

2015

# A Comparison of the Factor Structure of the Short Form Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) for Women and Men in a University Survey

V. Diane Woodbrown  
*University of South Carolina*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Clinical Psychology Commons](#), and the [Community Psychology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Woodbrown, V. D. (2015). *A Comparison of the Factor Structure of the Short Form Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) for Women and Men in a University Survey*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/3601>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [SCHOLARC@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:SCHOLARC@mailbox.sc.edu).

A COMPARISON OF THE FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE SHORT FORM  
LIBERAL FEMINIST ATTITUDE AND IDEOLOGY SCALE (LFAIS)  
FOR WOMEN AND MEN IN A UNIVERSITY SURVEY

by

V. Diane Woodbrown

Bachelor of Arts  
Florida State University, 1984

---

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

Clinical Community Psychology

College of Arts & Sciences

University of South Carolina

2015

Accepted by:

Suzanne Swan, Director of Thesis

Svetlana Shinkareva, Reader

Lacy Ford, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

© Copyright by V. Diane Woodbrown, 2015  
All Rights Reserved.

## DEDICATION

To my daughters, Peyton and Ainsley, for my husband, Doug, and for my mother, Betty, and father, Warner, without whom I would never have accomplished this feat.

And to my exceptional and stalwart mentor and lab team, Suzanne, Pete, Chris, Andrew & Svetlana. Thank you all.

## ABSTRACT

The current study compares the factor structure of the short form Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS; Morgan, 1996) for males and females in a University survey. We first provide a discussion of feminism, a brief narrative review summarizing previous and co-existing measures of the construct “feminist attitudes” for males and females, and then conduct confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) and exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) to test Morgan’s own theory that there may exist a single general factor underlying the Liberal Feminist Attitudes Ideology Scale for males and for females, and that the latent construct/s underlying this scale are comparable for men and women. Results of the data analysis, using a sample of 890 University of South Carolina college students, revealed a two-factor structure for females, and no discernable structure for males. Overall, females had stronger feminist attitudes than did males, though males' scores did align somewhat closely with a feminist perspective on some items of the scale. Implications for theory based on the study’s findings are discussed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 MEASURING FEMINISM.....	1
1.2 THE CONSTRUCT FEMINIST ATTITUDE AND IDEOLOGY.....	3
1.3 THE LIBERAL FEMINIST ATTITUDE AND IDEOLOGY SCALE.....	6
1.4 LFAIS SCALE DEVELOPMENT .....	8
1.5 FEMINIST ATTITUDE IDEOLOGY AND MALES .....	11
CHAPTER 2 METHOD.....	15
2.1 SAMPLE SELECTION.....	15
2.2 PROCEDURE.....	16
2.3 MEASURE .....	16
2.4 ANALYSIS PLAN .....	18
CHAPTER 3 RESULTS.....	21
3.1 DESCRIPTIVE DATA .....	21
3.2 LATENT CONSTRUCTS .....	23
CHAPTER 4 DISCUSSION.....	41
4.1 OVERVIEW.....	41
4.2 DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND LIMITATIONS .....	43

4.3 CONCLUSIONS .....	48
REFERENCES .....	50
APPENDIX A – SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES.....	57

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Most widely cited measures of "feminism" .....	5, 6
Table 1.2 Morgan's pilot study questions, which generated conceptual domains for her scale.....	9
Table 2.1 Liberal feminist attitudes and ideology scale – short form .....	17, 18
Table 3.1 Demographic descriptive statistics .....	22
Table 3.2 Descriptive statistics for females only – raw scores .....	24
Table 3.3 Descriptive statistics for females only – recoded .....	25
Table 3.4 Descriptive statistics for males only – raw scores .....	26
Table 3.5 Descriptive statistics for males only – recoded .....	27
Table 3.6 Descriptive statistics for both females and males .....	28
Table 3.7 Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and exploratory structural equation modeling fit statistics for 1-factor model for males and females combined.....	29
Table 3.8 Exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) residual variances for 1-factor model .....	30
Table 3.9 LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-7) .....	32
Table 3.10 LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-7) .....	33
Table 3.11 Exploratory structural equation modeling fit statistics for 2-factor model.....	35
Table 3.12 LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-10) .....	37
Table 3.13 LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-8) .....	38

Table 3.14 LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-8) .....	39
Table A.1 Exploratory structural equation modeling fit statistics for 3-factor model.....	57
Table A.2 LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-10) .....	58, 59
Table A.3 LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-10) .....	60, 61
Table A.4 Correlation matrix for females only, using LFAIS item key in Table A.5 .	62-66
Table A.5 Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) item numbers and content.....	67
Table A.6 LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-7) .....	68
Table A.7 LFAIS factor loadings for females, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-8).....	69

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The rights of women first became a prominent political issue during the French and American revolutions of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century (Lerner, 1971; Abrey, 1975). In 1837, the term “feminism” was reportedly first used by the French philosopher Charles Fourier (Goldstein, 1982) who had an interest in improving the status of women in society, though he was not a proponent of equality between the sexes. Fifty-eight years later, in 1895, “Feminism” debuted in the Oxford English Dictionary, where it was defined as “advocacy of the rights of women (based on the theory of equality of the sexes).” There is an ongoing debate over the assertion some have made that the quest for women’s rights defined “feminism” (and the feminist movement) up until the later part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (e.g., Goldstein, 1982; Lerner, 1971), when the focus became women’s liberation, and then was joined by a third, more “diverse”, wave of feminism in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, but this is only one example of the diversity within the scholarship that has sought to define and, ultimately, to measure the “feminism” construct.

### *1.1 Measuring feminism*

One hundred years after the term “feminism” reportedly first appeared, Charles Kirkpatrick (1936) was the first to endeavor to measure it as a construct of interest. Since then, “feminism” has been defined and re-defined in the literature in different ways, and using different terms, by a variety of scholars. This earliest attempt used a measure

Kirkpatrick called the Belief-Pattern Scale for Measuring Attitudes Towards Feminism (BSMATF; Kirkpatrick, 1936). While his work does not define feminism per se (most feminism scales do not), a definition is implied in his measures' questions which ascertain respondents' views regarding women's roles and rights in economic, domestic, political-legal, conduct, and status realms. This kind of a scale, which has as its primary focus an inquiry about attitudes regarding gender specific "roles", has come to be referred to in the literature as a "sex role traditionalism attitude" scale or a "gender role traditionalism attitude" scale (Morgan, 1996). These kinds of scales are designed to measure respondents' attitudes toward the roles the sexes are traditionally expected to play in society and/or in their private lives, and most "feminism" scales that developed subsequent to Kirkpatrick's have largely been adaptations of it. Examples of some typical traditional sex role expectations, according to, for instance, the Attitudes Toward Sex Roles Scale (FEM; Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975), include the ideas that males, and not females, should be the primary breadwinners for their families; and that males, and not females, should play leadership roles in our state or federal governments.

According to Morgan's (1996) work, and to her rationale for having developed her own scale for measuring feminist attitudes (the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale, LFAIS; Morgan, 1996), Kirkpatrick's measure (and others that were adapted from it) conflates views regarding women's and men's "roles", or their sex stereotypic personality traits (Carver, et al., 2013), in society with views regarding the essential tenets of feminism. In fact, most sex role traditionalism attitude scales are not explicitly identified as such, but they seek to measure the construct "sex or gender role attitudes", or in the case of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1975) to measure

their sex stereotypic personality traits (or how well individuals fit into traditional sex roles), despite the implication by some that they seek to measure the construct “feminism”. For instance, data gleaned using the 60-item Bem Sex Role Inventory that assesses masculine, feminine, and androgynous personality traits among individuals has often been used to make claims about respondents’ attitudes about feminism – despite the fact that Bem herself did not believe the scale was a measure of feminism (Bem, 1975). Because some scales (including the Bem Sex Role Inventory), which were clearly defined by their authors as tools for investigating other constructs (like sex roles or sex stereotypic personality traits), have nevertheless been used by some researchers to measure the feminism construct anyway, some misleading assertions have been made in the field (SRAI; Renzetti, 1987) (Toller, Suter, & Trautman, 2004; Frieze and McHugh, 1998). The fact of the matter is that any scale that is actually a sex roles scale cannot be said to have construct validity as a feminist scale at all.

### *1.2 The construct “feminist attitude and ideology”*

In contrast to the construct “sex role attitudes”, Morgan’s “feminist attitude and ideology” construct taps the explicit sociopolitical domains of gender role attitudes, as well as attitudes about the goals of feminism, and attitudes about feminist ideology as well. Morgan (1996) advises that, “a feminism scale needs to reflect the reality of feminism as a political movement with interpretations, agendas, and implications larger and more diverse than people’s perceptions of ‘proper’ gender roles and behaviors. To be valid as a feminism scale,” she says, a measure’s items should be developed “with an ear to mainstream thought and people’s perceptions about feminist ideas and goals.”

Examples of some essential tenets of feminism, according to Morgan, and for the

purposes of my thesis, include the ideas that females and males should have equal access to education, that men and women should respect each other equally, and that equality between the sexes is a worthwhile goal. For instance, one of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (Morgan, 1996) items reads, “Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.” This item is reverse coded and gets at people’s perceptions about feminist ideas and goals, which goes beyond sex roles.

In contrast, ideas regarding women’s and men’s proper *roles* in society and/or in their private lives (which is the focus of Kirkpatrick’s scale and others) is a construct which is certainly *related* to the construct of “feminist attitude and ideology”, but it is a wholly separate one nonetheless. For instance, an item from the sex role attitudes measure Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1972) reads, “Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man”. This item gets at people’s perceptions of ‘proper’ gender *roles* and/or *behaviors*.

Because of the great societal and political transformations that have occurred since Kirkpatrick introduced his original scale in 1937, “feminism” as a construct has evolved over time (Frieze & McHugh, 1998). In this paper we have intended to mention each of the most widely cited scales that attempt to measure feminism, no matter what language their authors use to name their construct. This list of feminism measures that have followed Kirkpatrick’s is long (see Table 1.1, below, for a list of the most widely cited of these scales), but only 5 (3 of which also have short form versions), including Morgan’s, have been designed to truly get at a construct which looks at “feminist attitude and ideology” (These 5 are highlighted in Table 1.1, and are discussed in more detail in

Table 1.1

*Most widely cited measures of “feminism”*

Scale title	Scale acronym	Citation
Feminist Identity Development Scale <sup>1</sup>	FIDS	Downing & Roush, 1984
Feminist Identity Scale <sup>1</sup>	FIS	Rickard, 1987
Feminist Identity Scale – Short <sup>1</sup>	FIS-Short	Rickard, 1994
Feminism and the Women’s Movement Scale <sup>1</sup>	FWM	Fasinger, 1994
Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale <sup>1</sup>	LFAIS	Morgan, 1996
Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale – Short form <sup>1</sup>	LFAIS-Short	Morgan, 1996
Feminist Perspectives Scale <sup>1</sup>	FPS	Henley, Meng, O’Brien, McCarthy, & Sockloskie, 1998
Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short <sup>1</sup>	FPS-Short	Henley, Meng, O’Brien, McCarthy, & Sockloskie, 2000
Belief-Pattern Scale for Measuring Attitudes Toward Women Scale	BSMATF AWS	Kirkpatrick, 1936 Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1972
Attitudes Toward Women Scale – Short	AWS-Short	Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973
Attitudes Toward Sex Roles Scale	FEM	Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975
Attitudes Toward Feminist Issues Scale	ATFIS	Brodsky, Elmore, & Nattziger, 1976
Sex Role Attitudinal Inventory	SRAI	Renzetti, 1987
Attitude Toward Feminism Scale	ATFS	Fassinger, 1990

Feminism Analysis Measure	FIM	Henderson-King & Stewart, 1999
Feminist Identity Composite	FIC	Fischer, Tokar, Mergl, Good, Hill, & Blum, 2000

---

<sup>1</sup> *Only these scales look at feminist attitudes and ideology. The others are sex role traditionalism scales.*

the section directly following this one.). Every other scale aside from these 5 is actually a sex role traditionalism attitude scale (Morgan, 1996), which does not *necessarily* reflect feminist ideology (e.g., Dempewolff, 1974; Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975).

### *1.3 The Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale*

Because of the aforementioned complexities surrounding the measurement of this construct, there has not been one “go to” scale upon which researchers have relied to detect participants’ levels of feminist attitude and ideology. The five measures referred to above (and the short form versions of three of them) that attend to the feminism construct (and have both face and content validity) include the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS; Downing & Roush, 1984), the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS; Rickard, 1994) and its short form, the Feminism and the Women’s Movement Scale (FWM; Fasinger, 1994), the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS; Morgan, 1996) and its short form, and the Feminist Perspectives Scale (FPS; Henley, Meng, O’Brien, McCarthy, & Sockloskie, 1998) and its short form.

Of these, only the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale – Short form offers a brief overtly sociopolitical measure of attitudes about the essential tenets of feminism for use with general populations. The scale intentionally mostly reflects *liberal* feminist ideology “because liberal feminist thought predominates in popular writing”

(Morgan, 1996), which means that the scale is “*not* designed to assess distinctions among differing feminist ideologies or types of feminists”.

The LFAIS differs from both the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS; Downing & Roush, 1984) and the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS; Rickard, 1994) in that both of these later scales measure individuals’ *progress* in their development as a feminist (from passive acceptance of traditional women’s roles through a period of revelation regarding discrimination to active commitment to feminism). The items of these two scales arose out of existing developmental theories (Avery, 1977) and the measures overall are designed in part to ascertain an individual’s conception of the *self* as feminist (Bargad & Hyde, 1991), which is different from assessing attitudes and ideologies about larger feminist ideas and goals. The LFAIS also differs from the Feminism and the Women’s Movement Scale (FWM; Fassinger, 1984), which also attends to the construct feminist attitude and ideology but is designed solely to assess attitudes toward the feminist *movement*, which, while important, is more restrictive in its scope than the LFAIS. The final scale with construct validity as a feminism scale is the Feminist Perspectives Scale (FPS; Henley, Meng, O’Brien, McCarthy, & Sockloskie, 1998), which is an impressive instrument that has addressed an important need in some contexts to measure degrees of different *forms* of feminism, which allows for a more cross-cultural, global, perspective (Frieze & McHugh, 1998) than the LFAIS does. This scale is an important one which allows researchers to determine whether a particular kind of feminist ideology is more likely to lead to higher feminist self-identification and greater participation in collective action (Henley, Meng, O’Brien, McCarthy, & Sockloskie, 1998). But because of the Feminist Perspectives Scale’s emphasis on teasing

out different *kinds* of feminism, its use is not always appropriate (or at the least, necessary) given one's research question -- for instance, if one is interested in exploring the essential tenets of feminism. Obviously, there are contexts in which each one of these scales can be quite valuable, and each has a role to play in investigations that seek to understand certain aspects of feminist thought.

#### *1.4 LFAIS scale development*

Some critics of Morgan's scale have suggested that the feminist movement cannot or should not be seen as a singular, all-inclusive movement (e.g. Einstein, 1983; Kornbluh, 1991; Tong, 1989). Morgan agrees that feminist thought is not monolithic (Morgan, 1996). But she has also pointed out that it is important to identify the common ground of feminist thought and, in fact, her pilot work (briefly described below) demonstrates a consensus on most of the larger issues such as the need to end sexual discrimination.

This consensus was discovered in the development of the LFAIS, which involved two different studies. The first study was a pilot to generate conceptual domains for the scale and the second was to create and select the items for the scale as well as to validate it empirically. The goal of the pilot was to gain an understanding of the attitudes and ideas about feminism both of college students and of avowed feminists in order to afford a more complete understanding of what feminism is from their point of view. The pilot was conducted with two independent samples; sample #1 consisted of college students and sample #2 consisted of participants in a one-day Women's Studies conference. To generate themes and items for the scale, respondents were asked the 4 questions in Table 1.2, below, and all were asked to write down their answers.

Table 1.2

*Morgan's pilot study questions, which generated conceptual domains for her scale.*

---

Question

---

1. We are interested in your honest and candid response. Please write down your thoughts when you hear the term the "Feminist Movement" (half of the respondents were given the term "the Feminist Movement").
  2. What goals are important to feminists? Please list what you perceive as the objectives of the Women's Movement.
  3. Do you agree with these goals?
  4. Are there other goals that you feel should be stressed with the movement?
- 

Participants' answers were content analyzed to determine general categories of themes, and then 124 Likert-type items were created to reflect the consensus on those themes. The 3 principle domains of feminism (and 5 sub-domains) that were represented in these themes were (1) Gender Roles, (2) Goals (including Global Goals and Specific Political Agendas), and (3) Feminist Ideological Stances and Underpinnings (including Historical and Current Discrimination and Subordination; The Importance of Collective Action; and The Sisterhood: Consciousness-raising). This third domain is the one which deals with larger ideological issues within feminist thought, reflecting the themes which are in keeping with academic definitions of feminism. This component of the LFAIS is the most fresh and unique, and the one that confirms the content validity of the measure in that it addresses the bigger ideological issues within feminist thought (Morgan, 1996).

The 124-item scale was then tested on two samples in the second study – another undergraduate population and another population of avowed feminists, this time from a women's studies conference. All respondents were encouraged to comment on all of the items of the measure. As a result of this study, 54 items were eliminated. Items were

taken out if respondents' comments indicated that an item was "vague, confusing, irrelevant, or misleading"; if an item was redundant in content; if it had low within-item variance, or if an item had a poor item-to-total correlation ( $< .20$ ) (Morgan, 1996). After this process, 60 items remained.

In the subsequent effort to create a short form of the scale, 11 items were found to meet two a priori conditions for predicting overt feminist-related behaviors (Morgan, 1996); and items that did meet these criteria were retained. Items met this criteria if they positively correlated with each of three specific feminist-related behaviors measured, which included (1) returning a provided letter to the governor in support of more stringent sexual harassment legislation; (2) responding to witnessing a sexist insult; and (3) recognizing sexism in a television commercial (though the author does not indicate how, precisely, these behaviors were measured). If an item significantly correlated at the .05 level with the aggregated behavioral index formed by standardizing and summing the three feminist behaviors it was retained for the final short form measure. Eleven items ultimately met these criteria and, interestingly, all of them were from either the LFAIS' "feminist ideology" domain or the "feminist goals" domain and not from the "gender roles" domain, which supports the hypothesis that feminist attitudes surpass ideas about sex role appropriate behaviors.

The Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale uses Condor's (1986) definition of feminism -- that is, "Ideas and action directed toward ending female social subordination" -- to inform the measure, and Morgan (1996) points out that the scale "explicitly taps diverse feminist thought and writings to ground the items in the theoretical underpinnings of feminist ideals." Morgan writes that, "the scale draws

together the work of several researchers in the field to provide a more unified scale that simultaneously assesses beliefs about gender roles, feminist goals and issues, and feminist ideology.” Results of Morgan's (1996) empirical study (N = 234) of the 60-item version of the scale showed excellent reliability (including test re-test) reporting a Cronbach's alpha of .94 for the entire scale, and excellent validity (content, face, construct, concurrent, convergent, divergent, and known groups), as well as resiliency to response bias. These results also reported a Cronbach's alpha of .81 for the short form, and Morgan does support its "cautious" use for researchers in need of a shorter feminist attitude scale, but she also advises that this short form be further developed in the future in order to refine a reliable and valid short form scale. The LFAIS-Short form will be covered in more depth in the following section 2.3.

### *1.5 Feminist attitude and ideology and males*

Interestingly, seldom have any of these scales been given to men. Only three such instances were uncovered. Toller, Suter, & Trautman (2004) utilized the Sex Role Attitudinal Inventory (Renzetti, 1987) with males (n=118) as well as with females (n=175) in order to examine the relationships among gender role identity, support for feminism, and willingness to consider oneself a feminist. Toller, Suter, & Trautman define gender role identity as the degree to which one perceives oneself as masculine or feminine in the context of a society, which matches up ways of behaving with biological sex assignments. The authors of this study assert that scores on this scale indicate the degree to which participants demonstrate feminist attitudes toward gender roles. Like other scales that look at sex roles this measure cannot claim construct validity as a feminism scale.

Breen & Karpinski (2008) used the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale – Short form in their study, which investigated the meaning of the *label* “feminist” for both men and women. This study, which utilized a sample of undergraduates (N=60), and a social-cognitive technique referred to as an “impression formation paradigm”, investigated participants' impressions of “target” individuals who engaged in moderately feminist activities and who were labeled feminist (or not) in a brief written description. The only variables manipulated in this study were the sex of the target individual and whether or not the target individual was identified as a feminist. Participants then provided their evaluation of the target individual and also completed the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale - Short form as well as a measure of feminist self-identification.

A 2 (gender of target individual) x 2 (target feminist identification) ANOVA was conducted on the impression ratings of the target individual and a significant interaction was found between the two variables,  $F(1,56) = 7.10, p = .01$ . Follow-up analyses revealed that when the target was female, participants rated the feminist target individual more favorably than the non-feminist target individual,  $F(1,56) = 3.73, p = .06$ . When the target individual was male, participants had more favorable impressions of the non-feminist compared to the feminist,  $F(1,56) = 3.37, p = .07$ . This provides evidence that the feminist label negatively affects many individuals' evaluations of those who either claim, or are given, the label feminist.

Lastly, Morgan (1996) herself developed the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale, and tested it for validity and reliability, using both women and men, though males constituted less than half of her sample (women,  $n = 160$ ; men,  $n = 74$ ).

Morgan did *not* examine gender differences in her study. In fact, Morgan herself has stated that evaluating gender differences is an important next step (Morgan, 1996),

and she has suggested that she suspects the presence of a single general factor – feminist ideology -- underlying the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale. She frankly advises that, “future research should focus on the factor structure of the LFAIS.” Morgan states that empirical evidence should be secured to determine whether or not there are differences between the structure of men’s and women’s feminist attitudes. No one has undertaken this kind of work before.

There does exist one measure for males only – the Male Gender Equality Scale (MGES; Allen, 2009), which assesses constructs related to men's support for gender equality, and this scale is obviously important. However, in order to improve the study of these phenomena in a way that is applicable to as many people as possible, the validation of a single scale for use with men and women will be key to moving the field forward. At present, the lack of a scale that has been confirmed to function in the same way for males and females leaves us with an inability to compare responses about feminist attitudes and ideologies between males and females. Because the levels of feminist attitudes and ideologies amongst males has been linked to positive outcomes with regard to social issues -- including the finding that males with higher feminism scores were more likely to report prosocial bystander behaviors (Woodbrown, et al., 2014), we need to be able to compare these phenomena across gender. This will allow research to come to understandings about any similarities and/or differences males and females have which lead them to engage in positive behaviors that impact important social issues.

It is in the service of exploring this question about whether the latent constructs underlying the construct called feminism are comparable for men and women that I have undertaken this thesis. My hypothesis is that the single factor feminist ideology will be

found to underlie the construct “feminist attitude and ideology” (Morgan, 1996), as perceived by both males and females, in the most useful measure to date for this kind of research.

My thesis will explore the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale – Short form to determine in what ways gender plays a role in its measurements, and whether or not there are different factor structures at work for males and females. I will compare male (n = 281) and female (n = 579) responses in order to learn about any differences in how males and females may interpret and/or respond to the items from the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale. It will be useful to determine whether or not the questions of this scale mean the same thing for males and females. Learning about any gender differences may be an important first step in teasing out the core elements of feminism as perceived by both males and females.

In the current context of women and men working together to solve social problems (e.g. violence on college campuses), we need to understand males as well as females. What are the ways in which males and females understand these constructs differently? We know that males are much more inclined to subscribe to traditional gender roles (Baber & Tucker, 2006; Bryant, 2003; Frieze et al., 2003; D. J. Schneider, 2004), and we know that males more than females have negative opinions *about* feminists (Pierce, et al., 2003). This thesis will explore the Liberal Feminist Attitudes Ideology Scale to determine in what ways gender plays a role in its measurements, and whether or not there are different factor structures at work for males and females.

## CHAPTER 2

### METHOD

#### *2.1 Sample Selection*

At the University of South Carolina, a stratified random sample of full time undergraduate students aged 18-24 was obtained using enrollment data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The current study is part of a larger longitudinal study of dating violence and sexual violence among college students. For the larger study, undergraduate students were surveyed in March/April of 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. In the first year of the study (2010), stratum selection was based on year in school with 25% from each class (first year, sophomore, junior, and senior). The sample represented the racial composition of the undergraduate student population. In 2010 N=4,000 students were randomly sampled. In 2011, 2012, and 2013, all students who completed the survey in the previous year (except for seniors who were assumed to have graduated) were invited to complete the survey again. Also in 2011, 2012 and 2013, first year students were added to the sample to replenish the graduating seniors. Thus, in each of these years, five hundred female and five hundred male freshmen (n=1,000) were randomly selected and invited to participate in the survey.

The current study employs data from 2013 and contains two populations: A sample of first year students who were invited to complete the survey for the first time (N=1,000); and a sample of sophomore, junior, and senior undergraduate students who completed the survey in 2012 and were invited to complete it again in 2013 (N=1,379).

To generate the sample of first year students, 500 female and 500 male first year students (n=1,000) were randomly selected using enrollment data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment for the spring 2013 semester. The sample represented the racial composition of full-time first year students, aged 18-19.

## *2.2 Procedure*

In March of 2013, an email describing the online survey and inviting students to participate was sent to all sampled students' email addresses. Students who were interested in participating were instructed to click on the survey link in the email. At this link students read the study description and informed consent, and then were asked if they wished to participate in the study. If they wanted to participate, they indicated "yes" and were taken to the survey questions. If they did not want to participate, they indicated "no" and were taken to a page exiting the survey. Participants received a \$5 Amazon e-gift certificate after completing the survey. Students who did not want to participate could opt out by clicking a link in the invitation email, or emailing study staff. Reminder emails were sent approximately every 3-4 days for the following four weeks. The Institutional Review Board approved the research protocol; a waiver of written consent was granted.

## *2.3 Measure*

Though the Short Form of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale is an 11-item scale, one item was excluded from this study ("America should pass the Equal Rights Amendment") at Morgan's (1996) suggestion, given that it refers to a topic potentially unfamiliar to some people. This left a total of 10 items. Items 2, 5, 8, and 10 are reverse coded. The measure has six response choices on a Likert-type response scale

ranging from “1 = strongly disagree” to “2 = disagree” to “3 = slightly disagree” to “4 = slightly agree” to “5 = agree” to “6 = strongly agree”.

The short form items appear to provide a reliable form of the LFAIS. In the attitude-behavior study from the empirical portion of the short form scale development study (with 234 respondents) Cronbach's alpha on the 11-item short form was .81. Nevertheless, Morgan does suggest that further research should be done to define a reliable and valid short form of the LFAIS and, until that can be done, she cautiously encourages the use of these 10 items (shown in Table 2.1, below) for those researchers in

Table 2.1

*Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale – Short form*

---

Item

---

1. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.
  2. Although women can make good leaders, men make better leaders. *R*
  3. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.
  4. Men should respect women more than they currently do.
  5. Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. *R*
  6. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.
  7. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.
  8. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. *R*
  9. Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens.
  10. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity. *R*
-

**SCORING INSTRUCTIONS** -- Item responses are coded as follows:

Strongly Agree = 6

Agree = 5

Agree Slightly = 4

Disagree Slightly = 3

Disagree = 2

Strongly Disagree = 1

*Note:* Mean scores are then calculated for each item. Scores can range from 1 to 6 with scores indicating relative levels of endorsement ( $> 3.5$ ) or denouncement ( $< 3.5$ ) of a construct. Items 2, 5, 8, and 10 are reverse coded.

---

need of a shorter feminist attitude scale need of a shorter feminist attitude scale.

#### *2.4 Analysis Plan*

The extent to which a confirmatory factor model measuring Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology (with ten items each on a 6-point response scale) exhibits measurement and structural invariance between women and men will be examined using Mplus v. 6.11 (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2010). Robust weighted least squares (WLSMV) estimation will be used for the analysis because polytomous item response formats (such as the Likert-scale responses used in our study) are categorical, not continuous, and thus may fail to maintain the scale and distributional properties assumed by models such as ordinary least squares regression or common linear factor analysis (Wirth & Edwards, 2007). Categorical confirmatory factor analysis assumes that ordered categorical responses are discrete representations of continuous latent responses. Flora & Curran (2004) found that using robust weighted least squares estimation yields parameter estimates, which are less biased and provide more proper solutions. A configural

invariance model will initially be specified in which single-factor models will be estimated in each group.

Fit indices to be considered include the chi-square test, Standard Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Cumulative Fit Index (CFI), and Weighted Root Mean Residual (WRMR) (Hu and Bentler, 1999; Marsh et al., 2004). The chi-square test displays the exact fit of the model. It identifies how closely the predicted covariance matrix replicates the actual covariance matrix based on the range allowed by the model's available degrees of freedom. Therefore, a non-significant chi-square indicates that the model provides a good fit to the data. Several criticisms of the chi-square test exist. Increases in sample size inflate the chi-square value. Samples may not have an underlying chi-square distribution for the covariance structure, making the test irrelevant. Further, the chi-square test holds models to a stringent standard that few can meet (Brown, 2006). Thus, considering additional fit indices to the chi-square test is advised. Also, an index of absolute fit, the SRMR is less stringent (Hu and Bentler, 1999). It represents the discrepancy between the estimated and actual correlation matrix. Values range from 1.0 to 0 with smaller values indicating better fit. Values of .07 and below indicate acceptable fit.

The value of the RMSEA is that it includes adjustment for parsimony. The RMSEA (Steiger & Lind, 1980) incorporates representation of the model complexity by including discrepancy in fit for each degree of freedom. Referred to as a population-based index, the RMSEA also incorporates a noncentrality parameter that adjusts the test of fit for distributions that display non-normality (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara,

1996). Values range from 0 to 1.0, with fit improving as values decrease. Values below .05 indicate adequate fit.

Unlike the chi-square test, the CFI is not affected by sample size and demonstrates incremental model fit. It functions by comparing the estimated model to a model where all latent factors are uncorrelated. As the CFI value increases, the estimated model demonstrates less similarity to the null, uncorrelated base model. Values for the CFI range from 0 to 1.0; appropriate model fit falls above .95 (Brown, 2006).

The WRMR is the average weighted residual. It is good with non-normal and categorical outcomes. Values should be less than or equal to 1.00 (Yu, 2002; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Marsh, et al., 2004).

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

#### *3.1 Descriptive Data*

Three hundred and eight of the N=1,000 sampled first year students completed the survey (response rate = 30.9%). Six hundred and thirty-five of the N=1,379 sophomore, junior, and senior undergraduate students who completed the survey in 2012 and were invited to participate again in 2013 completed the survey (response rate = 46.1%). In sum, N=943 students (out of a sampled N=2,377) completed the survey (overall response rate = 39.7%). At the time of assessment, the average woman in the sample was 19.5 years old (range 18 – 23 years of age); men averaged 19.5 years old as well, with the same range (range 18 – 23 years of age). Additional demographic data for the sample are presented in Table 3.2, below.

Tables 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7, on the subsequent pages, present descriptive statistics for each item of the measure. These tables display means, standard deviations, and variances by item for females only, for males only, and for males and females combined (separate tables are indicated for raw scores and recoded scores). In the following passages only recoded mean scores are examined.

Our analysis, which began by running item means, demonstrated that both the average male and the average female respondent believed that women should have the same opportunities as men (LFAIS 3:  $M = 5.67$ ,  $sd = .75$  for females;  $M = 5.07$ ,  $sd = 1.06$  for males), that men should respect women more than they currently do (LFAIS 4:

Table 3.1

*Demographic descriptive statistics*

	Women (%)	Men (%)
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
White	80.2	78.4
Black or African American	15.5	10.8
Asian	6.3	6.9
Hispanic or Latino/Latina	3.7	4.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.3	1.0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1.0	0.7
Other	0.8	2.3
<b>Year in School</b>		
Freshman	28.9	36.9
Sophomore	41.0	36.9
Junior	19.8	17.0
Senior	9.7	8.2
Other	0.5	0.7

M = 5.35, sd = .84 for females; M = 4.71, sd = 1.12), that women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States (LFAIS 1: M = 5.34, sd = 1.10 for females; M = 4.39, sd = 1.60 for males), that women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history (LFAIS 7: M = 5.16, sd = .92 for females; M = 4.67, sd = 1.25 for males), and that doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously than they currently do (LFAIS 6: M = 4.88, sd = 1.14 for females; M = 4.26, sd = 1.29 for males). Results for these 5 items demonstrated marked gender similarities in feminist attitudes and ideology though, in each case, on average, females endorsed each feminist perspective more strongly than did males.

Women in the survey did *not* believe that women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best they can at their jobs rather than "wasting time" with political activity (LFAIS 10: M = 2.96, sd = 1.43 for females; M = 3.44, sd = 1.46 for

males). Nor did females, on average, believe that women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important aspects of their lives (LFAIS 8:  $M = 2.67$ ,  $sd = 1.28$  for females;  $M = 3.57$ ,  $sd = 1.43$  for males), or that men make better leaders (LFAIS 2:  $M = 2.12$ ,  $sd = 1.33$  for females;  $M = 3.33$ ,  $sd = 1.59$  for males), or that women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need them more (LFAIS 5:  $M = 1.74$ ,  $sd = 1.07$  for females;  $M = 2.30$ ,  $sd = 1.19$  for males). In all of *these* realms males' answers revealed less of a feminist position, as they either agreed somewhat with these items or disagreed less strongly than did the females on average.

Neither males nor females agreed that women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens (LFAIS 9:  $M = 3.12$ ,  $sd = 1.33$  for females;  $M = 2.38$ ,  $sd = 1.35$  for males), though females were more inclined to agree with this than were the males. This item ended up being a controversial one, and it was ultimately excluded from our model because of the supposition that the language of women's "being treated as second class citizens" doesn't resonate with young college students (more will be said about this in our results analysis in the section on latent constructs).

As a whole, the data indicate that females have stronger feminist attitudes and ideology across the board, though males' scores in the sample did align somewhat closely with a feminist perspective as well in some cases, particularly for items 3 and 4, which support the ideas that females should have equal opportunities and that males should respect females more than they currently do.

### *3.2 Latent constructs*

The research question asked whether or not there was a single general latent construct underlying the LFAIS for men and women, as proposed by Morgan (1996).

Table 3.2

*Descriptive statistics for females only – Raw scores*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
1. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.	575	<b>5.34</b>	1.00	1.20
2r. Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.	576	4.88	1.33	1.77
3. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.	571	<b>5.67</b>	.75	.56
4. Men should respect women more than they currently do.	576	<b>5.36</b>	.84	.71
5r. Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.	572	5.26	1.07	1.13
6. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.	572	4.88	1.14	1.31
7. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.	567	5.16	.92	.84
8r. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.	568	4.33	1.28	1.60
9. Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens.	569	3.13	1.33	1.76
10r. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.	568	4.04	1.43	2.05
Valid N (listwise)	539			

Table 3.3

*Descriptive statistics for females only – Recoded\**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
1. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.	575	<b>5.34</b>	1.10	1.20
2r. Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.	576	2.12*	1.33	1.77
3. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.	571	<b>5.67</b>	.75	.56
4. Men should respect women more than they currently do.	576	<b>5.36</b>	.84	.71
5r. Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.	572	1.74*	1.07	1.14
6. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.	572	4.88	1.14	1.31
7. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.	567	5.16	.92	.84
8r. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.	568	2.67*	1.28	1.64
9. Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens.	569	3.12	1.33	1.76
10r. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.	568	2.96*	1.43	2.05
Valid N (listwise)	539			

Table 3.4

*Descriptive statistics for males only – Raw scores*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
1. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.	279	4.39	1.60	2.56
2r. Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.	280	3.67	1.60	2.54
3. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.	279	<b>5.07</b>	1.06	1.12
4. Men should respect women more than they currently do.	280	<b>4.71</b>	1.12	1.25
5r. Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.	276	<b>4.70</b>	1.20	1.43
6. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.	275	4.26	1.29	1.67
7. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.	276	4.67	1.25	1.57
8r. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.	275	3.43	1.43	2.03
9. Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens.	280	2.38	1.35	1.81
10r. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.	279	3.56	1.46	2.12
Valid N (listwise)	260			

Table 3.5

*Descriptive statistics for males only – Recoded\**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
1. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.	279	4.39	1.60	2.56
2r. Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.	280	3.33*	1.59	2.54
3. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.	279	<b>5.07</b>	1.06	1.12
4. Men should respect women more than they currently do.	280	<b>4.71</b>	1.12	1.25
5r. Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.	276	2.3*	1.20	1.43
6. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.	275	4.26	1.29	1.67
7. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.	276	<b>4.67</b>	1.25	1.57
8r. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.	275	3.57*	1.43	2.03
9. Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens.	280	2.38	1.35	1.81
10r. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.	279	3.44*	1.46	2.12
Valid N (listwise)	260			

Table 3.6

*Descriptive statistics for both females and males*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
1. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.	854	5.027	1.36	1.84
2r. Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.	856	4.48	1.53	2.34
3. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.	850	<b>5.47</b>	.91	.82
4. Men should respect women more than they currently do.	856	<b>5.15</b>	.99	.98
5r. Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.	848	<b>5.08</b>	1.14	1.30
6. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.	847	4.68	1.23	1.51
7. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.	843	5.00	1.06	1.13
8r. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.	843	4.03	1.39	1.95
9. Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens.	849	2.88	1.38	1.90
10r. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.	847	3.88	1.46	2.12
Valid N (listwise)	799			

*Note:* Table uses recoded mean scores for recoded items, 2, 5, 8, & 10.

To answer this question, a test of configural invariance was conducted for the multi-group model using confirmatory factor analysis with oblique rotation, as the factors are on the same scale and thus are presumed to correlate with one another. Fit statistics for this model were as follows:  $\chi^2 = 743.810$ ; RMSEA = .111; CFI = .866; WRMR = 2.852, indicating poor model fit, as seen in Table 3.8, below.

Table 3.7

*Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and exploratory structural equation modeling fit statistics for 1-factor model for males and females combined*

	$\chi^2$	RMSEA	CFI	WRMR
CFA	743.81	.111	.866	2.852
ESEM (items 1-10)	431.269	.135	<b>.935</b>	1.515
ESEM (items 1-8)	181.506	.123	<b>.969</b>	1.099

*Note:* Fit indicated by low  $\chi^2$ ; RMSEA < .09; CFI > .90; and WRMR < .06.

As fit indices were outside of the acceptable range, an exploratory structural equation modeling analysis (ESEM) was employed because of its broad applicability to clinical studies that are not appropriately addressed by confirmatory factor analysis (Marsh, et al., 2014). Fit statistics for the revised model were as follows:  $\chi^2 = 431.569$ ; RMSEA = .135; CFI = .935; WRMR = 1.515, indicating a somewhat better, but still poorly fitting, model, as also seen in Table 3.8. Considering the somewhat improved fit, an attempt was made to identify possible sources of model misfit. It was discovered that the residual variances for items 9 (.67) and 10 (.75) were markedly higher than for items 1 through 7, and somewhat higher than for item 8 (.61), as seen in Table 3.9, below.

Table 3.8

*Exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) residual variances for 1-factor model*

Description	Residual Variances
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	.32
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	.37
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	.42
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.36
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	.55
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	.44
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.48
Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. (LFAIS8r)	<b>.61</b>
Women in the U.S. are treated as second-class citizens. (LFAIS9)	<b>.67</b>
Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity. (LFAIS10r)	<b>.75</b>

*Note:* Items with high residual variances are in bold.

More importantly, potential theoretical problems were identified with both items 9 and 10. For items 1 through 7 (and to some extent 8) there exists a link to the conceptual domains of either "competence/equal opportunity" or "respect", and there is feminist theory, which supports the existence of these domains as well (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

It is our theory that items 1, 2, 3, and 5 may cluster together around this Competence/Equal Opportunity factor and that items 4, 6, and 7 may cluster together around the Respect factor. Glick & Fiske (1996) write in their paper on ambivalent sexism that, "Hostile sexist beliefs in women's incompetence at agentic tasks characterize women as unfit to wield power over economic, legal, and political institutions, whereas benevolent sexism provides a comfortable rationalization for confining women to domestic roles." Sexism is not the same as feminism, of course, but these two constructs are certainly related, as evidenced by the inclusion of feminism as a construct in some of the items of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The logic here is that women deserve equal opportunities to do things such as be president (item 1), be leaders (item 2), and have the same job opportunities (items 3 & 5) because they are as competent as men.

This theory also supports our findings when running factor loadings. Factor loadings in Table 3.10, below, show that in the excellent fitting 2-factor model for females (for items 1 through 7 only) items 1 (.86), 2 (.76), 3 (.63), and 5 (.56) all load well on the first factor (Competence/Equal Opportunity), and items 4 (.77), 6 (.74), and 7 (.72) all load well on the second factor (Respect). Factor loadings in Table 3.11, below, show that, for the less well fitting 2-factor model for males, items 1, 2, 3, and 5 all load

Table 3.9

*LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-7)*

Description	Factor	
	Competence/Equal Opportunity	Respect
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.86</b>	.00
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.76</b>	-.05
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.63</b>	.18
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.00	<b>.77</b>
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	<b>.56</b>	.01
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	-.11	<b>.74</b>
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.02	<b>.72</b>

*Note:* Factor loadings in bold represent items that were retained for that factor.

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 23.305/df = 8$ ; RMSEA = .058; CFI = .993; WRMR = .421.

Table 3.10

*LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-7)*

Description	Factor	
	Competence/Equal Opportunity	Respect
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.81</b>	.01
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.76</b>	-.07
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.68</b>	.10
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.00	<b>.90</b>
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	<b>.61</b>	-.12
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	.05	<b>.70</b>
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.44	.28

*Note:* Factor loadings in bold represent items that were retained for that factor.

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 43.87/df = 8$ ; RMSEA = .126; CFI = .977; WRMR = .547.

well on the first factor (Competence/Equal Opportunity), that items 4 and 6 load well on the second factor (Respect), but item 7 cross-loads on both factors. Factor loading criteria for identifying and interpreting factors here was suggested by Igabaria, Iivari, & Maragahh (1995), who stated that each item should load  $\geq 0.50$  on one factor and  $\leq 0.35$  on the other factor.

Additional theory by Tavis & Wade (1984) supports the idea that items 4, 6, and 7 may cluster together around the Respect factor. These authors write, "it is important to note the prevalence of hostile sexism. In nearly all cultures and time periods for which information is available, women have been restricted to social roles with less status than those of men." Women have lower status and the diminished respect that comes with this lower status. Men don't respect women (item 4), doctors don't respect women (item 6), and this has been true for a long time (item 7).

Item 8 doesn't load with the Competence/Equal Opportunity factor, possibly, because it doesn't deal explicitly with competence, even though it does address equal opportunity. It seems as though item 9 would load with Respect, but that model doesn't fit and the residual is large. As previously stated, the problem with item 9 may be a result of language, and that the language used for this item (written almost twenty years ago) simply doesn't resonate with young college students today. Young women may agree that they aren't always respected and that some people don't see them as competent, but it seems plausible that they would not agree that they are treated as second class citizens with a clear division of higher status and lower status, as African Americans were in the Jim Crow era, for instance. Item 10 does not fit, as it is the only item dealing with political activity, which is different than competence/equal opportunity or respect.

Because of these difficulties with items 9 and 10, we ran the exploratory structural equation modeling analysis (ESEM) again, this time excluding these last two items, which did improve the fit, but only slightly:  $\chi^2 = 431.569$ ; RMSEA = .135; CFI = .935; WRMR = 1.515 (as also seen in Table 3.8), meaning that we could not find any evidence to support the existence of a single general factor of any kind underlying this measure, even when excluding the less well fitting items.

Because all of our 1-factor analyses revealed variance, we next ran the models using a 2-factor configural invariance model for each sex, as well as for the two sexes together. We began by running the model to include all 10 items, and did not get a fit (see Table 3.12, below, for fit statistics: for males in this model  $\chi^2 = 213.75/df = 26$ ; RMSEA = .16; CFI = .90; WRMR = 1.14; and for females  $\chi^2 = 229.35/df = 26$ ; RMSEA = .12; CFI = .93; WRMR = 1.18.)

Table 3.11

*Exploratory structural equation modeling fit statistics for 2-factor model.*

Model in sequence	1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of items	Males 1-10	Males 1-8	Males 1-7	Females 1-10	Females 1-8	Females 1-7
$\chi^2$	213.751 26df	129.5 13df	43.87 8df	229.347 26df	67 13df	23.305 8df
RMSEA	.16	.179	.126	.116	.085	<b>.058*</b>
CFI	.899	.929	.977	.93	.978	<b>.993*</b>
WRMR	1.137	.966	.547	1.18.	.707	<b>.421*</b>

\* These statistics indicate an excellent fit for a 2-factor structure for females.

The factor loadings for males with this model (as displayed in Table 3.13, below) looked good for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, & 10, but there was cross-loading for item 7, and item 9 did not load on either factor. For females, the factor loadings with this model were good for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 9, but there was cross-loading for item 8, and item 10 did not load on either factor for women.

When we did not see a fit with this model we ran the model again for items 1 through 8 only, given our theoretical reasoning above (again see Table 3.12 for fit statistics). Eliminating items 9 and 10 definitely improved the fit overall for females ( $\chi^2 = 67$ ; RMSEA = .085; CFI = .978; WRMR = .707), but it did little for males ( $\chi^2 = 129.5$ ; RMSEA = .179; CFI = .929; WRMR = .966). For males, the factor loadings for this model (as displayed in Table 3.14) were good for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 8, but item 7 cross-loaded. For females, the factor loadings for this model (as displayed in Table 3.15) were good for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7, but item 8 cross-loaded. Because item 8, like items 9 and 10, could not be reasoned to link to the themes Competence/Equal Opportunity or to Respect (as all of items 1 through 7 could) we then modified the model to drop item 8 as well.

This well-founded theoretical modification did not result in a much better fit for males as one can see by these fit statistics displayed in earlier in Table 3.12 ( $\chi^2 = 43.87/df = 8$ ; RMSEA = .126; CFI = .977; WRMR = .547). And for males, as one can see in the previous factor loadings table (Table 3.11), the loadings were good for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6, but item 7 cross-loaded.

For females, though, this modification resulted in an excellent fitting model. As shown previously, in Table 3.12, the fit here indicates a definite, clean, well-founded 2-

Table 3.12

*LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-10)*

Description	Factor	
	Competence/Equal Opportunity	Respect
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.60</b>	.23
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.76</b>	.01
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.52</b>	.25
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.05	<b>.78</b>
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	<b>.72</b>	-.17
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	-.01	<b>.81</b>
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.44	.34
Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. (LFAIS8r)	<b>.56</b>	.00
Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens. (LFAIS9)	.14	<b>.37</b>
Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity. (LFAIS10r)	<b>.59</b>	-.14

*Note:* Factor loadings in bold represent items that were retained for that factor.

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 213.75/df = 26$ ; RMSEA = .16; CFI = .899; WRMR = 1.14.

Table 3.13

*LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-8)*

Description	Factor	
	Competence/Equal Opportunity	Respect
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.66</b>	.19
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.78</b>	.00
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.56</b>	.25
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.00	<b>.89</b>
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	<b>.65</b>	-.09
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	.04	<b>.72</b>
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.45	.32
Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. (LFAIS8r)	<b>.50</b>	.00

*Note:* Factor loading in bold represent items that were retained for that factor.

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 129.5/df = 13$ ; RMSEA = .179; CFI = .929; WRMR = .966.

Table 3.14

*LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 2-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-8)*

Description	Factor	
	Competence/Equal Opportunity	Respect
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.84</b>	.00
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.74</b>	-.01
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.63</b>	.16
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.00	<b>.78</b>
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	<b>.50</b>	.05
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	-.10	<b>.73</b>
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.02	<b>.72</b>
Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. (LFAIS8r)	.22	.38

*Note:* Factor loading in bold represent items that were retained for that factor.

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 67/df = 13$ ; RMSEA = .085; CFI = .978; WRMR = .707.

factor structure for females for items 1 through 7 ( $\chi^2 = 23.305$ ; RMSEA = .058; CFI = .993; WRMR = .421). Additionally, this model indicated strong, clear factor loadings for each item (as seen in Table 3.10). Factor 1 (Competence/Equal Opportunity) in this model consisted of items 1 (.86), 2 (.76), 3 (.63), and 5 (.56); and factor 2 (Respect) in this model consisted of items 4 (.77), 6 (.74), and 7 (.72). There is a clear match here between theory and our good fitting structural model, which has provided evidence that, for women, there exists underlying the LFAIS-Short form a 2-factor latent structure, while, for males, there appears to be no underlying structure at all.

## CHAPTER 4

### DISCUSSION

#### *4.1 Overview*

The current study sought to test Morgan's (1996) theory that there may be a single general factor underlying the short form Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) for women and men. Our hypothesis was that gender equivalence would be demonstrated in the factor structure of the measure in a sample of undergraduates at the University of South Carolina.

Exploratory factor analyses with oblique rotation yielded a 2-factor solution for females only, and indicated no structure for males. The two factors underlying the scale for females were "Competence/Equal Opportunity" and "Respect" ( $\chi^2 = 23.31/df = 8$ ; RMSEA = .058; CFI = .993; WRMR = .421). The data was analyzed using Mplus version 6.11 (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2010). Fit is indicated by low  $\chi^2$ , RMSEA < .09, CFI > .90, and WRMR < .06 (Hu and Bentler, 1999; Marsh et al., 2004). In order to identify and interpret factors, we used the criterion suggested by Igabaria, Iivari, & Maragahh (1995), which states that each item should load 0.50 or greater on one factor and 0.35 or lower on the other factor.

Overall, results showed that females had stronger feminist attitudes and ideology than did males, though males' scores in the sample did align somewhat closely with a feminist perspective as well in some cases, particularly around the idea of equal

employment opportunities for women (LFAIS 3) and around the idea that men should respect women more than they do (LFAIS 4).

There were both similarities and differences in how males and females responded to the ten individual items of the scale, as evidenced by mean comparisons of responses by sex. These mean comparisons showed that both males and females believed that women should have the same opportunities as men, that men should respect women more than they currently do, that women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States, that women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history, that doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously, though females believed all of these things more strongly than did males.

More marked differences arose with the remaining items, indicating that while women rejected the notion that men make better leaders, men were more inclined to believe this was true. Females also rejected the idea that women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, and not wasting time with political activity, while men were somewhat more inclined to endorse this item as well. Females did *not* agree that women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sector of their lives, while men were more inclined to agree with this idea too. Regarding whether or not many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more, women by and large disagreed, while men disagreed much less strongly. Neither males nor females agreed that women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens, though females disagreed less strongly than did males on average, though it could be that students (both male and female) do not identify with the language of this

item, and may have answered in the negative, while agreeing with it somewhat theoretically.

Although the present study disproved the existence of a single general factor underlying the LFAIS for men and women, and found instead that the latent constructs underlying the LFAIS are different for males and females, we went on to discover more about the nature of the structures for males and females. Namely, we learned that there exists a 2-factor structure for females when eliminating three ill-fitting items, which are inconsistent with the themes represented by the other remaining items. We learned also that, as of this finding, there does not appear to be any factor structure at all underlying the LFAIS short form for males.

Theory supports the existence of the two factors this study identified as underlying the scale for females. The domains "Competence/Equal Opportunity" and Respect" have both been cited in the feminist theory literature, which explores sexism and its tenets and impact, including the belief in women's incompetence to wield power outside of the home (Glick & Fiske, 1996), and the fact that women have been restricted to roles with less status than those of men (Tavris & Wade, 1984).

#### *4.2 Directions for Future Research and Limitations*

While the current study did not find invariance in the underlying structure of the LFAIS, our principle finding that feminism is something different for males and females is no less compelling a contribution to the literature, and has the potential to aid efforts to come to greater understandings of males' views of feminism and the role these ideas may play in the context of women and men working together to solve social problems, such as reducing violence on college campuses.

The differences between the sexes in terms of feminist ideology is hardly surprising. If feminism is "ideas and action directed toward ending female social subordination" (Condor, 1986), the relationship between feminism and the two different sexes could logically be supposed to be different too. Theoretically, feminist attitudes *could* mean the same thing for both men and women, but this is somewhat like saying that racism could mean the same thing for whites in a white-dominant culture and minorities in that same culture. *Practically*, these constructs map on to individuals in different groups differently. For females, feminist attitudes are attitudes that have to do directly with them and their own experiences in the world. For males, feminist attitudes refer to their ideas about someone else.

The United Nations' Department of Economic and Social Affairs' most recent "The World's Women" (UNDESA, 2010) report details statistics and trends that paint a picture of a theoretical framework, which posits a number of ways in which the experiences of women and men differ. Eight key areas were covered in this study (population and families, health, education, work, power and decision-making, violence against women, environment and poverty) and women were at a distinct disadvantage in every one.

In more narrative form, we offer the following, relatively random, current event statistics as a cultural backdrop on the world in which women live: In 2014, the total number of female partners (including junior partners) at venture capital firms was 6 percent (Diana Project, 2014), and one of these -- Ellen Pao, the only woman to hold such a position at the most well-known and successful of these firms (Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers) -- was fired and then filed a gender discrimination lawsuit, which exposed a

well-documented misogynistic culture in which professional survival may be virtually impossible for women (Isaac & Streitfeld, 2015). Subsequently, Ms. Pao was harassed aggressively, even receiving multiple death threats, until she resigned (on 7.10.15) her next position as CEO of Reddit. A male partner at Reddit attributed the treatment of Ms. Pao to the "toxic misogyny in the Reddit ecosystem." In interviews about the situation, Ms. Pao herself has said that many people are more comfortable attributing such difficulties to individual women rather than acknowledging that the problems may be with society at large.

In the same week as this paper was written, the U.S. Women's National Soccer Team won the 2015 World Cup, and the team was awarded \$2 million from the international soccer association (FIFA) for this feat. In contrast, in the last World Cup for men *every* men's team was awarded \$1.5 million just for playing. Additionally, each male team that lost in the first round was awarded \$8 million, losers of the round of 16 received \$9 million, teams eliminated in the quarterfinals got \$14 million each, the 4th placed team was awarded \$20 million, the 3rd placed received \$22 million, 2nd place got \$25 million, and the 1st place winners took \$35 million (Statistica, 2015). The salary ranges for the National Women's Soccer League players are well below those for the male players as well. In 2015, women were paid between \$6,000 and \$30,000 each, which is below the poverty line in some cities in which players compete -- and each National Women's Soccer League *team* operates with a salary cap of around \$200,000. The men's national soccer league salary cap, by contrast, was \$3.1 million in 2014. In total, first division women's soccer players make roughly 99% less than male professional soccer players. With the exception of tennis, this kind of gender disparity

exists throughout professional sports (WSF, 2011; Pilon, 2015). And, while wages in tennis may have reached parity, the most persistent concerns for female tennis athletes are about their physical safety off the court, as female players (and not male players) regularly experience threats of violence and death (Rothenberg, 2015).

Institutional sexism, like institutional racism as defined by the Aspen Institute (2015), refers to "policies and practices within and across institutions that, intentionally or not, produce outcomes that chronically favor, or put a group at a disadvantage" (Blow, 2015). When a practice like institutional sexism is unwritten in this way (when the effects of it seem to us random, or attributable to an individual female's own actions or circumstances) and is thus concealed, it can be difficult, if not impossible, to point to the proof for it. But there are no individual architects of a system that has been built (or, more accurately, accumulated) subconsciously over time (Blow, 2015).

Given the existence of such gross differences in experiences and in access to power and privilege between the sexes, it may be that many males (even feminist males) feel a reluctance to give up their privilege, or even to allow themselves to care about the situation women find themselves in, suspecting a zero sum game.

Recent research on empathy (Cameron, et al., 2015) confirms well-established and consistent findings that human beings are much less likely to be interested in helping struggling groups of people in "out-groups", for example, males helping females as a group (Cikara, et al., 2014). But this new research also suggests something else – that empathic capacity can *change*, sometimes dramatically, "depending on what we *want* to feel". These studies, and others like them, have drawn the conclusions that (1) when there is no financial cost involved in feeling empathy for others in an out-group people

feel more empathetic toward an out-group than they do otherwise, implying that sensitivity to mass suffering is not intrinsically limited; that (2) when people learn that empathy is a malleable skill that can be improved upon they often engage in more of an effort to experience empathy for groups other than their own; and that (3) powerful people are less likely to feel empathy for others because they have less incentive to interact with others (Cameron, et al., 2015).

If males, who have substantially more power as a group (planet-wide) than do females (and who perceive females as an out-group which will cost them in resources if the gender playing field is leveled) don't want to feel the empathy required to have feminist views, then where does that leave us given the research that tells us that higher levels of feminist attitudes and ideologies amongst males has been linked to positive outcomes with regard to social issues, including engaging in prosocial bystander behaviors, like reducing violence on college campuses (Woodbrown, et al., 2014)?

According to the United Nations' Commission on the Status of Women, the chronic underinvestment in women's empowerment has continued to hamper progress on women's rights and gender equality for decades, with financial gaps between the sexes in some countries as high as 90% (UN Women, 2015). Our next research questions will require an exploration not only of how to measure feminist ideology in males, but of how to engender it as well, by convincing males that investing in women's empowerment is not a zero-sum game, and that empathy is a skill that can be practiced and grown.

Our study's finding that men, on average, believed that men make better leaders than women do, that women should focus on doing their jobs well rather than trying to affect societal/political change, that many women in the work force are taking jobs away

from men who need them more, and that women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives all underscore the inherent gap in experience between the sexes. Future studies might look more closely at the etiology of such beliefs and examine avenues by which these male suppositions can be corrected.

Results of the current study are limited. The fact that this scale was developed using samples with fairly narrow demographics definitely limited the project overall. Morgan (1996) herself acknowledged this, but nevertheless believed in the scale's promise as a reliable and valid, overtly sociopolitical, measure of liberal feminist attitudes. It is, in fact, the only one of its kind. Thus, even with its imperfections it is a useful tool that should certainly be improved upon.

The current lack of a scale that has been confirmed to function in the same way for males and females has meant an inability to compare feminist attitudes by sex, and our study has not altered this situation. At this time it remains unadvisable to compare feminist attitudes by gender because the factor structure of the scale differs for males and females. Until, and unless, a scale is determined to function similarly for men and women in the future, it is recommended that the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) be used solely for ascertaining feminist attitudes for women. Future research should certainly look toward developing such a scale for men.

#### *4.3 Conclusion*

In Banyard's (2011) own work on prosocial bystanding actions, in which she promotes creating an ecological model of bystander intervention, she points out the critical role that innovations will play in developing models that work. Latane and Darley (1970) have often written about the prerequisites an individual person must

possess internally about the prerequisites of the immediate context before they can make the decision to intervene to take prosocial bystander actions. Bronfenbrenner (1997) and Kelly (2006) present ecological models, which acknowledge the critical role that cultural values can play in whether or not an individual steps in to change social norms, like rejecting gender inequality, or stepping in to stop misogyny or campus violence. These cultural values may very well include feminist ideology if our goal is for males to take a more proactive stance alongside women.

Reflecting on how strategies for sexual violence prevention, Banyard (2011) wrote: “Given the prevalence of sexual and relationship violence in communities, innovations in prevention are sought.” Banyard's statement underscores just how critical the situation is – not only for women, but for anyone who cares about a woman, or who is being raised by a woman, or for anyone who sees the value of living in a world in which no one is being systematically oppressed. The hurdles between here and gender equality currently seem formidable, and solutions are going to require innovations that can prevail upon men to engage equally with women with the goal of equality (Crooks, Goodall, Hughes, Jaffe, & Baker, 2007). This study's findings suggest that many men are yet unaware of the presence, as well as the costs to society, of a lack of gender parity. If our goal is to engage men as allies in violence prevention, our efforts must educate and encourage men to embrace the notion of feminist ideology, and then we must find an accurate way to measure it.

## REFERENCES

- Abray, Jane (1975). Feminism in the French revolution. *The American Historical Review*, Oxford University Press, Vol. 80, No. 1, pp. 43-62.
- Allen, Christopher T. (2009). Engaging men in violence prevention: Empirically examining theoretical barriers and catalysts. *Dissertation*, University of South Carolina.
- Aspen Institute (2015). Educational and policy studies organization based in Washington, D.C., whose mission is to foster leadership based on enduring values and provide a nonpartisan venue for dealing with critical issues.  
<http://www.aspeninstitute.org>.
- Baber, Kristine & Tucker, Corinna (2006). The social roles questionnaire: A new approach to measuring attitudes toward gender. *Sex Roles*, 54, 7/8, p459-467.
- Banyard, V. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 216-229.
- Bargad, Adena, & Hyde, Janet S. (1991). A Study of Feminist Identity Development in Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 181 – 201.
- Bem, S. L. (1975). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 634 – 643.
- Blow, Charles (2015). Confederate flags and institutional racism. *New York Times*, *Opinion Editorial*, June 24.

- Brown, Timothy A. (2006). Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research (Methodology in the social sciences). *The Guilford Press*, NY, NY.
- Cameron, Daryl, Inzlicht, Michael, & Cunningham, William, A. (2015). Empathy is actually a choice. *New York Times*, July 10.
- Carver, Lisa F., Vafaei, Afshin, Guerra, Ricardo, Freire, Aline, & Phillips, Susan P. (2013). Gender Differences: Examination of the 12-item Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI-12) in an Older Brazilian Population. *Public Library of Science (PLOS ONE)*, 8, 10.
- Cikara, M., Bruneau, E., Van Bavel, J. J., & Saxe, R. (2014). Their pain gives us pleasure: How intergroup dynamics shape empathic failures and counter-empathic responses. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 55, 110-125.
- Davis, Roisin (2015). Something's Missing From Pope Francis' 'Radical' Vision of Equality: Women. Truth Dig. [http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/somethings\\_missing\\_from\\_pope\\_francis\\_vision\\_of\\_equality\\_-\\_women](http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/somethings_missing_from_pope_francis_vision_of_equality_-_women).
- de Ayala, R. J. (2008). The theory and practice of item response theory. Guilford Press, New York, New York.
- Dempewolff (1974). Development and Validation of a Feminism Scale, *Psychological Reports*, 34(2), 651-657.
- Brush, Candida, Greene, Patricia, Balachandra, Lakshmi, & Davis, Amy E. (2014). Diana Report: Women entrepreneurs 2014: Bridging the gender gap in venture capital, *Arthur M. Blank Center for Entrepreneurship at Babson College*, <http://www.babson.edu/Academics/centers/blank-center/global-research/diana/Documents/diana-project-executive-summary-2014.pdf>

- Downing, N. E. & Roush, K. L. (1985). From Passive Acceptance to Active Commitment: A Model of Feminist Identity Development. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 13, 695–709.
- Fassinger, R. E. (1994). Development and testing of the Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement (FWM) Scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18(3), 389-402.
- Fischer, Ann, Tokar, David, Mergl, Marija, Good, Glenn, Hill, Melanie, & Blum, Sasha (2000). Assessing women's feminist identity development. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 15–29.
- Fink, J., Kane, M., LaVoi, N. (2014). The freedom to choose: Elite female athletes' preferred representations within endorsement opportunities. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(2), 207-219.
- Flora, D. B., & Curran, P. J. (2004). An empirical evaluation of alternative methods of estimation for confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data. *Psychological methods*, 9(4), 466.
- Frieze, Irene Hanson & McHugh, Maureen, C. (1998). Measuring feminism and gender role attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 3, p. 349.
- Frieze, I. H., Ferligoj, A., Kogošvek, T., Renner, T., Horvat, J., & Šarlija, N. (2003). Gender-role attitudes in university students in the United States, Slovenia, and Croatia. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*, 27(3), 256.
- Goldstein, Leslie (1982). Early feminist themes in French utopian socialism: the St. Simonians and Fourier. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Henderson-King, Donna, and Stewart, Abigail, J. (1999). Educational experiences and shifts in group consciousness: Studying women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 390-399.
- Henley, Nancy M., Meng, Karen, O'Brien, Delores, McCarthy, William J., & Sockloskie, Robert (1998). Developing a scale to measure the diversity of feminist attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 2, 3, 317-348.
- Henley, Nancy M., Spalding, Leah, R., & Kosta, Andrea (2000). Development of the short form of the feminist perspectives scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 254-256.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- Igbaria, M., Iivari, J., & Maragahh, H. (1995). Why do individuals use computer technology? A Finnish case study. *Information & management*, 29(5), 227-238.
- Isaac, Mike, & Streitfeld, David (2015). It's silicon valley 2, Ellen Pao 0; Fighter of sexism is out at Reddit. *New York Times*.
- Kimmel, E. B. (1989). The experience of feminism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13, 133-146.
- Lerner, Gerda (1971). Women's rights and American feminism. *The American Scholar*, Vol. 40, 2.
- Liss, M., Hoffner, C., & Crawford, M. (2000). What do feminists believe? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24(4), 279-284.

- Kirkpatrick, Clifford (1936). The construction of a belief-pattern scale for measuring attitudes toward feminism. *The Journal of social psychology*, 7, 4, 421-437.
- Marsh, Herbert, W., Morin, Alexandre, J. S., Parker, Philip, D., & Kaur, Gurvinder (2014). Exploratory structural equation modeling: An integration of the best features of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 10, 85-110.
- McHugh, M. C., & Frieze, I. H. (1997). The measurement of gender-role attitudes. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly*, 21(1), 1.
- Morgan, B. L. (1994). The relationship of feminist attitudes to behavior. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*, University of California, Irvine.
- Morgan, B. L. (1996). Putting the feminism into feminism scales: Introduction of a liberal feminist attitude and ideology scale (LFAIS). *Sex Roles*, Vol. 34, 5/6.
- Muthen, L.K., & Muthen, B.O. (1998-2010). *Mplus User's Guide*. Sixth Edition. Los Angeles, California: Muthen & Muthen.
- Oxford English Dictionary (2014). Definition of "feminism". *Oxford University Press*.
- Pierce, W. D., Sydie, R. A., Stratkotter, R., & Krull, C. (2003). Social concepts and judgments: A semantic differential analysis of the concepts feminist, man, and woman. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 338-346.
- Pilon, Mary (2015). The World Cup pay gap: What the U.S. and Japan didn't win in the women's soccer final. *Politico*. <http://www.politico.eu/article/world-cup-women-pay-gap-gender-equality>.
- Renzetti, C. M. (1987). New wave or second stage? Attitudes of college women toward feminism. *Sex Roles*, 16, 265-277.

- Rickard, K. M. (1989). The relationship of self-monitored dating behaviors to level of feminist identity on the feminist identity scale. *Sex Roles*, 20, 213–226.
- Rothenberg, Ben (2015). Concerns over personal safety haunt women on tennis tour. *New York Times*, June 30.
- Smith, Ferree, & Miller (1975). A short scale of attitudes toward feminism. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, 6, 1, 51 – 56.
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L., & Stapp, J. (1972). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 32(1), 29-39.
- Statistica (2015). Prize money distribution at the 2014 soccer World Cup in Brazil. *Statistica: The Statistics Portal*. <http://www.statista.com/statistics/303680/prize-money-distribution-2014-fifa-world-cup-brazil/>
- Thompson, B., & Daniel, L. G. (1996). Factor analytic evidence for the construct validity of scores: A historical overview and some guidelines. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 197 – 208.
- Toller, Paige, W., Suter, Elizabeth A., & Todd C. Trautman, 2004. Gender role identity and attitudes toward feminism. *Sex Roles*, 51, 1.
- United Nations' Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2010). The World's Women: Trends and statistics. *United Nations publication*, ISBN 978-92-1-161539-5.
- Wirth, R. J., & Edwards, M. C. (2007). Item factor analysis: current approaches and

- future directions. *Psychological methods*, 12(1), 58.
- Women's Sports Foundation (2011). Pay inequity in athletics. *Women's Sports Foundation*. New York, New York. <http://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/home/research/articles-and-reports/equity-issues/pay-inequity>.
- Woodbrown, V. Diane, Warren, Peter, Swan, Suzanne, & Allen, Christopher T. (2014). Feminist males stand up to stop interpersonal violence. *International Society for Research on Aggression Annual Conference*, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Yu, C. Y. (2002). *Evaluating cutoff criteria of model fit indices for latent variable models with binary and continuous outcomes*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California - Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA.

APPENDIX A – SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

*Table A.1. Exploratory structural equation modeling fit statistics for 3-factor model*

Model in sequence	7	8	9	10	11	12
Number of items	Females 1-10	Females 1-8	Females 1-7**	Males 1-10	Males 1-8*	Males 1-7**
$\chi^2$	87.673	16.312	n.d.	96.45	35.319	n.d.
RMSEA	.082	.048	n.d.	.125	.12	n.d.
CFI	.976	.996	n.d.	.958	.983	n.d.
WRMR	.615	.295	n.d.	.626	.421	n.d.

\* Model would not run. Data not interpretable.

\*\* Model would not run. Data non-existent.

*Table A.2. LFAIS item factor loadings for males, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-10)\**

Description	Factors		
	1	2	3
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.84</b>	.00	-.42
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.83</b>	-.10	-.02
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.76</b>	.02	-.44
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.10	<b>.74</b>	-.02
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	<b>.77</b>	-.28	.00
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	-.01	<b>.82</b>	.02
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	<b>.46</b>	.28	.03
Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. (LFAIS8r)	.43	.01	<b>.66</b>
Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens. (LFAIS9)	.00	<b>.47</b>	.27

Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity. (LFAIS10r)	<b>.56</b>	-0.19	.13
--	------------	-------	-----

---

*\*LFAIS item loadings for males using 3-factor model for items 1–8 only, and for items 1–7 only are not interpretable.*

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 96.45$ ; RMSEA = .125; CFI = .958; WRMR = .626, which indicates a poor fit.

*Table A.3. LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-10)*

Description	Factors		
	1	2	3
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.85</b>	.00	.05
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.57</b>	.00	.32
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.75</b>	.08	-.01
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.33	<b>.62</b>	-.01
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	.40	-.01	.41
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	.20	<b>.59</b>	.00
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.30	<b>.59</b>	.03
Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. (LFAIS8r)	-.01	.47	<b>.60</b>

Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens. (LFAIS9)	-01	<b>.03</b>	.00
Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity. (LFAIS10r)	.03	.20	<b>.57</b>

---

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 87.673$ ; RMSEA = .082; CFI = .976; WRMR = .615.

Table A.4. Correlation matrix for females only, using LFAIS item key in Table A.5

	Pearson Coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Q1 & Q1	1		575
Q1 & Q2r	.471**	.000	574
Q1 & Q3	.494**	.000	569
Q1 & Q4	.311**	.000	573
Q1 & Q5r	.236**	.000	569
Q1 & Q6	.199**	.000	569
Q1 & Q7	.313**	.000	564
Q1 & Q8r	.183**	.000	565
Q1 & Q9	.166**	.000	565
Q1 & Q10r	.174**	.000	565
Q2r & Q1	.471**	.000	574
Q2r & Q2r	1		576
Q2r & Q3	.257**	.000	570
Q2r & Q4	.233**	.000	574
Q2r & Q5r	.299**	.000	570
Q2r & Q6	.144*	.001	570
Q2r & Q7	.198**	.000	565
Q2r & Q8r	.295**	.000	566
Q2r & Q9	.106**	.012	566
Q2r & Q10r	.174**	.000	565
Q3 & Q1	.494**	.000	569
Q3 & Q2r	.257**	.000	570

Q3 & Q3	1		571
Q3 & Q4	.313**	.000	569
Q3 & Q5r	.246**	.000	565
Q3 & Q6	.183**	.000	565
Q3 & Q7	.286**	.000	560
Q3 & Q8r	.128**	.002	561
Q3 & Q9	<b>.038</b>	.368	561
Q3 & Q10r	<b>.059</b>	.165	561
Q4 & Q1	.311**	.000	573
Q4 & Q2r	.233**	.000	574
Q4 & Q3	.313**	.000	569
Q4 & Q4	1		576
Q4 & Q5r	.183**	.000	571
Q4 & Q6	.424**	.000	566
Q4 & Q7	.461**	.000	567
Q4 & Q8r	.337**	.000	567
Q4 & Q9	.269**	.000	567
Q4 & Q10r	.138**	.001	567
Q5r & Q1	.236**	.000	569
Q5r & Q2r	.299**	.000	570
Q5r & Q3	.246**	.000	565
Q5r & Q4	.183**	.000	571
Q5r & Q5r	1		572
Q5r & Q6	<b>.065</b>	.124	569
Q5r & Q7	.172**	.000	564

Q5r & Q8r	.309**	.000	565
Q5r & Q9	-.118**	.005	564
Q5r & Q10r	.258**	.000	565
Q6 & Q1	.199**	.000	569
Q6 & Q2r	.144**	.001	570
Q6 & Q3	.183**	.000	565
Q6 & Q4	.424**	.000	571
Q6 & Q5r	<b>.065</b>	.124	569
Q6 & Q6	1		572
Q6 & Q7	.398**	.000	564
Q6 & Q8r	.250**	.000	566
Q6 & Q9	.286**	.000	565
Q6 & Q10r	.188**	.000	566
Q7 & Q1	.313**	.000	564
Q7 & Q2r	.198**	.000	565
Q7 & Q3	.286**	.000	560
Q7 & Q4	.461**	.000	566
Q7 & Q5r	.172**	.000	564
Q7 & Q6	.398**	.000	564
Q7 & Q7	1		567
Q7 & Q8r	.304**	.000	561
Q7 & Q9	.289**	.000	561
Q7 & Q10r	.213**	.000	562
Q8r & Q1	.183**	.000	565
Q8r & Q2r	.295**	.000	566

Q8r & Q3	.128**	.002	561
Q8r & Q4	.337**	.000	567
Q8r & Q5r	.309**	.000	565
Q8r & Q6	.250**	.000	566
Q8r & Q7	.304**	.000	561
Q8r & Q8r	1		568
Q8r & Q9	.256**	.000	563
Q8r & Q10r	.409**	.000	564
Q9 & Q1	.166**	.000	565
Q9 & Q2r	.106**	.012	566
Q9 & Q3	<b>.038</b>	.368	561
Q9 & Q4	.269**	.000	567
Q9 & Q5r	-.118**	.005	564
Q9 & Q6	.286**	.000	565
Q9 & Q7	.289**	.000	561
Q9 & Q8r	.256**	.000	563
Q9 & Q9	1		569
Q9 & Q10r	<b>.073</b>	.084	564
Q10r & Q1	.174**	.000	565
Q10r & Q2r	.274**	.000	566
Q10r & Q3	<b>.059</b>	.165	561
Q10r & Q4	.138**	.001	567
Q10r & Q5r	.258**	.000	565
Q10r & Q6	.188**	.000	566
Q10r & Q7	.213**	.000	562

Q10r & Q8r	.409**	.000	564
Q10r & Q9	<b>.073</b>	.084	564
Q10r & Q10r	1		568

---

*Note:* Those items which do **not** correlate are in bold.

*Table A.5. Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) item numbers and content*

---

Item Number	Item
Q1	Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.
Q2r	Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.
Q3	A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.
Q4	Men should respect women more than they currently do.
Q5r	Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.
Q6	Doctors need to take women's health concern more seriously.
Q7	Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.
Q8r	Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.
Q9	Women in the U.S. are treated as second class citizens.
Q10r	Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.

---

*Table A.6. LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-7)\**

Description	Factors		
	1	2	3
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.79</b>	.00	.00
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	.79	<b>121.63</b>	.00
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.83</b>	.00	.03
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.48	.00	.59
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	<b>.54</b>	.00	.00
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	.33	.00	.60
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.49	.00	.55

*\* Model would not run. Data not interpretable or non-existent.*

*Table A.7. LFAIS item factor loadings for females, using 3-factor model with oblique rotation (items 1-8)*

Description	Factors		
	1	2	3
Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States. (LFAIS1)	<b>.91</b>	.02	-.02
Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders. (LFAIS2r)	<b>.62</b>	-.02	.31
A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man. (LFAIS3)	<b>.62</b>	.21	.00
Men should respect women more than they currently do. (LFAIS4)	.05	<b>.75</b>	.00
Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more. (LFAIS5r)	.42	.02	.37
Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously. (LFAIS6)	-.02	<b>.71</b>	-.07
Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history. (LFAIS7)	.07	<b>.69</b>	.00
Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives. (LFAIS8r)	.00	.35	<b>.56</b>

*Note:* Fit statistics for this model are  $\chi^2 = 16.312$ ; RMSEA = .048; CFI = .996; WRMR = .29.