at least three months. If they answered no to any of these questions, then they were directed to a page that thanked them and stated that they did not meet the criteria for the current study.

**Demographics**

In addition to completing the measures, participants also completed a demographics sheet (see Appendix A). Students were asked if they identified as a woman or female, and if their partner identified as a man or male, since study participation was limited to women in other-sex relationships. They were asked to give their age and to answer how many years and months they had been in their current romantic relationship. They were also asked if their relationship was exclusive on a continuous Likert scale (1 = *not at all exclusive* to 5 = *completely exclusive*). Regarding more specific demographic information, they were asked to indicate their ethnic identity (African American/Black, Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander, Latina/Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, Middle Eastern, European American/White, biracial/multiracial, other, prefer not to answer). Though participants had to be in other-sex relationships, relationship behaviors do not always reflect internal sexual orientation, so they were asked about this (heterosexual, lesbian, bisexual, other, or prefer not to answer). They were asked their academic year. Finally, they were asked to indicate whether they were recruited through a psychology course or a women’s studies course.

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited through psychology classes at The University of Akron via HPR, the psychology subject pool, and offered extra credit for participation.
In addition, instructors of women’s studies classes at The University of Akron were contacted and asked to distribute the information for participation to students in their course sections. The recruitment e-mail is included in Appendix G. The reason for this was to recruit a wider range of students with a wider range of attitudes toward feminism. Students who agreed to participate and met the requirements were directed to the survey on The University of Akron Qualtrics secure survey website. After providing informed consent (see Appendix H), participants completed the relationship status measure. If they indicated that they were eligible for the study, they completed the demographics form, and then they took the surveys.

First, the two modified CMNI-46 measures were presented in random order, so they either took the ideal partner measure followed by the actual partner measure, or vice versa. The reason for this was to prevent priming of gender-related thoughts that could impact how participants thought about their ideal and actual relationships. Order effects were analyzed to determine any differences between the two conditions, and using Bonferroni-corrected $t$-tests, no significant differences were found between the two conditions on any total scale or subscale scores. The remaining surveys were presented in the same order: the FIC, the FBB measure, and finally the RAS. Upon completion of the surveys, students were thanked for their participation and provided with a debriefing paragraph (see Appendix I). In addition, if they were eligible for extra credit, they were redirected to a separate page to provide their name and e-mail address as well as the class for which they were receiving credit. To maintain anonymity, this was submitted separately from their survey responses. Institutional approval is included in Appendix J.
Statistical Analyses and Hypotheses

The main statistical analyses were canonical correlation, bivariate correlation, and multiple regression. For the first analysis, on one side of the canonical correlation, the feminist variables were added, including the five feminist identity dimensions and the feminist/nonfeminist/egalitarian identity categorical aspect dummy-coded as two continuous variables of feminist identity status and egalitarian identity status. On the other side, the nine subscales of the ideal partner CMNI-46 were entered. The second analysis was the same, except that instead of ideal partner ratings, the nine subscales of the actual partner CMNI-46 were entered. The third analysis involved bivariate correlations in which each of the ideal partner’s conformity to individual masculine norms, as well as their total conformity to masculine norms, were correlated with those of the actual partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms. Due to the large number of analyses being run in this procedure, a Bonferroni-corrected significance level of $p < .005$ was used to avoid a type I error. Finally, a fourth analysis of multiple linear regression was conducted to determine the relationship between feminist identity variables and relationship satisfaction, with a potential moderator of partner’s conformity to masculine norms. The predictor variables were the five feminist identity development dimension scores, the feminist identity status item, the egalitarian identity status item, the total partner conformity to masculine norms score, and six interaction terms for total partner conformity to masculine norms and each of the feminism-related variables. The hypotheses associated with each analysis are listed in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2  
*List of Hypotheses*

---

**First Canonical Correlation Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1**: Using canonical correlation, three canonical variates will be found which will suggest relationships between participant feminist variables and ideal partner conformity to masculine norms.

- **Hypothesis 1a**: The first canonical variate pairing will show low scores on Passive Acceptance and high scores on Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification, as well as low ideal partner conformity to the subscales of Emotional Control, Violence, Power Over Women, Playboy, and Self-Reliance.
- **Hypothesis 1b**: The second canonical variate pairing will show high scores on Revelation, as well as low scores on ideal partner conformity to the subscales of Emotional Control, Violence, and Power Over Women.
- **Hypothesis 1c**: The third canonical variate pairing will show high scores on Passive Acceptance, low feminist self-identification, and high egalitarian identification without strong associations to other dimensions of feminist identity development, as well as high ideal partner conformity to Emotional Control and low partner conformity to Risk-Taking.

*(continued)*
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Second Canonical Correlation Hypothesis

Hypothesis 2: Using canonical correlation, canonical variates will be found which will suggest relationships between participant feminist variables and actual partner’s perceived conformity to masculine norms.

Bivariate Correlation Hypothesis

Hypothesis 3: Using Bonferroni-corrected bivariate correlation analyses, women’s ideal partner’s scores on individual subscales of and total conformity to masculine norms will relate to their associated actual partner’s perceived scores on individual subscales of and total conformity to masculine norms.

Multiple Linear Regression Hypotheses

Hypothesis 4: Using hierarchical linear regression, it will be found that partner’s conformity to masculine norms will moderate the relationship between women’s feminist variables and relationship satisfaction, such that the variance accounted for is significant at the $p = .05$ level, and adding the moderation terms will bring a significant $\Delta R^2$.

Hypothesis 4a: Passive Acceptance and egalitarian identity scores will positively predict relationship satisfaction scores, and Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification scores

(continued)
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will negatively predict relationship satisfaction scores, when partner’s perceived total conformity to masculine norms score is high.

Hypothesis 4b: Passive Acceptance and egalitarian identity scores will negatively predict relationship satisfaction scores, and Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification will positively predict relationship satisfaction scores, when partner’s perceived total conformity to masculine norms score is low.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the statistical analyses. First, the data screening procedures will be described. Second, descriptive statistics will be explored, which will include means, standard deviations, and internal consistency statistics for each subscale for all participants as well as the subgroups of feminists, egalitarians, and nonfeminists. Third, the tests of hypotheses will be discussed. This will include the two canonical correlation analyses, followed by the bivariate correlation analyses, and, finally, the hierarchical regression analysis.

Data Screening

Specific inclusion criteria for the study included identifying as a woman/female, being in a relationship of at least three months with someone identifying as a man/male, and being a college student between the ages of 18 and 24. Additionally, using her Feminist Beliefs and Behaviors (FBB) measure, Zucker (2004) removed participants who identified as a feminist but rejected at least one of the three core beliefs of feminism, and this study followed that guideline as well. The initial data set consisted of 273 participants, and 103 of those participants were removed. Of those removed, 30 (10.99%) were not able to be classified into Zucker’s (2004) feminist identification groups due to identifying as feminists but not endorsing all three core feminist beliefs, 27
(9.89%) were removed because they did not meet study criteria (e.g., relationship requirements, age requirements, gender identity requirements), and 11 (4.03%) were removed for participating twice (i.e., during both semesters the study was running). In these 11 cases, the second participation was removed. Two (0.73%) did not consent to participate, six (2.20%) participants stopped after the consent form, nine (3.30%) stopped participating partway through the surveys, four (1.47%) were removed due to missing full pages of data, and five (1.83%) were removed because they had more than one item missing on a particular subscale. Finally, nine individuals (3.30%) were removed because they were multivariate outliers. This left a total of 170 participants (62.27% of the original sample) for the analysis.

Regarding missing data, there was no identifiable pattern to items that were missing. After removing participants who missed pages of data or stopped participating, for each individual item, anywhere from zero to two participants did not have a response. The choice of removing participants with more than one item on a subscale was determined to be the best option for removal because the five subscales for which there were two or more items missing ranged in size from five to eight items. This meant that participants were missing between 25% and 40% of the data for the subscale, and this was higher than the recommendation of 20% provided by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Graham (2009) suggests that deletion of cases is appropriate as long as it occurs in lower than 5% of participants and therefore does not result in a large loss of power. For any missing data after removal of participants, missing item values were replaced with the individual participant’s mean on the other items of the given scale or subscale using pairwise deletion methods (Parent, 2013). Prior to removal of multivariate outliers, the
179 participants were missing 0.18% of the item values, and these were replaced with their means on the entire subscale.

Scale totals and subscale totals were created by computing the average of all items for the particular subscale, consistent with the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) use by Hendrick (1988), the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46) use by Parent and Smiler (2013), and the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) use by Fischer et al. (2000). Subscales were examined for normality prior to the removal of the nine multivariate outliers using the guidelines from Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). Of the 26 scales, positive skews were found for both the Ideal Partner and Actual Partner CMNI-46 Power Over Women subscales (1.28 and 0.74, with a standard error of .19), as well as for both the Ideal Partner and Actual Partner CMNI-46 Playboy subscales (1.38 and 0.78, with a standard error of 0.19). In addition, a negative skew was found for relationship satisfaction (-1.03, with a standard error of 0.19). Both the Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Power Over Women subscale and the Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Playboy subscale was found to be leptokurtotic (1.06 and 1.65, with a standard error of 0.36). Beyond kurtosis and skewness statistics, histograms and P-Plots were examined to determine appropriate normality. The histogram showed problems with the aforementioned skewed and kurtotic scales, as well as with the Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Emotional Control subscale, the Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Self-Reliance subscale, the Actual Partner CMNI-46 Primacy of Work subscale, and the Synthesis subscale. The P-Plots showed additional problems with the Actual Partner CMNI-46 Risk-Taking subscales.

To normalize the distributions of the data, several of these subscales were transformed. Transformation did not improve the Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Emotional
Control subscale, the Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Self-Reliance subscale, or the Actual Partner CMNI-46 Risk-Taking subscale, so those remained in their original forms. However, the Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Power Over Women subscale was transformed using the logarithm of its square root. The Ideal Partner CMNI-46 Playboy subscale and the Relationship Assessment Scale total were transformed using their reflected inverses. The Actual Partner CMNI-46 Power Over Women, Playboy, and Primacy of Work subscales as well as the Synthesis subscale were transformed using their square roots. Aside from descriptive and internal consistency statistics, these transformed scale scores were used for all analyses.

After removal of multivariate outliers, final skewness scores ranged from -0.71 on the Violence subscale of the CMNI-46 for the actual partners to 0.54 for the Winning subscale for the CMNI-46 for the actual partners. All skewness scores had a standard error of 0.19. Final kurtosis scores showed a range from -1.15 on the transformed ideal partner’s Power Over Women subscale of the CMNI-46, to 0.81 on the CMNI-46 total score for actual partners. All kurtosis scores had a standard error of 0.37.

Prior to main analyses, two dummy variables were created to create continuous variables from the categorical variable of feminist identity categories. Because the main area of interest was how feminists and egalitarians differed from non-feminists, a feminist identity variable and an egalitarian identity variable were created. For the feminist identity variable, those who identified as a feminist and agreed with all three of the Zucker (2004) feminist beliefs were given a value of 1, and those who did not were given a value of 0. For the egalitarian identity variable, those who did not identify as a
feminist but agreed with the three core beliefs were given a value of 1, and all others were given a value of 0.

One additional screening that was performed was to examine the difference between those who took the CMNI-46 regarding their ideal partner first and those who took the CMNI-46 regarding their actual partner first. These were run to make sure that there were no order effects where thinking about one’s actual partner first primed one to think of similarities and differences in ideal partner, or vice versa. A total of 26 independent-samples t-tests was performed. Since a Type II error was more important to consider in this analysis than a Type I error, a Bonferroni correction to the alpha level was not used. The 26 dependent variables consisted of all total and subscale scores on both the ideal and actual partner CMNI-46, the five feminist identity development dimension scores, and the relationship satisfaction score. One t-test was significant at the $p < .05$ level, that of the perception of the actual partner’s Risk-Taking conformity ($t = 2.30, p = .02$). Specifically, the mean for those who took the actual partner CMNI-46 before the ideal partner CMNI-46 was 2.50 ($SD = .55$), and the mean for those who took it in the opposite order was 2.29 ($SD = .59$). The $p$ values for the tests for the other scales ranged from .06 to .91. Since the actual partner Risk-Taking scale was the only significant test of 26, this finding was likely due to chance.

A final preliminary analysis was performed to examine the differences between heterosexual participants and non-heterosexual participants. For this analysis, the one participant who preferred not to answer the sexual orientation question was not included, and those who identified as bisexual or other were grouped into a non-heterosexual category. The nine masculine norm subscale scores for both ideal and actual partners, the
feminist identity development dimension scores, and the relationship satisfaction scores were included as dependent variables. The MANOVA was significant with a Wilks’ lambda of .76 [$F(24, 144) = 1.91, p = .01$. A Bonferroni correction was used to determine significance on the resulting between-subjects one-way ANOVAs, and the resulting cutoff for significance was $p < .002$. This resulted in significant differences between the two groups only on the Heterosexual Self-Presentation conformity for ideal partners, with heterosexual participants having a mean of 2.43 ($SD = .67$) and non-heterosexual participants having a mean of 1.69 ($SD = .65$).

**Descriptive Statistics**

Before hypothesis testing was performed, descriptive statistics were run for the entire analyzable sample ($N = 170$), as well as for analyzable feminists ($n = 77$), egalitarians ($n = 57$), and nonfeminists ($n = 36$). Those who identified as feminists and endorsed Zucker’s (2004) three core beliefs of feminism were categorized as feminists, those who endorsed the three beliefs but did not identify as a feminist were placed in the egalitarian group, and those who rejected at least one of the beliefs and did not identify as feminists were grouped in the nonfeminist category. The descriptive statistics included means and standard deviations for the total scores on each scale and subscale. In addition, Cronbach’s alphas were performed for each scale and subscale to examine internal reliability.

FIC ratings were done on a Likert scale ($1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $5 = \text{strongly agree}$). Full statistics for the FIC are provided in Table 4.1. For the entire analyzed sample, scores were highest for Synthesis ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.54$), followed by Active
Table 4.1  
*Feminist Identity Composite Means, Standard Deviations, and Internal Consistency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive Acceptance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revelation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Embeddedness-Emanation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthesis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *N* = 170; *n* = 77 for feminists; *n* = 57 for egalitarians; *n* = 36 for nonfeminists.

Commitment (*M* = 3.59, *SD* = 0.60), Embeddedness-Emanation (*M* = 3.19, *SD* = 0.79), and Revelation (*M* = 2.83, *SD* = 0.66), with Passive Acceptance scores being the lowest (*M* = 2.82, *SD* = 0.65). Generally, participants tended to indicate some level of agreement with Synthesis and Active Commitment items, then, while the means fell closer to the neutral or undecided indicator for the other three scales. Cronbach’s alphas were adequate to good for all of the scales for the whole sample, falling between .71 and 118.
When considering individual groups, they primarily ranged from marginal to excellent with the exception of the Passive Acceptance scale for egalitarians, which had a poor Cronbach’s alpha of .50.

The CMNI-46 uses a four-point Likert scale that is not numbered for participants, but was numbered for data analysis from 1 to 4 (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). Full statistics for the CMNI-46 for both the ideal and actual partner are provided in Table 4.2. For the CMNI-46 for both the ideal and actual partner ratings, the total means were 2.01 (SD = 0.28) for ideal partners and 2.35 (SD = 0.33) for actual partners. Subscale scores for the ideal partners ranged from a mean of 1.39 (SD = 0.40) on the Playboy subscale to a mean of 2.38 (SD = 0.57) on the Violence subscale. Subscale scores for perceptions of actual partners ranged from a mean of 1.66 (SD = 0.59) on the Playboy subscale to a mean of 2.78 (SD = 0.73) on the Heterosexual Self-Presentation subscale. Participants generally ranked both their actual partners and ideal partners on the lower end of conformity to masculine norms, with the exception of the scales for actual partners for Winning, Violence, and Heterosexual Self-Presentation, which all fell very slightly above the midpoint. For the ideal partner total score, the Cronbach’s alpha was in the good range at .897, and the Cronbach’s alpha for the actual partner total score was in the excellent range at .91. For the subscales for the ideal partner, Cronbach’s alphas were almost all in the adequate to good range (.70 for Risk-Taking to .89 for Heterosexual Self-Presentation), with the exception of the Playboy subscale, which was in the marginally acceptable range at .66. For the actual partner subscales, all Cronbach’s alphas were in the adequate to excellent range, from .79 on the Playboy subscale to .91 on the Winning subscale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal Partner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Partner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Over Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4.2 (continued)
CMNI-46 Means, Standard Deviations, and Internal Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal Partner</th>
<th>Actual Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primacy of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Self-Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminists</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarians</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfeminists</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 170; n = 77 for feminists; n = 57 for egalitarians; n = 36 for nonfeminists.

Finally, most participants indicated satisfaction with their relationships. The mean for all analyzed participants for the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) was 4.26 (SD = 0.69). More specifically, nonfeminists scored highest (M = 4.32, SD = 0.75), followed by feminists (M = 4.27, SD = 0.62) and then egalitarians (M = 4.20, SD = 0.74). Internal consistency was in the good range, with Cronbach’s alpha of .89 for all participants, .88 for feminists, .89 for egalitarians, and .90 for nonfeminists.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis was that a canonical correlation between the feminist identity variables (the five subscales of the FIC, the feminist identification variable, and the
egalitarian identification variable) and the nine ideal partner CMNI-46 subscale scores would yield three significant canonical variates. Specifically, it was hypothesized in Hypothesis 1a that one canonical variate would show relationships between low Passive Acceptance scores; high Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification scores; and low ideal partner Emotional Control, Violence, Power Over Women, Playboy, and Self-Reliance scores. It was hypothesized in Hypothesis 1b that the second canonical variate would show a relationship between high scores on Revelation and low ideal partner scores on Emotional Control, Violence, and Power Over Women. Finally, it was hypothesized in Hypothesis 1c that the third canonical variate would show a relationship between high Passive Acceptance and egalitarian self-identification, low feminist self-identification, high ideal partner conformity to Emotional Control, and low ideal partner conformity to Risk-Taking.

Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. The canonical correlation analysis showed a significant relationship between the identified sets of variables with a Wilks’ lambda of .37 \[F(63, 873) = 2.71, p < .001\]. Rather than three roots being significant, only two roots were found to be significant at the \(p < .05\) level, and as such, two roots were interpreted. Guidelines from Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) were used for interpreting the roots. Canonical correlation creates two canonical variates predicted by the sets of variables on each side. The first root created maximizes the explanation of that variance, and subsequent roots continue to explain variance that is not accounted for by previous roots. Variables were considered to be interpretable if their loading on the significant root was .30 or greater. In addition, the total variance accounted for by each root was interpreted, which considers all variance accounted for in all variables by the root. Then
the percentage of variance accounted for in each set of variables by their own canonical variate for the root was interpreted. The redundancy index was interpreted as well, which refers to the variance in one set of variables accounted for by the opposite set of variables’ canonical variate. (See Table 4.3 for full results of the analysis.)

The specific root hypotheses were partially supported. The first root showed 38% of variance explained in all variables. This root was characterized by very low Passive Acceptance (-.95), moderately low egalitarian identification (-.41), moderately high Embeddedness-Emanation (.34), moderately high feminist identification (.37), and moderately high Active Commitment (.47). Regarding their preferences in their ideal partner, the root was characterized by low Power Over Women (-.62) and low Heterosexual Self-Presentation (-.77). The percentage of variance accounted for in the conformity variables by this root was 22.9% with 8.6% redundancy, and the percentage of variance accounted for in the feminist identity variables was 14.3% with 5.40% redundancy. Overall, those who identify as feminists, endorse Active Commitment and to some degree Embeddedness-Emanation attitudes, and reject Passive Acceptance attitudes are more likely to rate their ideal partner as low in Power Over Women and low in Heterosexual Self-Presentation.

The second root showed 21% overlapping variance and was characterized by very low Synthesis (-.94), moderately low Active Commitment (-.46), and moderately low feminist identification (-.37). Regarding the ideal partner, this root was characterized by a very high desire for Emotional Control (.90), high desire for Self-Reliance (.68), high desire for Power Over Women (.62), and moderately high desire for Playboy
Table 4.3
Feminist Identity/Attitudes and Conformity of Ideal Partner to Masculine Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Variates</th>
<th>Root 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Root 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feminist Identity and Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness-Emanation</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>-5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Commitment</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identity Status</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Identity Status</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Variance</td>
<td>14.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conformity to Masculine Norms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Control</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Over Women</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-8.84</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primacy of Work</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Self-Presentation</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Variance</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>8.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $N = 170$. Bolded values represent those which load on their roots at .30 or greater. Corr. = structural correlation; coeff. = unstandardized function coefficient.

conformity (.40). The percentage of variance accounted for in the conformity variables by the second root was 19.08% with 3.95% redundancy, and the percentage of variance accounted for in the feminist identity variables was 22.70% with 4.70% redundancy.

Those who do not identify as feminists and do not endorse Synthesis or Active Commitment attitudes tend to rate their ideal partner as higher in conforming to
Emotional Control, Self-Reliance, Power Over Women, and Playboy norms, and the opposite is also true.

As such, Hypothesis 1a was partially supported by both the first and second roots, which showed relationships between all of the expected variables except for Violence. Hypothesis 1b was generally not supported, in that Revelation was not a significant variable in either root. Hypothesis 1c was not supported, because even though Passive Acceptance and egalitarian self-identification were found to be important variables in the first root, they were not significantly related to desire for Emotional Control and Risk-Taking in the ideal partner; Emotional Control seemed to be more important in relation to other feminist identity variables.

**Hypothesis 2**

The second hypothesis was that a canonical correlation analysis between the feminist identity variables (the five subscales of the FIC, the feminist self-identification variable, and the egalitarian identification variable) and the nine actual partner CMNI-46 subscale scores would be significant. Specific canonical variate hypotheses were not made for this analysis. (See Table 4.4 for full results of the analysis.)

Hypothesis 2 was supported. This canonical correlation analysis, too, showed a significant relationship between the two sets of variables with a Wilks’ lambda of .43 \[ F(63, 873) = 2.25, p < .001 \]. Two roots were found to be significant at the \( p < .05 \) level, and again, variables on each of these two roots were considered interpretable if their loading was .30 or greater.

The first root showed 32% overlapping variance. This root showed high scores in Passive Acceptance (.90), moderate scores in egalitarian identity (.31), and low scores in
### Table 4.4

**Feminist Identity/Attitudes and Perceptions of Conformity of Actual Partner to Masculine Norms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Canonical Variates</th>
<th>Root 1</th>
<th>Root 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feminist Identity and Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness-Emanation</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Commitment</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identity Status</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Identity Status</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Variance</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conformity to Masculine Norms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Control</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Over Women</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primacy of Work</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Self-Presentation</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Variance</td>
<td>16.61%</td>
<td>18.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 170; Bolded values represent those which load on their roots at .30 or greater. Corr. = structural correlation; coeff. = unstandardized function coefficient.*

Active Commitment (-.36). It also showed high scores in ratings of actual partners’ Heterosexual Self-Presentation (.71), Power Over Women (.70), and Primacy of Work (.38). The percentage of variance accounted for in the conformity variables by the first root was 16.61% with 5.28% redundancy, and the percentage of variance accounted for in
the feminist identity variables was 14.81% with 4.71% redundancy. An egalitarian identity paired with high endorsement of Passive Acceptance and low Active Commitment correlates with certain masculine norms (Heterosexual Self-Presentation, Power Over Women, and Primacy of Work).

The second root showed 16% overlapping variance. This root was marked by low Revelation (-.78) and moderately low Active Commitment (-.54) and Synthesis (-.48). When examining the conformity ratings in actual partners, it was marked by moderately low Winning (-.50), Self-Reliance (-.46), Risk-Taking (-.38), and Playboy scores (-.38). The percentage of variance accounted for in the conformity variables by the second root for this analysis was 18.24% with 2.85% redundancy, and the percentage of variance accounted for in the feminist identity variables was 9.88% with 1.55% redundancy. Those especially low in Revelation and also low in Synthesis and Active Commitment perceive their partners as low in conformity to the masculine norms of Winning, Self-Reliance, and Playboy, and the opposite also holds true.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis was that the scores on participants’ actual partners’ conformity to masculine norms (overall and on individual subscales) would significantly correlate with the respective scores on their ideal partners’ conformity to masculine norms. To test this, ten bivariate correlation analyses were performed with a Bonferroni corrected p value of p < .005 to account for the fact that multiple tests were carried out. (See table 4.5 for full results of the analysis.)

The correlation between the ideal partner total CMNI-46 and the actual partner total CMNI-46 was positive and significant ($r = .54$, $p < .001$). In addition, all nine
Table 4.5
Correlations Between Perceptions of Actual Partners’ and Ratings of Ideal Partners’ Conformity to Masculine Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMNI-46 Scores</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Control</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Over Women</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primacy of Work</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual Self-Presentation</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 170; all were significant at the Bonferroni-corrected $p$ value of $p < .005.*

 subscale correlations between the ideal partner and the actual partner were positive and significant, including Winning ($r = .39, p < .001$), Emotional Control ($r = .34, p < .001$), Risk-Taking ($r = .53, p < .001$), Violence ($r = .60, p < .001$), Power Over Women ($r = .61, p < .001$), Playboy ($r = .39, p < .001$), Self-Reliance ($r = .24, p = .002$), Primacy of Work ($r = .48, p < .001$), and Heterosexual Self-Presentation ($r = .71, p < .001$). This suggests a positive relationship between how women rate their actual partners on conformity to masculine norms and what they imagine their ideal partners would be like in the same areas.

**Hypothesis 4**

The final hypothesis was that scores on the feminist identity variables would predict relationship satisfaction when moderated by perceptions of actual partners’ total conformity to masculine norms. Hypothesis 4a was that when women perceived their partners as highly conforming to masculine norms, Passive Acceptance and egalitarian
identity would positively predict relationship satisfaction, and Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification would negatively predict relationship satisfaction. Hypothesis 4b was that when women perceived their partners as low in conformity to masculine norms, Passive Acceptance and egalitarian identity would negatively predict relationship satisfaction, and Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment, and feminist self-identification would positively predict relationship satisfaction.

When preliminarily examining bivariate correlations, there were no significant relationships between the feminism-related variables (the FIC subscales, feminist identity, and egalitarian identity) and relationship satisfaction. Specifically, the correlations with relationship satisfaction ranged from -.15 for Revelation to .08 for Synthesis. There was a significant negative correlation between the total CMNI-46 actual partner score and relationship satisfaction ($r = -.37, p < .001$). A hierarchical linear regression was then performed with the dependent variable of the total RAS score to examine this set of hypotheses. All predictor variables were centered to create interaction terms. In Step 1, the five feminist identity development variables, feminist self-identification, and egalitarian identity were entered as predictors. In Step 2, the total actual partner CMNI-46 score was entered as a predictor as well. In Step 3, seven interaction terms were entered to reflect each feminist identity variable’s interaction with the total actual partner CMNI-46.

Step 1 was not significant ($R^2 = .04, p = .50$), indicating that the feminist identity variables were not significant predictors on their own. The model created by the second step was significant ($R^2 = .17, \Delta R^2 = 0.14, p < .001$), indicating that adding the
perception of partner’s conformity to masculine norms created significant predictive value. Finally, the model created by the third step remained significant but did not add significant predictive value ($R^2 = .20$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.02$, $p = .77$).

Despite the significance of the model, the set of hypotheses was not supported. From Step 2 to Step 3, the $\Delta R^2$ value was not significant, and none of the interaction terms showed a significant $\beta$ value. However, in Step 2 and Step 3, the total score for the CMNI-46 for perceptions of one’s partner was significantly and uniquely negatively predictive of relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -.40, p < .001$; $\beta = -.40, p < .001$; respectively). This suggests that, as perceptions of partner conformity increases, relationship satisfaction decreases, regardless of feminist attitudes and identification. (See Table 4.6 for full results of the analysis.)

Due to low power for the full analysis, two additional hierarchical linear regression analyses were run to focus on the feminist identity status variables and the feminist identity development dimensions. Relationship satisfaction was the dependent variable for both analyses. In Step 1 of the first analysis, the five feminist identity development dimension scores were entered. In Step 2, the total actual partner CMNI-46 score was entered in addition. In Step 3, five interaction terms were added to reflect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness-Emanation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 4.6 (continued)
Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Feminist Identity/Attitudes and Partner’s Perceived Conformity to Masculine Norms Predicting Relationship Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Commitment</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Identity</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness-Emanation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Commitment</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Identity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identity</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Conformity</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embeddedness-Emanation</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Commitment</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Identity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identity</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Conformity</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance x</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Conformity x Revelation</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Conformity x Embeddedness-Emanation</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Conformity x Synthesis</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Conformity x Active Commitment</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Identity x</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Partner Conformity x Feminist Identity</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 170; * p < .01, ** p < .001
interactions the total CMNI-46 score and each dimension’s score. Step 1 was again not significant ($R^2 = .04$, $p = .32$), suggesting that the feminist identity development dimensions did not significantly predict relationship satisfaction. The Step 2 model was significant ($R^2 = .17$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.14$, $p < .001$). Again, adding the perception of partner’s conformity to masculine norms created predictive value for the model. Finally, the Step 3 model again remained significant but did not add significant predictive value ($R^2 = .18$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$, $p = .82$). The only significant unique predictor emerged in both Step 2 and Step 3; the total CMNI-46 score for the current partner negatively predicted relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .001$; $\beta = -.28$, $p < .001$; respectively).

In the second analysis, the dependent variable was again relationship satisfaction. In Step 1, feminist identity status and egalitarian identity status were entered as predictors. In Step 2, the total actual partner CMNI-46 score was entered as well. In Step 3, two interaction terms to reflect the total CMNI-46 score’s interaction with both feminist identity status and egalitarian identity status were added. In this analysis, too, Step 1 was again not significant ($R^2 = .01$, $p = .65$). This indicated once more that the feminist identity statuses did not significantly predict relationship satisfaction. The Step 2 model was again significant ($R^2 = .14$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.14$, $p < .001$), such that including the perception of partner’s conformity to masculine norms added significant predictive value. Finally, the Step 3 model once again remained significant but did not result in the significant addition of predictive value ($R^2 = .15$, $\Delta R^2 = 0.01$, $p = .37$). Finally, as in the previous two analyses, the total CMNI-46 score for the current partner emerged in Steps
2 and 3 as the only unique predictor, and it negatively predicted relationship satisfaction 
(β = -0.26, \( p < .001 \); β = -0.25, \( p < .001 \); respectively).
CHAPTER V:
DISCUSSION

This chapter will elaborate on the results of the current study. Specifically, the hypotheses will be revisited, with attention to possible meanings of the results of the associated analyses. These will then be discussed in connection with one another. Then, the implications for research will be explained, followed by implications for practice. Finally, a discussion of the strengths and limitations for the study will be provided.

Summary of the Hypotheses and Results

The current study supports the idea that feminist identity and attitudes relate to perceptions of partner conformity to masculine norms, as well as the desire for an ideal partner to conform at varying levels to masculine norms. It also supports the idea that conformity to masculine norms in a male partner relates to women’s relationship satisfaction in heterosexual partnerships. This was examined using the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC; Fischer et al., 2000), modified versions of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46; Parent & Moradi, 2009), and the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988). Of the 273 initial participants collected from The University of Akron, 103 were removed from the analyses due to failing to meet inclusion criteria, not consenting to participation, not fitting the Zucker (2004) feminist identity categories, participating more than once, having missing data, stopping midway,
or outlier status. After data screening, 170 women were included in the final analyses. Four main hypotheses were tested using canonical correlation, bivariate correlation, and hierarchical linear regression. These hypotheses were partially supported and are described in more detail in the following sections.

**Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis was that a canonical correlation analysis would show significant associations between the feminist identity variables (the five FIC scales, the feminist identification variable, and the egalitarian identification variable) and the ratings of the ideal partner on conformity to masculine norms (the nine subscales of the CMNI-46 related to the ideal partner). The first set of canonical variates that was hypothesized predicted a relationship between feminist variables of low Passive Acceptance, high Synthesis, high Active Commitment, and high feminist self-identification, and ideal partner conformity scores of low Emotional Control, low Violence, low Power Over Women, low Playboy, and low Self-Reliance. The second set of canonical variates that was hypothesized predicted a relationship between high Revelation and ideal partner conformity scores of low Emotional Control, low Violence, and low Power Over Women. The third set of canonical variates that was hypothesized predicted a relationship between high Passive Acceptance, high egalitarian identification and low feminist identification to high ideal partner conformity to Emotional Control and low ideal partner conformity to Risk-Taking. These hypotheses were based on the Backus and Mahalik (2011) study examining desires in heterosexual women for ideal partner conformity to masculine norms, but they were only partially supported by the current project.
There was a significant relationship between the two sets of variables, but the two significant roots that were found were slightly different from what was expected. Specifically, the root that accounted for the most variance suggested that high Passive Acceptance, high egalitarian identity status, low Embeddedness-Emanation, low feminist identification, and low Active Commitment related to high levels of Power Over Women and Heterosexual Self-Presentation in an ideal partner. The feminist component of this particular constellation of beliefs and desires seems to be characterized by rejection of sexism and heterosexism, which fits well with both the ratings of the ideal partner and with the ratings of feminist attitudes and identity. The rejection of traditional gender roles and the desire to work toward social change for women and other oppressed groups characteristic of a feminist identity seem to be reflected in the desire for a partner who does not seek power over women and the lack of desire for a partner to wants to convince others of his heterosexuality. This also is in line with the previous literature on gender-related attitudes and partner ideals; women who hold more traditional attitudes toward gender tend to seek partners who have similar traditional attitudes and behavior (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Lee, Fiske, Glick, & Chen, 2010; Rudman & Phelan, 2007; Travaglia, Overall, & Sibley, 2009).

The other significant root reflected low desire for partner conformity to traditional masculine norms in a variety of areas. This suggested a relationship between very high Synthesis, high Active Commitment, and high feminist identification with low ideal partner ratings on Emotional Control, Self-Reliance, Power Over Women, and Playboy. This root seems to be characterized more by a desire for openness and acceptance of genuine needs, emotions, and traits. This is consistent with the literature, in that more
advanced dimensions of feminist identity development focus heavily on allowing actual characteristics to come through, regardless of whether or not they fit with traditional gender roles (e.g., Downing & Roush, 1985; Fischer et al., 2000; Rickard, 1989). This seems to be reflected in the desire for partners to be low in aspects of conformity that restrict expression of genuine emotions and needs, though it may be nontraditional for men to engage in such open expression.

When comparing and contrasting the two roots, some interesting patterns emerge. The two roots are somewhat similar in their relationship between higher levels of feminist identity and desiring a partner who does not care about maintaining a patriarchal power structure. Since a feminist identity is defined by a desire to combat sexism, it is unsurprising that individuals who endorse attitudes consistent with feminism and adopt the social label of feminist would not want a partner who seeks a gendered power structure. This is consistent with research that suggests that feminist women seek less conformity to this masculine norm in their partner and more equality in their relationships (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Yoder, Perry, & Saal., 2007; Yoder, Snell & Tobias, 2012; Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011). Further, considering the poor correlates of conformity to the Power Over Women norm such as abusive behaviors, problematic alcohol use, rape myth acceptance, and low relationship satisfaction (Burn & Ward, 2005; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Tager, Good, & Brammer, 2010), it is important to understand what factors in women set the stage for relationships with men with these attitudes. The current study suggests that a stronger feminist identity relates to lower levels of desiring such conformity in a partner, and more traditional attitudes and an egalitarian identity status may predict a desire for such conformity.
When considering the major differences between the roots, one root seems more characterized by endorsing the feminist identity, working toward change, and rejecting traditional roles with no strong relation to Synthesis attitudes, whereas the other reflects high levels of Synthesis attitudes with no strong relation to acceptance or rejection of traditional roles. Both roots were related to desires for low partner conformity to particular masculine norms, but different combinations of such conformity. The former seems to relate to a desire for rejection of sexism and heterosexism in a partner and the latter relates to a desire for a more emotionally open, honest, and equality-oriented partner. This fits with the theoretical nature of Passive Acceptance and Synthesis proposed by Downing and Roush (1985). Given the traditional nature of Passive Acceptance, it makes sense that these would be related to a desire for more traditional partners, whereas the individual acceptance nature of Synthesis would make sense in relation to a desire for partners more expressive of their emotions and needs.

Overall, it is worth noting that this analysis adds further understanding to Backus and Mahalik’s (2011) examination of preferences for conformity to masculine norms in ideal partners. Some aspects are replicated, and some aspects are not. Specifically, Backus and Mahalik (2011) found that Passive Acceptance was an important predictor for lower Risk-Taking conformity, and higher Emotional Control, Power Over Women, Dominance, Self-Reliance, and Disdain for Homosexuals. The Power Over Women and Heterosexual Self-Presentation aspects were replicated, but the rest were not. Unlike Backus and Mahalik (2011), Revelation was not found to be significantly related to any desires for conformity, and Embeddedness-Emanation was found to be significantly and negatively related to desire for Power Over Women and Heterosexual Self-Presentation.
Perhaps the most significant replication of Backus and Mahalik (2011) was that of an integrated gender identity as negatively related to ideal partner conformity to norms of emotional suppression, seeking power over women, desire for multiple sexual partners, and avoidance of help-seeking, and a commitment to gender equality as significantly related to lower ideal partner conformity to norms of seeking power over women, desiring multiple sexual partners, and avoidance of seeking support. This suggests that more advanced dimensions of feminist identity negatively correlate with a desire for a conforming partner in these areas. Again, since these dimensions are defined by acceptance of personal qualities, regardless of their fit with gender norms, this fits with a desire for a partner to be more himself, instead of defined by masculine norms.

Examining these variables with a canonical correlation instead of several regression analyses streamlines the findings and perhaps explains some of the discrepancies between the initial study and the current study. It is also possible that the use of the shorter CMNI-46 with nine scales instead of the full 11-norm CMNI developed by Mahalik et al. (2003) explains some of the differences in findings. Finally, the inclusion of women not in relationships may have impacted the findings. Even though not all findings were exactly replicated, both studies confirm the idea that feminist attitudes and identification relate to the preferences one has for conformity to masculine norms in their romantic partner.

Overall, the first analysis suggests that women do have a preference for different types of partners, and that preference is informed by their feminist identity and attitudes. Very broadly, feminist women tend to prefer ideal partners who have lower levels of certain aspects of conformity to masculine norms.
Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis was that a canonical correlation between the feminist identity variables and the ratings of the actual current partner on conformity to masculine norms would show significant associations between the two. Specific hypotheses about sets of canonical variates were not made. This hypothesis was fully supported; the canonical correlation had two significant roots, suggesting that feminist identity and attitudes relate to perceptions of current male romantic partners’ conformity to masculine role norms.

The first significant root was characterized by high levels of Passive Acceptance, as well as moderately high levels of egalitarian identity and moderately low levels of Active Commitment, which were correlated with high ratings of their partners’ conformity to the norms of Heterosexual Self-Presentation, Power Over Women, and Primacy of Work. This root suggests that traditional attitudes and an egalitarian identity relate to perceptions of a partner’s traditional gender and sexual orientation power norms, as well as that partner’s focus on work. Again, this is particularly relevant considering the relationship of conformity to the Power Over Women norm with the aforementioned undesirable aspects (Burn & Ward, 2005; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Tager et al., 2010).

When considering the opposite side of the second significant root, it was characterized primarily by high levels of Revelation, as well as moderately high levels of Active Commitment and Synthesis, which were correlated with high levels of perceived partner conformity to Winning, Self-Reliance, and Playboy norms. Contrary to what might be desired with a more integrated view of gender and commitment to social change, it seems that individuals with higher levels of these identity dimensions actually
perceive their partners as more conforming to particular norms when their awareness of sexism is new. This is contrary to much of what has been found in relation to the Revelation dimension, which seems to be associated both theoretically and in the literature with seeking the opposite of what gender norms would dictate (Downing & Roush, 1985; Rickard, 1989). One potential reason for this is that perhaps being faced with higher levels of conformity in a partner causes individuals to rethink their own gender-related attitudes. This possibility will be explored more after each hypothesis is discussed.

Interestingly, when comparing the two significant roots, Active Commitment seems to be related to conformity to certain masculine norms and lack of conformity to others. It is possible that, when individuals are committed to social change but are also in the early and angriest stages of exploring injustice, this marks a different constellation of feminist identity attitudes than when traditional attitudes are solidly rejected and one is firm in their commitment to the feminist cause, and, as such, these represent two different types of individuals. The second root, then, likely fits an earlier type of development of feminist attitudes, where an individual is learning about sexism and battling against it, but perhaps is not as solidly formed in their identity. This may be similar to the Awakening Feminism dimension explored by Yoder et al. (2012), which is characterized by high Revelation and is often oppositely related to aspects associated with more established levels of feminist identity. This is also consistent with other findings that the Revelation dimension and early awareness of sexism is related to a variety of different outcomes than other dimensions in the model (e.g., Fischer & Good, 2004; Moradi & Subich, 2002b). It is also possible that the individuals most representative of this second root are
in relationships with highly conforming partners, and this causes them to think more about gender and sexism and leads to higher awareness.

The particular norms to which commitment to gender equality is positively and negatively related provide additional understanding. For the second root, the norms that are correlated with this commitment are not clearly against the values of feminism. However, a commitment to feminism by definition requires challenging existing oppressive structures that place White, heterosexual men in power (Downing & Roush, 1985). It seems to fit well that women high in this dimension would be with partners who do not conform to sexist and heterosexist norms. Furthermore, this is consistent with the findings of Rudman and Phelan (2007) that women who identify as feminists are more likely to be with partners who hold feminist values, and having such a partner predicts relationship equality. It seems likely that relational equality is an important factor in such relationships.

It is also of note to examine aspects of feminist identity and attitudes that did not relate to perceptions of partners’ conformity to masculine norms, namely Embeddedness-Emanation and feminist identity status. Though the Embeddedness-Emanation dimension relates in the first hypothesis to wanting certain levels of conformity, it does not relate to any perceptions of the current partner. One potential reason for this is that when using the FIC, Embeddedness-Emanation seems to be less predictive in general than other dimensions of the Downing and Roush (1985) feminist identity development model (e.g., Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Fischer et al., 2000; Moradi & Subich, 2002b). This may represent difficulties with the particular scale or model. Hyde (2002) specifically suggests that the feminist identity development model might be better
understood as three dimensions: Passive Acceptance, Revelation, and Active Commitment.

When examining feminist identity status and its lack of significance in testing this hypothesis, this is somewhat surprising given current research. Again, current research suggests that women who identify as feminists are more likely to have partners who also identify as feminists (Rudman & Phelan, 2007). Perhaps one reason is that even though women may want equality in their relationships, they may not fully expect that this is possible. This is consistent with findings by Askari, Liss, Erchull, Staebell, and Axelson (2010), who found that women’s ideals for relationships tend to be higher than their expectations. This mismatch between expectations and ideals may explain, too, why the two masculine norms of belief that violence can be justified and suppression of emotions were unrelated to aspects of feminist identity and attitudes. Backus and Mahalik (2011) found that for ideal partners, desire for both of these were predicted by feminist identity development dimensions, and the current study found that desire for suppression of emotions was predicted by the feminist variables. It may be the case that women may not see their ideals as realistic possibilities, and therefore may have come to the conclusion that their partners may be more conforming than they would like.

**Hypothesis 3**

The third hypothesis was that women’s ratings of their ideal partners’ conformity to masculine norms would correlate significantly with their actual partners’ conformity to masculine norms. To examine this hypothesis, the overall CMNI-46 scores for actual and ideal partners were examined in relation to one another, as well as the scores for each subscale of the CMNI-46. This hypothesis was supported for the total scores and all
subscales. Women in this study tended to show at least some level of congruency between their ideal partner and their actual partner.

There are a few potential reasons as to why this was found. First, it is possible that women had previous ideas of what they wanted from their ideal partners and sought out and stayed in relationships with partners who fit that image. This would suggest that a desire for a partner at a particular level of masculine norms caused participants to choose a partner who fit that level of conformity. This is consistent with research that finds that ideal qualities in partners do not always influence whether individuals are initially attracted to someone, but do impact whether they choose to continue in long-term relationships and how they maintain them (e.g., Campbell & Stanton, 2014; Eastwick, Finkel, & Eagly, 2011; Eastwick & Neff, 2012). The second possibility is that, because women may idealize their partners, they formed their ratings of their ideal partner around their actual partner. In other words, having a partner at a particular level of conformity to masculine norms causes them to rate their ideal partner at a similar level. This is also consistent with the literature; for example, Murray, Holmes, and Griffin (1996b) found that individuals tend to change their ideals to match their partner to avoid the discomfort associated with discrepancies. The third possibility, given that this study measures women’s perceptions of their actual partners, is that women simply perceive their partners as similar to how they would want their partner to be. In other words, their perception of their partner is influenced by what they want and is not reflective of their actual partner.

The second and third possibilities are consistent with research suggesting that individuals tend to have positive illusions about their partner such that their partner is
seen as closer to the “ideal partner” than they actually are, and that this is actually somewhat necessary for a satisfying relationship (Murray et al., 1996a, 1996b; Murray & Holmes, 1997). As such, the women in the current study may not have accurate perceptions about their partner, but even still, the fourth hypothesis test suggests that these perceptions do have value in relating to relationship satisfaction.

It is also important to note that stronger relationships existed for some correlations, particularly for partner’s belief that violence can be justified, for their desire to control women, and for their desire to convince others of their heterosexuality. Weaker correlations existed for aspects such as self-reliance, desire for multiple partners, drive to win, and suppression of emotions, indicating a lack of alignment in some areas. It is possible that certain areas are more important to find congruency between an ideal partner and an actual partner; the areas with stronger correlations may represent more value-oriented areas and areas that align with one’s worldviews, as opposed to personality characteristics. For example, if one is a feminist or an anti-feminist, one likely either opposes or endorses male power over women, and these could represent strong value systems (Downing & Roush, 1985; hooks, 2000). It would likely create more conflict for someone if her partner did not align with these views. She may then either choose partners who fit these views or, to avoid dissonance, inaccurately perceive her partner as aligning because of the threat of him not aligning.

Overall, the finding for this hypothesis sheds additional light on the Backus and Mahalik (2011) study examining ideal partners; one major criticism of that study was that it did not examine actual partners, and this suggests that indeed, ideal partner ratings are correlated to how we perceive our actual partners. Furthermore, much of the other
research on partner preferences focuses either on actual partners or desires for partners (e.g., Rickard, 1989; Rudman & Phelan, 2007; Yoder et al., 2011). The current study links those two pieces together to support that individuals do, to some degree, find their actual partners similar to their ideal partners.

**Hypothesis 4**

The final hypothesis was that perceptions of one’s actual partner’s conformity to masculine norms would moderate the relationship between feminist variables (the five FIC subscales, the feminist identification variable, and the egalitarian identification variable) and relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was not supported; instead, it was found in a hierarchical regression analysis that the only significant and unique predictor of relationship satisfaction was perceptions of actual partner conformity to masculine norms. The higher respondents perceived their partner as conforming to masculine norms, the lower they reported their relationship satisfaction. It seems from this analysis that, regardless of what one’s own gender-related attitudes and ideas are, having a partner who is more highly conforming is associated with lower relationship quality. It is worth noting that these analyses were likely underpowered, since no known programs can adequately test for power for moderation regression analyses.

Though this did not confirm the hypothesis, it is not entirely surprising when one considers the findings of research on conformity to masculine norms. Perhaps the major reason that, regardless of what women’s feminist attitudes are, ratings of partners are the only significant predictor of relationship satisfaction is because high conformity to masculine norms may not be especially conducive to effective relationship skills. Total conformity to masculine norms is linked to a variety of aspects that may be problematic.
for relationships, such as sexist behaviors, extrarelational involvement, life satisfaction in certain groups, and relationship satisfaction in general (Burn & Ward, 2005; Chuick, 2009; Hunt & Gonsalkorale, 2014; Rochlen, McKelley, Suizzo, & Scaringi, 2008; Tager & Good, 2005). It has also been related to abusive behaviors and attitudes, which could impact relationship satisfaction (Amato, 2012; Berke, Sloan, Parrott, & Zeichner, 2012; Chitkara, 2011; Cohn & Zeichner, 2006; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Miller et al., 2014; Tager, Good, & Brammer, 2010). So, even if a woman desires a partner high in conformity to masculine norms, there may be aspects of this that are not conducive to effective relationships.

It is also important to discuss that feminist identity did not account for significant variance in relationship satisfaction, which moves against stereotypes that feminists cannot be in romantic relationships (Anderson, Kanner, & Elsayegh, 2009; Liss, Hoffman, & Crawford, 2000; Ramsey et al., 2007; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). This further strengthens the finding from Rudman and Phelan (2007) that feminists can be satisfied with their romantic partners. It appears not to matter either way whether or not women identify as feminists; what seems more important is their partners’ conformity to masculine role norms.

Each hypothesis has now been discussed on its own. How each finding relates to each other will be explored more in the following sections.

**Connecting the Findings**

When drawing the results for each hypothesis together, some patterns emerge. To start, it is important to make the distinction between what individuals want in their relationship, what individuals believe they have in their current relationship, and what
seems to be associated with the best relational satisfaction. These are three separate aspects, all of which were examined in this study and all of which are related to the variables of interest in different ways.

First, the results suggest that individuals may want a partner who conforms to masculine norms at varying levels and that this is related to their own feminist attitudes and identity. This is to some degree consistent with the findings of Backus and Mahalik (2011), though not all of their initial findings were replicated. Results also indicate that individuals may have partners whom they perceive as conforming to masculine norms at various levels, and this too may be related to their feminist identity. Some important comparisons can be made in examining the findings from these two hypotheses.

The first roots found for both canonical correlation analyses fit together neatly. Specifically, the first analysis suggests that those who reject traditional gender norms and are committed to the feminist cause rate their ideal partner as low in conformity to the norms of seeking power over women and attempting to convince others of their heterosexuality. The second analysis suggests that those with the same feminist identity profile actually perceive their current partner as low in conformity to the same areas. In this instance, it seems that what one wants and what one perceives in her current partner seems to align. Past research has found correlations between more advanced feminist identity and desire for equality and low conformity to masculine norms in relationships (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2011; Yoder et al., 2012). The current study extends these findings by asking specifically about what one hopes for in her ideal partner and what one actually perceives in her existing relationship. Not only do women who hold and are committed to social equality causes want a partner who does
not seek power over women, but they see themselves as having such a partner. Further, for women who hold more traditional attitudes or who hold feminist attitudes but reject the feminist label, a partner’s seeking of power over women is both desired and perceived as present in their relationship.

Perhaps more interesting are the second roots for each canonical correlation, which show some opposing aspects of ideal partners and perceptions of actual partners. It seems that those who merely see themselves as others as unique individuals with strengths and weaknesses regardless of gender, and those who have a commitment toward social equality, want partners who do not suppress their emotions, seek control over women, desire multiple sexual partners, and do not avoid seeking help from others. However, when these feminist aspects are paired with a new understanding of sexism and gender-related power structures, they perceive their partners as individuals who want to win, engage in risky behaviors, desire multiple sexual partners, and avoid help-seeking.

One potential reason for this is that the newfound awareness of sexism is especially related to seeing the ways in which one’s partner conforms to masculine norms. Individuals who hold values of equality may want partners who are nonconforming, but when they are also just starting to notice sexism, they may end up perceiving their partners as especially conforming. Considering that research suggests that individuals with beginning awareness of sexism typically have a difficult time with traditional gender norms and potentially men in general, it is possible that this may be a source of distress for women who fit within this root (Cunningham, 2012; Downing & Roush, 1985; Fischer & Good, 1994, 2004; Henderson-King & Stewart, 1997; Rickard, 1989; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yoder et al., 2012). It is also possible that this
does not create discontent, but simply represents exploration of a variety of gender-related attitudes and behaviors. It is also noteworthy that, although two of the specific norms appearing in these roots are the same (Playboy and Self-Reliance), two are not; Power Over Women and Emotional Control represent different dimensions than Winning and Risk-Taking. It is possible again that the latter two norms are less in conflict with values of feminism, whereas especially Power Over Women represents an aspect that directly conflicts (Downing & Roush, 1985; hooks, 2000). The Playboy and Self-Reliance norms also show lower strength of correlations between ideal and actual partners, and this may explain why they appear in both analyses in different directions. Further analysis of how this impacts relationship satisfaction may be warranted.

The relationship of feminist identity development aspects such as Embeddedness-Emanation (seeking out woman-oriented subculture), Revelation (early awareness of sexism), and holding a feminist identity to ideal and perceived actual partner conformity to masculine norms is somewhat less clear. Surrounding oneself with women’s culture and feminist identity seem to be related to wanting ideal partners not to seek power and control over women, and who do not care if others see them as heterosexual, but they do not seem to manifest in any relationships to their perceptions of current romantic partner. Early awareness of sexism shows no relationship to ideal partner ratings, but it does show a relationship to seeing their partner as driven to win, engaging in risky behaviors, desiring multiple sexual partners, and avoiding help from others. Considering that this early awareness of sexism in the Revelation dimension is theoretically and empirically associated with a developing understanding of gender (Downing & Roush, 1985;
Rickard, 1989; Yoder et al., 2012), it is possible that women high in this dimension are still exploring their relationship desires as they further develop their identities.

Also, it is important to note that, beyond what women want and what women perceive, this study finds that conformity to masculine norms in a male partner, overall, is a negative indicator of relationship satisfaction. Moreover, this is the case regardless of a woman’s feminist identity and attitudes. This is especially important to consider for women with more traditional values related to gender and egalitarian identity status, which predicts higher desires for ideal partner conformity to certain norms, as well as perceptions of actual partner conformity to certain norms. This may not be conducive to long-term relationship satisfaction. Though the finding that only conformity to masculine norms was significant was unexpected, it does replicate the finding by Burn and Ward (2005) that male conformity to masculine norms in an other-sex relationship is related to poorer relationship satisfaction for both partners.

Finally, taken together, these results add to the existing research on the egalitarian, “I’m not a feminist, but…” identity elaborated on by Zucker (2004). Past research has suggested that this represents something different from feminist identity, and typically falls somewhere in between feminist identity and nonfeminist identity (e.g., Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Yoder et al., 2011; Zucker, 2004; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010). Indeed, in the current study, egalitarian identity status is associated with traditional gender values and a desire for control over women, aspects that do not fit a desire to eliminate gendered power structures. There also may be some confusion in women with an egalitarian identity status, indicated by the low alpha level on the Passive Acceptance scale for this group of women. This suggests that egalitarian women may not
have as much agreement within themselves related to gender traditionality. When considering all of these findings related to this identity status, this study supports the idea that adopting the label of feminism represents something qualitatively different from merely endorsing statements consistent with beliefs of feminism.

In addition to expanding on the current research, this study also raises a variety of important questions that could be explored in future projects. The implications for future research will be discussed in the next section.

**Implications for Research**

Future research may seek to replicate the current research in terms of how feminist identity and attitudes relate to ideal partners and perceptions of actual partners in their conformity to masculine norms. Research has consistently explored the relationship of feminist variables and various dimensions of psychological health and well-being (e.g., Carpenter & Johnson, 2001; Cunningham, 2012; Eisele & Stake, 2007; Fischer & Good, 1994; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2011; Yoder et al., 2012). However, researchers have called for further exploration of feminist variables and interpersonal relationships (Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Rudman & Phelan, 2007). This study expands this literature by examining romantic relationships, and it also provides a variety of additional directions for future research. One potential future examination might be to include actual partners in the research, instead of asking about perceptions. Considering that women may not be the most accurate in reporting their partners’ beliefs and behaviors, it would be helpful to ask partners, themselves, how they conform. This would also allow for exploration of further
aspects of gender-related attitudes and behaviors in male partners; for example, they could be asked about their own attitudes toward feminism and gender equality.

Another consideration for future research is how to deal with social desirability. Certain aspects of the FIC and the CMNI-46 relate to social desirability measures (Fischer et al., 2000; Parent & Moradi, 2011). Women may not be entirely honest with acknowledging their attitudes toward feminism if they believe the socially appropriate behaviors are to reject traditional attitudes, accept equality, and not feel angry with men. Furthermore, women may have difficulty reporting anything that does not align with their values in rating their ideal and actual partner. For example, if a feminist woman idealizes someone who desires a gendered power structure, she may not want to acknowledge or admit such a desire. She may be embarrassed or uncomfortable with reporting that her current partner engages in conforming behaviors. Likewise, for a woman who strongly believes traditional values are moral and right, she may struggle with wanting equality for her relationship and would be less likely to honestly report such a desire. Twenge (1997) suggests that measuring aspects related to gender in any way is subject to social desirability of particular traits and how much individuals want to admit to particular traits. Women who hold feminist attitudes have been shown to be reluctant to identify as a feminist, too, due to the social judgment attached to feminism (Anderson et al., 2009; Aronson, 2003; Liss et al., 2000; Ramsey et al., 2007; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Finally, it could be difficult to measure relationship satisfaction accurately because an individual who is unsatisfied in her relationship may not want others to know that. Examining such aspects in a more multifaceted and objective manner than self-report and using measures that do not relate to social
desirability may eliminate some of these problems and could be a direction for future research.

By examining longer-term relationships, the current study goes beyond Rickard’s (1989) examination of early dating behaviors, and it also goes beyond the Backus and Mahalik (2011) exploration of ideal partners. However, experimental research cannot be done to establish causality for research questions like the ones examined by the current study, since women cannot be randomly assigned to feminist attitude and identity groups. Longitudinal research may be helpful in establishing causal links between women’s desires for partners, their choices of partners, and their development of feminist identities. This study in particular raises two major causal questions. First, do women choose partners who meet their ideals for conformity to masculine norms, or do women’s partners cause them to develop particular ideals for such conformity? Second, do women’s partner choices cause them to question their traditional beliefs and move into the more advanced dimensions of feminist identity development? In order to adequately answer these questions, it is necessary to carry out longitudinal research. Longitudinal research may also help to explain the smaller correlations between ideal and actual partners, in terms of how such discrepancies develop.

Future research may also consider additional aspects of identity. Given the importance of considering intersectionality in research, it would be helpful to see if this translates across individuals representing a range of ethnicities, sexual orientations, socioeconomic statuses, religions, and geographic locations. Feminism and masculine norms may not look the same to every group of individuals (Aronson, 2003; Fischer & DeBord, 2012; Mahalik et al., 2003; Twenge, 1997; Vandiver, 2002). Furthermore,
exploring how relationships and feminist identities may differ in relation to age would be helpful, considering the wealth of research that suggests feminism has changed across various age cohorts; additionally, values and relationship qualities may change over time, especially in the emerging adult group (Arnett, 2000, 2006, 2007; Erchull et al., 2009; Fincham & Cui, 2011; Vandiver, 2002). Future research could also focus on same-sex relationships. Same-sex relationships may have different qualities than other-sex relationships in terms of conformity to masculinity. In fact, in the current study, even with a very small group of non-heterosexual participants, differences were found between heterosexual participants and non-heterosexual participants, further supporting the idea that additional examination of sexual orientation in ideal and actual partner research would be helpful.

This research focuses on relationship satisfaction, which is not the only aspect of relationship quality that exists. Rudman and Phelan (2007) looked at a variety of different relationship outcomes including relationship quality, stability, and equality, as well as the sexual health of the relationship. This moves beyond a basic idea of relationship satisfaction and explores romance in a more multidimensional manner. When considering multiple aspects of a relationship, too, feminist variables may come into play. When examining relationship equality, for example, it would be unsurprising to see feminist variables act as significant antecedents.

Finally, considering other aspects of masculinity in a partner might be of use. Conformity to masculine norms indicates that one conforms to society’s expectations for masculinity, but does not necessarily suggest that an individual has expectations for others or beliefs that others should also conform to prescribed stereotypes (Mahalik et al.,
2003). More specific to romantic relationships, a partner who conforms highly to masculine norms may conform highly, himself, but not have any expectations for his partner in gender prescriptions. Exploring constructs that assess his beliefs about gender – for example, the masculinity ideology construct proposed by Levant (1992) – might show different patterns of results.

In addition to providing future directions for research, the current project provides useful implications for practice. These are discussed in the next section.

**Implications for Practice**

One of the aims of Downing and Roush (1985) in initially developing the feminist identity development model was to provide a model that could be used in psychotherapy tailored to women. McNamara and Rickard (1989) argue that considering this model in psychotherapy can provide helpful guidelines for what a female client might be experiencing. Indeed, much of the research has supported that more advanced dimensions of feminist identity, the presence of feminist attitudes, and feminist self-identification relate positively to a variety of well-being indicators that would be of interest in practice, specifically those related to empowerment and autonomy (Cunningham, 2012; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Yakushko, 2007; Yoder et al., 2012). From this body of research, it makes sense that incorporating the discussion of feminist values in therapy may be advantageous for female clients. However, this research often does not take into account interpersonal well-being.

The current study extends this finding to the realm of romantic relationships with the findings that more advanced feminist identity dimensions relate to desiring and
perceiving an actual partner low in certain aspects of conformity to masculinity. Perhaps the most notable of these areas is the Power Over Women norm. Certain aspects of feminist identity and attitudes negatively relate to a desire for this in a partner, and acceptance of traditional gender norms and egalitarian identity positively relate to such a desire. Furthermore, to some extent, the same relationships hold for perceptions of one’s actual partner in believing in and seeking power over women. As previously mentioned, seeking power over women has correlated with aspects that could be problematic for a relationship, including abusive behaviors, substance use, rape myth acceptance, and low relationship satisfaction (Burn & Ward, 2005; Locke & Mahalik, 2005; Tager et al., 2010). Exploring what factors in women relate to such characteristics in male partners may be of benefit in preventing unhealthy relationship patterns. More specific to therapy, asking women about their feminist identity and values, as well as their expectations for their partner’s values, may open the door to discussion and encouragement of equality in one’s relationship.

Another important finding relates to relationship satisfaction. Considering that individuals may seek therapy specifically for relationship issues, it may be of benefit to explore a woman’s male partner’s conformity to masculine norms, since this was the primary antecedent of relationship satisfaction in the test of the fourth hypothesis. When examined together with the likelihood that those higher in Passive Acceptance and egalitarian identity status may desire a partner who conforms more to certain masculine role norms, it may be helpful for clinicians to discuss these aspects together. This is consistent with recommendations from other research on the positive relationship of acceptance of traditional gender norms and the negative relationship of feminist attitudes.
to potentially problematic relationship desires and patterns, such as self-silencing and sexual assertiveness (Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Fitz & Zucker, 2014; Schick, Zucker, & Bay-Cheng, 2008; Witte & Sherman, 2002; Yoder et al., 2007; Yoder et al., 2012). Exploring and challenging traditional attitudes about gender may be of help in creating more conducive conditions for a healthy romantic relationship.

Beyond individual therapy, oftentimes couples seek counseling for issues of relationship satisfaction, and the current findings could be relevant for those couples. It is recommended that therapists bring up discussions of gender, power, masculinity, and women’s feminist identities in couples counseling (Burn & Ward, 2005; Knudsen-Martin, 2015; Leslie & Southard, 2009; McDougall & McGeorge, 2014). If feminist women desire certain types of nonconformity to masculine norms in a partner, exploring their desire and attitudes may be important so they are able to voice what they value in a relationship. Further, since conformity to masculine norms is related to poorer relationship satisfaction, discussing how this is enacted in the couples’ relationships and talking about how that works for them may be relevant. Therapists may want to focus on helping clients to fully be themselves, regardless of social pressures.

Finally, considering the lack of relationships between feminist values and relationship satisfaction, this study may allow clinicians to help dispel some myths about feminism for both those who identify as feminists and those who do not. Several negative stereotypes exist about feminists, including that they are anti-male, lesbians, and incapable of being in a romantic relationship (Anderson et al., 2009; Liss et al., 2000; Ramsey et al., 2007; Rudman & Fairchild, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). However, feminist identity does not seem to relate to relationship satisfaction in any way. It may
simply mean that feminists’ relationships look somewhat different in terms of what they desire in a partner. This could be useful to process with a young woman exploring her values related to gender equality.

Though there are important implications for the study, it is not without its limitations. It also has many strengths. These will be discussed in the next section.

**Strengths and Limitations**

There are several strengths and weaknesses to the current project. One limitation was that this study was cross-sectional and correlational in nature. No causal conclusions can be drawn from this without further longitudinal research. As such, it answers the question of how women’s ideal partners, actual partners, and relationships look in the moment, but it does not answer the question of which of these causes which. This is particularly apparent in examining the correlations between desires for conformity in ideal partners and the perceptions of actual partners’ conformity. It is also apparent in examining the relationship between perceptions of actual partners’ conformity to norms and the feminist identity variables. Considering that partner characteristics may cause individuals to reconsider their gender-related ideals and attitudes is compelling, but this cannot be examined with the current set of data and requires more long-term, longitudinal types of research.

Second, the use of self-report is a limitation in a few ways. Women may not be self-aware in reporting their own feminist attitudes and identity, and they may not be certain of how they would rate their ideal or actual partner. Also, as mentioned previously, this measures only perceptions of partners from an outside perspective, instead of how partners would actually see themselves. It is possible that women idealize
their partners and see them the way they want to see them instead of the way they actually are. It is also possible that women, especially those in earlier stages of a long-term relationship, may not even be fully aware of how much their partners conform to particular masculine norms. Without examination of both members of a couple, it is difficult to determine the accuracy of their perceptions.

Moving more specifically into self-report issues, women may not be entirely honest in relation to social desirability, as discussed earlier. A highly feminist woman may not want to report desiring or currently dating a partner who is highly conforming to masculine norms, particularly those that are more in conflict with feminist values such as Power Over Women and Heterosexual Self-Presentation. Women may also fear judgment for not experiencing satisfaction in their relationships, and, therefore, may report higher levels than are accurate.

Third, the use of relationship satisfaction as a measure of relationship quality was a strength in that it assesses how individuals feel about their relationship, but it also has some limitations in that there are a variety of other constructs that determine relationship quality. Relationship satisfaction may not be accurate in that, even though an individual feels good about his or her relationship, that relationship may not actually be strong. For example, Hendrick (1988) examined participants one semester after administering the RAS. When she looked at only one member’s score in a relationship, she could predict only 57% of couples whose relationship ended, suggesting that many individuals who reported reasonable levels of relationship satisfaction did not stay in their relationship. Relationship satisfaction is one indicator of quality, but not a complete indicator.
Also, the lack of diversity and the exclusion of particular individuals for the sample was a limitation. The sample used primarily identified as White, was from one university, and was limited in other demographic characteristics including sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and year in school. This limits the generalizability of the study, especially considering the evidence that the feminist identity development model may not fully apply to individuals who are not White and middle-to-upper class (Fischer & DeBord, 2012; Moradi, Subich, & Phillips, 2002a, 2002b; Vandiver, 2002). Though the exclusionary criteria met the needs and questions of the current study, it also created limitations. Specifically, this study looked only at other-sex relationships, college women, and the age bracket of 18-25. Women who fall outside of these particular criteria may have different beliefs about their relationships and different gender-related attitudes about romance, and thus, these findings may not generalize to other groups. Furthermore, women who did not fall into Zucker’s (2004) three categories (determined by them endorsing a feminist identity but rejecting one of the cardinal beliefs) were excluded from the study. This represents a different subset of women who may experience relationships (and feminist attitudes) in a manner not represented by the current study.

Another limitation lies in the use of the Downing and Roush (1985) feminist identity development model. Though it remains the most widely used and recommended model, it has been criticized as not reflecting the experiences of women of color, not being a stage model as it was initially intended to be, and not being as accurate for the current generation (Erchull et al., 2009; Fischer & DeBord, 2012; Hyde, 2002; Moradi & Subich, 2002a, 2002b; Vandiver, 2002). Exploration of additional models to examine
women’s progression of feminist identity development may be helpful, but this was not a consideration of the current study.

Also regarding the choice of measures and models, the CMNI-46 has not been shown to have excellent fit indices (Parent & Moradi, 2011), which is a limitation. In addition, the Playboy subscale for ideal partners was problematic in internal consistency in this study. Considering this came up in several analyses, it is worth bearing in mind when interpreting the results.

Finally, it is worth noting that women may not identify as feminists for different reasons, and this is an important consideration in exploring the egalitarian identity aspect. For example, historically, the feminist movement has catered to the needs of White women and not women of other ethnicities, and because of this, non-White women may reject the feminist label due to its exclusion of their needs (e.g., Aronson, 2003; Moradi, 2005; Williams & Wittig, 1997). Further, Fitz, Zucker, and Bay-Cheng (2012) suggest that understanding non-labelers as quasi-feminists or neoliberals is an important distinction. Specifically, they argue that quasi-feminists who endorse core feminist beliefs but do not identify as feminists hold ideologically similar positions without the label, but neoliberals believe in meritocracy and accept more sexist beliefs. The egalitarian identity category does not distinguish between these groups, and this is an important aspect of non-labeling that is not taken into account in the current study.

Although there are limitations to the current study, there are also several strengths. The use of canonical correlation to examine all aspects together instead of individually expanded on previous findings in the literature. Rather than consideration of each feminist identity dimension or masculine norm on its own as, for example, was done
in Backus and Mahalik (2011), this study took into account constellations of attitudes and desires that go together. This is consistent with the recommendations made by Moradi et al. (2002b) on how to utilize the feminist identity development model, and it also seems to be an important addition in understanding how desires for and actual perceptions of conformity may be considered together.

Also, the breadth of what was examined is much wider than what has been done in previous studies. For example, the current study examined both feminist identity development dimensions (an attitudinal component) as well as feminist identification (a social identity component). This is consistent with the most recent literature recommendations for examining feminist identity and attitudes; they are different aspects that may relate to findings in different ways (Liss et al., 2000; Liss & Erchull, 2010; McCabe, 2005; Zucker & Bay-Cheng, 2010). Furthermore, identification was considered in a more multifaceted way than a simple yes-or-no identity through the use of Zucker’s (2004) model of feminists, nonfeminists, and egalitarians who endorse feminist beliefs but reject the label. In fact, this was supported as an important addition to identification, considering the contrast between egalitarians and both feminists and nonfeminists.

Another area that the current study expanded upon was in examining both ideal partner ratings and actual partner ratings, whereas most studies have not examined actual longer-term relationships (e.g., Backus & Mahalik, 2011; Rickard, 1989). Desires for partners who conform in varying ways may or may not translate into real choice of partners, and this study supports the idea that in some ways they do, and in some ways they do not.
Combining these ideas with relationship satisfaction was also a novel approach. This expanded on the approach of Rudman and Phelan (2007), who examined feminist identity within relationships, but only used basic questions to determine feminist identity. This study takes into account attitudes as well as identification, and again utilizes the three categories proposed by Zucker (2004). Ultimately, this adds understanding to how feminist identity and attitudes relate (or do not relate) to relationship satisfaction, despite stereotypes that exist that feminists cannot be in effective other-sex romantic relationships (Rudman & Fairchild, 2007). This examination of several areas that have not been previously explored together in research represents a new way of examining feminist identity and romantic relationships.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the current study suggests that it may be important to consider women’s feminist identities and attitudes in relation to their romantic ideals and current romantic relationships. Women may want different levels of conformity to masculine norms in their partner in relation to their feminist identities and attitudes, and, in some cases, they may perceive those different things in their partners. Specifically, women with stronger, committed feminist identities may want partners who are less conforming, and they perceive their current partners as not desiring a gendered power structure. Further, regardless of what women idealize in their partners and what their feminist attitudes and identity are, having a partner who conforms highly to masculine norms relates to poorer relationship satisfaction. This may be especially important for those working with clients struggling with their feminist values relative to their interpersonal relationships, and it
also opens up many possibilities for future research in exploring how feminist variables relate to partner qualities.
REFERENCES


Feiring (Eds.), *The development of romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.


Byrne, D., London, O., & Reeves, K. (1968). The effects of physical attractiveness, sex, and attitude similarity on interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Personality, 36*, 259-271. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1968.tb01473.x


N. Williams (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of feminist multicultural counseling psychology* (pp. 87-111). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.


175


177


180


181


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate the best answer for each of the following questions.

1. Do you identify as a woman/female?
   _____ Yes             _____ No

2. Does your romantic partner identify as a man/male?
   _____ Yes             _____ No

3. What is your current age? _____

4. How long have you been in your current romantic relationship?
   _____ years, _____ months

5. In an exclusive relationship, neither partner is dating anyone else. How exclusive is your relationship?
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at all exclusive</td>
<td>Moderately exclusive</td>
<td>Completely exclusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What is your ethnic or racial identity?
   _____ African American/Black
   _____ Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander
   _____ Latina/Hispanic
   _____ American Indian/Alaskan Native
   _____ Middle Eastern
   _____ European American/White
   _____ Biracial/multiracial
   _____ Other ________________________
   _____ Prefer not to answer

7. What is your sexual orientation?
   _____ Heterosexual
   _____ Lesbian
   _____ Bisexual
8. What is your academic year?
   ____ Freshman
   ____ Sophomore
   ____ Junior
   ____ Senior
   ____ Graduate
   ____ Other _____________________________

9. How were you recruited?
   ____ Psychology course
   ____ Women’s studies course
   ____ Other _____________________________
APPENDIX B

RELATIONSHIP STATUS MEASURE

Brown, Feiring, and Furman (1999) suggest a romantic relationship includes three components:

1. Both participants recognize that there is a relationship with one another.
2. The relationship is voluntary for both participants.
3. The relationship includes both companionship and some level of physical intimacy (for example, kissing).

Please indicate your agreement with the following four statements:

1. My romantic relationship includes all three of the above components.
   _____ Yes    _____ No

2. I currently consider my partner my boyfriend/fiancé/husband.
   _____ Yes    _____ No

3. My partner currently considers me his girlfriend/fiancée/wife.
   _____ Yes    _____ No

4. I have been in my relationship for at least three months.
   _____ Yes    _____ No
APPENDIX C

FEMINIST IDENTITY COMPOSITE

The statements listed below describe attitudes you may have toward yourself as a woman. There are no right or wrong answers. Please express your feelings by indicating how much agree or disagree with each statement.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = neutral or undecided
4 = agree
5 = strongly agree

_____ 1.  I like being a traditional female.

_____ 2.  My female friends are like me in that we are all angry at men and the ways we have been treated as women.

_____ 3.  I am very interested in women artists.

_____ 4.  I am very interested in women's studies.

_____ 5.  I never realized until recently that I have experienced oppression and discrimination as a woman in this society.

_____ 6.  I feel like I've been duped into believing society's perceptions of me as a woman.

_____ 7.  I feel angry when I think about the way I am treated by men and boys.

_____ 8.  Men receive many advantages in society and because of this are against equality for women.

_____ 9.  Gradually, I am beginning to see just how sexist society really is.

_____ 10.  Regretfully, I can see ways in which I have perpetuated sexist attitudes in the past.
11. I am very interested in women musicians.
12. I am very interested in women writers.
13. I enjoy the pride and self-assurance that comes from being a strong female.
14. I choose my "causes" carefully to work for greater equality of all people.
15. I owe it not only to women but to all people to work for greater opportunity and equality for all.
16. In my interactions with men, I am always looking for ways I may be discriminated against because I am female.
17. As I have grown in my beliefs I have realized that it is more important to value women as individuals than as members of a larger group of women.
18. I am proud to be a competent woman.
19. I feel like I have blended my female attributes with my unique personal qualities.
20. I have incorporated what is female and feminine into my own unique personality.
21. I think it's lucky that women aren't expected to do some of the more dangerous jobs that men are expected to do, like construction work or race car driving.
22. I care very deeply about men and women having equal opportunities in all respects.
23. If I were married to a man and my husband was offered a job in another state, it would be my obligation to move in support of his career.
24. I think that men and women had it better in the 1950s when married women were housewives and their husbands supported them.
25. It is very satisfying to me to be able to use my talents and skills in my work in the women's movement.
26. I am willing to make certain sacrifices to effect change in this society in order to create a non sexist, peaceful place where all people have equal opportunities.
27. One thing I especially like about being a woman is that men will offer me their seat on a crowded bus or open doors for me because I am a woman.

28. On some level, my motivation for almost every activity I engage in is my desire for an egalitarian world.

29. I don't see much point in questioning the general expectation that men should be masculine and women should be feminine.

30. I feel that I am a very powerful and effective spokesperson for the women's issues I am concerned with right now.

31. I think that most women will feel most fulfilled by being a wife and a mother.

32. I want to work to improve women's status.

33. I am very committed to a cause that I believe contributes to a more fair and just world for all people.
APPENDIX D

FEMINIST BELIEFS AND BEHAVIORS

Please indicate your answer to the following question. The answer you select will determine what set of questions to which you are next directed. Both sets of questions are the same length.

I consider myself to be a feminist.

_____ Yes  _____ No

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:

1. Girls and women have not been treated as well as boys and men in our society.
   _____ Yes  _____ No

2. Women and men should be paid equally for the same work.
   _____ Yes  _____ No

3. Women’s unpaid work should be more socially valued.
   _____ Yes  _____ No
APPENDIX E

RELATIONSHIP ASSESSMENT SCALE

Please mark on the answer sheet the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

How well does your partner meet your needs?

- A Poorly
- B Average
- C Extremely well

In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

- A Unsatisfied
- B Average
- C Extremely satisfied

How good is your relationship compared to most?

- A Poor
- B Average
- C Excellent

How often do you wish you hadn’t gotten in this relationship?

- A Never
- B Average
- C Very often

To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations:

- A Hardly at all
- B Average
- C Completely

How much do you love your partner?

- A Not much
- B Average
- C Very much

How many problems are there in your relationship?

- A Very few
- B Average
- C Very many
APPENDIX F

CONFORMITY TO MASCULINE NORMS SCALES AND DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine Norm</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winning</td>
<td>Seeing high importance in winning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>Engaging in high-risk activities and behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Seeing violence as potentially justified and necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Over Women</td>
<td>Believing and seeking male control over women personally and societally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy</td>
<td>Desiring multiple, noncommitted sexual partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disdain for Homosexuals</td>
<td>Seeking to convince others of one’s heterosexuality; renamed to Heterosexual Self-Presentation in the CMNI-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primacy of Work</td>
<td>Placing work as the main focus and purpose of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Control</td>
<td>Suppressing emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>Avoiding seeking help from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Seeking general control over others and environment; removed in CMNI-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuit of Status</td>
<td>Wanting to be seen as important; removed in CMNI-46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Professor:

My name is Elizabeth Russell, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Collaborative Program for Counseling Psychology at the University of Akron. I am e-mailing to ask if you would be willing to share the following link with your students to participate in my dissertation study. This study examines gender-related attitudes and romantic relationships. To participate, students must be at least 18 years of age, they must identify as a woman/female, and they must be in a romantic relationship of at least three months with someone who identifies as a man/male.

Should you have any questions, feel free to contact me at etj5@zips.uakron.edu, or my dissertation chair, Dr. Ingrid Weigold, at weigold@uakron.edu.

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,

Elizabeth Russell, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
Collaborative Program in Counseling Psychology
The University of Akron
APPENDIX H

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION

Title of Study: Relationship of Gender-Related Attitudes in College Women and their Male Romantic Partners

Introduction: You are invited to participate in a research project conducted by Elizabeth J. Russell, M.A., a doctoral candidate in the University of Akron Collaborative Program in Counseling Psychology. This project is being completed for the doctoral dissertation requirement under the guidance of Ingrid K. Weigold, Ph.D.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship of women’s gender-related attitudes to those of their male romantic partners.

Procedures: Should you choose to participate, you will be asked to complete four measures: a demographics questionnaire, a questionnaire about your own gender-related attitudes and behaviors, a questionnaire about your partner’s attitudes and behaviors, and a questionnaire about your relationship.

Exclusion: In order to participate, you must identify as a woman, and you must be in a romantic relationship of at least three months with someone who identifies as a man. You must also be between the ages of 18 and 24.

Risks and Discomforts: There are no potential risks or discomforts expected with participation in this study. However, if you experience distress, you may contact the University of Akron Counseling Center at (330) 972-7082, or the Clinic for Individual and Family Counseling at (330) 972-6822.

Benefits: There is no direct benefit expected from participating in this study, but your participation may help deepen understanding of women’s gender-related experiences in romantic relationships.

Payments to Participants: If you are in a psychology class that accepts HPR credits, you will receive HPR credit for your participation.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw: Participation is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse participation, and you have the right to withdraw from participation at any time throughout the study.
Confidential Data Collection: Your name will be required for HPR credit. It will be collected after you complete the measures, and it will not be associated with the information you provide on the measures. All data you provide will be only accessible to the researchers. In any publication or presentation of this data, participants’ names and identifying information will not be provided, and only the aggregate data will be given.

Confidentiality of Records: Your data will be maintained in a computer file only accessible to the researchers. Your identifying information will be removed and your data will be linked to an identification number.

Who to Contact with Questions: If you have any questions regarding participation, please contact Elizabeth Russell at etj5@zips.uakron.edu, or Dr. Ingrid Weigold at weigold@uakron.edu.

Acceptance: I have read and understand the above information, and I do not have any questions about participation. I agree to voluntarily participate in this study. Checking “Yes” below will indicate my informed consent. I understand that I may print a copy or request a copy of this informed consent document.

_____ Yes, I agree to participate in this study, and I understand the above terms.

_____ No, I do not agree to participate in this study.
APPENDIX I

DEBRIEFING

Thank you for participating in this study. The purpose of this study was to examine women’s feminist identity styles in relation to their partners’ conformity to masculine norms, with additional examination of how those aspects relate to relationship satisfaction. If you have any questions regarding your participation, please contact Elizabeth Russell at etj5@zips.uakron.edu, or Dr. Ingrid Weigold at weigold@uakron.edu.
APPENDIX J

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

Office of Research Administration
Akron, OH 44325-2102

NOTICE OF APPROVAL

October 14, 2014

Elizabeth J. Russell
1341 Nelson Road
Bozeman, MT 59718

From: Sharon McWhorter, IRB Administrator

Re: IRB Number 20141003 "College Women’s Feminist Identity and Their Perceptions of Their Ideal and Actual Powers Conformity to Masculine Norms"

Thank you for submitting your Exemption Request for the referenced study. Your request was approved on October 13, 2014. The protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for exemption:

☐ Exemption 1 - Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices.

☒ Exemption 2 - Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior.

☐ Exemption 3 - Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior not exempt under category 2, but subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.

☐ Exemption 4 - Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.

☐ Exemption 5 - Research and demonstration projects conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine public programs or benefits.

☐ Exemption 6 - Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies.

Annual continuation applications are not required for exempt projects. If you make changes to the study's design or procedures that increase the risk to subjects or include activities that do not fall within the approved exemption category, please contact me to discuss whether or not a new application must be submitted. Any such changes or modifications must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

Please retain this letter for your files. This office will hold your exemption application for a period of three years from the approval date. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit another Exemption Request. If the research is being conducted for a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation, the student must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.

☒ Approved consent form/s enclosed

Cc: I. Weigold - Advisor
Cc: Valerie Callanan - IRB Chair
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