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ABSTRACT

The current study utilized data from young adults (undergraduate and graduate students) in order to examine the effect of feminist self-identification (as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale) and feminist perspectives (as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale—Short Form) on self-efficacy (as measured by General Self-Efficacy Scale total scores). Additionally, this study examined the relationship between demographics (i.e., gender, race) and outcome variables of interest (i.e., feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, self-efficacy). Participants included 305 individuals who are at least 18 years old and enrolled as undergraduate or graduate students at the University of South Carolina. Multiple regression assessed the relationships among the constructs of feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy, while a factorial MANOVA examined differences among demographics (i.e., race, gender) for the variables of interest (i.e., feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, self-efficacy). Results indicated that feminist behavior (a component of feminist perspectives) is a significant predictor of self-efficacy, and women had higher ratings than men for feminist identification and feminist perspectives. No significant differences existed between White and non-White participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, or self-efficacy. A discussion of results, implications for practice, and study limitations are provided.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Recently, there have been several campaigns and initiatives to increase awareness of feminist issues and educate people about what the “f-word” really means (e.g., Ban Bossy, LikeAGirl, HeForShe, 2015). While women have been at the forefront of each wave of the feminist movement, more men are voicing their support of feminism. Men and boys are even the focus of the United Nations' HeForShe campaign, encouraging support and activism from males in order to end gender inequality across the world. Because celebrities and notable figures are often used as figureheads for such campaigns, young adults may be more likely to be influenced by such efforts (Austin, Vord, Pinkleton & Epstein, 2008; Jackson, 2005). As more celebrities have been publicly identifying as feminists, more young adults are becoming aware of feminist issues and what it means to be a feminist. And as individuals who have come of age during “third wave” feminism (see Chapter 2) continue to develop in their understanding of feminism, it is also important to understand how changing views on feminism impact feminist perspectives. And because identifying as a feminist has potential mental health benefits related to self-esteem and self-efficacy (Eisele & Stake, 2008; McNamara & Rickard, 1989), it is an important area of inquiry for counselors and counselor educators. In fact, Eisele and Stake (2008) suggested that feminist self-labeling may be more strongly related to positive mental health than espousing feminist perspectives without identifying as a feminist. Researchers have suggested that feminist identification made women more
likely to engage in activism, and bisexual and lesbian women who identified as feminists exhibited more self-acceptance (Szymanski, 2004). By better understanding the relationship between self-efficacy, feminist identification, and feminist perspectives, counselors and counselor educators can better support their supervisees and/or clients.

**Problem Statement**

In general, women’s gender consciousness (i.e., the understanding that one’s gender affects their experiences in the world) and collective action efforts (i.e., unified efforts to improve a group’s position and achieve shared goals) for women have typically been weaker than that of other groups despite generally being more aware of gender issues than men (Aronson, 2003). Although several studies have investigated how such issues affect White college-aged women, perspectives from ethnic and racial minorities and men in the same age group have not been well represented. Previous research has suggested that status as a minority may make individuals more likely to support other minority groups (Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Wiley et al., 2012), yet some researchers believe that this may not be the case with feminism, as feminism may only align with the issues and experiences of White, middle class women (Aronson, 2003; Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Although previous waves of feminism have included more singular views and identities for group members, feminism today consists of more varied opinions about what it means to be a feminist and how identification as a feminist is expressed (Heywood & Drake, 1997; Aronson, 2003). Such variance in beliefs can be confusing for individuals and may contribute to them not identifying as feminist, despite sharing similar perspectives (Kelly, 2015). Researchers have suggested that feminist perspectives are linked with higher
perceived physical attractiveness, a more positive body image (Kinsaul, Curtin, Bazzini, & Martz, 2014), and improvement in coping with societal pressures (Rubin, Nemeroff, & Russo, 2004). Because the most recent wave of feminism (i.e., third wave) looks quite different from how society has previously defined what it means to be a feminist, becoming more familiar with how young adults currently view feminism and how they are incorporating the label into their identities is important for counselors and counselor educators in their practice. Understanding how students or clients incorporate the feminist label into their identity can potentially provide a clearer direction for work with students or clients and encourage a more trusting, collaborative relationship.

Social Significance

While men and women frequently report agreeing with feminist ideas and tenets, they rarely self-label as feminists (McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). When investigating the reasons behind the hesitation to self-label as a feminist, one of the most frequently expressed reasons from both men and women is the fear that they will be perceived negatively and inaccurately by others (Anderson, 2009; McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). For example, feminist women are thought of as being more intelligent, confident, and productive, they are also thought of as being lesbians, less attractive, and volatile (McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust & Miller, 2007; Suter & Toller, 2006; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Feminist men are often characterized as being gay, less masculine, and having more stereotypically feminine qualities (e.g., emotional, submissive, physically weaker) (McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Individuals may also decline to identify as feminists due to a lack of
education about feminism. Kelly (2015) found that many individuals who did not identify as feminists said they did not know about feminism, although they supported feminist perspectives and beliefs. Despite the potential negative consequences of self-labeling, research has suggested that having positive perceptions of feminists and feeling connected to women may buffer the fear of negative stereotypes and increase the likelihood that someone will self-identify as a feminist (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Wiley et al., 2012). Even brief exposure to positive portrayals of feminists may encourage positive perceptions of feminism, as well as increase the desire to participate in collective action for women (Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Wiley et al., 2012). Additionally, research has found that the act of self-identifying with a group or self-labeling may increase the likelihood of activism on behalf of that group (Leaper & Arias, 2011; Wiley et al., 2012; Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011; Zucker, 2004), which ultimately encourages social change. And while identification as a feminist may encourage positive mental health (e.g., self-efficacy), identifying as a feminist may not be as important as an individual adopting feminist attitudes due to the negative stereotypes about feminists (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). For example, even individuals who only privately identified as feminists (i.e., they do not label themselves as feminists to others) have still reported being supportive of feminist perspectives and beliefs (Kelly, 2015). This suggests that although they have some concern over being perceived negatively by others, they are not completely stigmatized by the label and therefore may be at a tipping point in their feminist identity. In fact, Kelly (2015) found that feminist self-labeling was more related to engagement in activism. However, feminist self-labeling has been shown to mediate the relationship
between feminist perspectives and self-efficacy (Eisele & Stake, 2008). Higher self-efficacy, defined as an individual’s belief in their ability to achieve a desired outcome, has been linked to increased health, higher levels of achievement, and better social skills (Bandura, 2002). Therefore, further investigation is needed into the relationship among feminist self-labeling, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy.

By nature, feminism encourages deeper examination of social imperatives (e.g., desire to form and to belong to groups) and societal norms (i.e., rules used to define acceptable behavior in a group) (Ruben et al., 2004). This may be particularly important for women, as such evaluation may act as a buffer for certain mental health issues (e.g., disordered eating, negative body image) (Rubin et al., 2004). However, self-efficacy has been shown to be an even stronger moderator of such issues in women compared to feminism and feminist beliefs (Kinsaul et al., 2014). Therefore, self-efficacy may be the most vital component necessary for improving and maintaining women’s mental health.

**Professional Significance**

Researchers identified a positive relationship between feminist perspectives and self-efficacy (Eisele & Stake, 2008). This may be partially explained by the positive relationship between nontraditional gender role attitudes and self-esteem (Szymanski, 2004), which are components of feminist perspectives and self-efficacy. If an individual feels more empowered about an issue, they may feel more encouraged and more capable (i.e., self-efficacy) to enact change on behalf of that issue (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Zimmerman, 1995). This may illuminate important knowledge regarding the relationship between self-efficacy and advocacy in general. While advocacy is not a focus of this study, understanding how self-efficacy impacts advocacy can provide counselors and
counselor educators insight into how this relationship might affect clients, students, and supervisees in their desire to engage in advocacy for any group or issue. Additionally, the findings may provide implications for how counselor educators may structure their teachings about feminism to make them seem more relevant to students of color and men. For example, if students of color and men significantly vary from White students and women in their understanding and support of feminist perspectives and the feminist label, counselor educators may focus more on making feminism seem more relevant to their lives. As previous researchers have suggested, seeing feminism as relevant to one’s own life is a crucial piece to supporting feminist beliefs and identifying as a feminist (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Wiley et al., 2012).

For counselors and counselor educators, understanding the relationship among such factors will not only help them better understand the worldview of clients who do not ascribe to traditional gender roles, but it will also encourage self-reflection on the impact that gender stereotyping and sexism can have on interactions with and treatment of clients and counselors-in-training (Goodman et al., 2004). By being unaware of how gender stereotyping influences clinical decision making, counselors risk providing biased treatment to clients based on their own values and unintentionally supporting traditional gender concepts (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; DeVoe, 1990; Good, Gilbert, & Scher, 1990). This imposition of values is addressed in the ACA Code of Ethics (2014), which states that counselors must be aware of their own values, resist imposing those values, and engage in additional training in areas that put them at risk of imposing their values onto those with whom they work (A.7.b). Counselors also have a responsibility to serve as advocates for their clients when necessary (A.7.b), and counselor educators must
infuse multicultural issues into all coursework (F.7.b.). Furthermore, DeVoe (1990) found that participating in advocacy efforts and feminist consciousness raising may make counselors more aware of feminist issues, resulting in increased insight into power differentials between men and women and awareness of how sexist values can negatively impact relationships.

**Theoretical Foundation**

Feminist theory is based on the following principles: (a) problems originate in political and social contexts; (b) commitment to social change is necessary; (c) acknowledging different ways of knowing gives voice to women; (d) an egalitarian relationship is central to the therapeutic relationship; and (e) political and social inequity negatively affect all people (Corey, 2009). Feminist theory shares many common threads with multicultural counseling theories (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; Goodman et al., 2004) that are currently taught in counselor education programs. And because multicultural approaches are highly valued in today’s counselor education programs, understanding feminist theory as well seems like a logical next step for counselor educators. Feminist theory also lends itself to this study because of its focus on empowerment and facilitating consciousness raising (Corey, 2009).

Social cognitive theory can also be used to help understand the constructs being examined in this study, particularly with the college-aged population. Social cognitive theory (SCT) posits that individuals’ beliefs in their abilities to influence the environment shape their actions in order to produce desired outcomes (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). As societal views on sexual mores, family structure, and gender roles continue to evolve, stereotypes continue to be influenced primarily by culture, not by inherent biological
differences between men and women (Khajehpour, Ghazvini, Memari, & Rhamani, 2011). Khajehpour et al. (2011) elaborate on this idea by suggesting that modeling is the most powerful means of transmitting cultural values, attitudes and behaviors, and thought patterns across generations. While modeling can occur through direct observation of others, media may also serve as a source from which individuals model behavior. Because young adults tend to be more susceptible to the media’s influence on their behavior and beliefs (Austin, Vord, Pinkleton & Epstein, 2008; Jackson, 2005), using a social cognitive theory lens to explain the potential power of this influence on feminist identification may be useful. Further, tenets of social cognitive theory may help explain why individuals choose to identify or not identify as feminists (e.g., learning as a cognitive process in a social context, vicarious reinforcement). Social cognitive theory may also help to explain the relationship between self-efficacy and advocacy, as those with higher levels of self-efficacy may persist with action despite unfavorable circumstances as long as they believe their efforts will produce the expected results (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Social cognitive theory also helps to explain how observed behavior (i.e., modeling) can influence values, attitudes, and thoughts, thereby affecting stereotypes and regulation of gender roles that are typically associated with the feminist label (Khajehpour et al., 2011). Thus, incorporating feminist theory and social cognitive theory (SCT) provides both a political/social lens and a learned behavior (i.e., modeling) lens through which to view the impact of feminist labeling and feminist perspectives on self-efficacy in undergraduate and graduate students.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of the study was to understand the relationship between feminism
and self-efficacy in college-aged students, by examining the differential relationship (i.e., discrepancies between the relationship between feminist self-labeling and self-efficacy, and between feminist perspectives and self-efficacy) of feminist self-identification and feminist perspectives to self-efficacy. As such, the study examined the relationships among variables of interest (i.e., feminist attitudes, feminist perspectives, self-efficacy) and differences among demographics (i.e., gender, race) for each variable of interest. One potential implication for understanding the relationship among feminist identification, self-efficacy, and feminist perspectives might be that counselors and counselor educators gain more awareness of the impact these constructs have on young adult clients, supervisees, and/or students. Additionally, results might also encourage self-reflection in counselors and counselor educators in order to examine how their own beliefs on feminism and women may impact their work with clients, students, and/or supervisees.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

This study explored the relationships among demographic factors, feminist perspectives, feminist identification, and self-efficacy for undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at a large four year University in the Southeast. The research questions and null hypotheses are presented below.

**Research Question 1**

What relationship exists among feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy? Specifically, can feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF; Szymanski, 2004), and feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000) predict self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE;
Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) of young adults?

**Hypothesis 1A.** Feminist identification ratings and feminist perspectives ratings are positively correlated with self-efficacy ratings.

**Hypothesis 1B.** Higher ratings for feminist self-identification and feminist perspectives will predict higher self-efficacy for young adults.

**Research Question 2**

What differences exist among various races (e.g., White, African American, Hispanic) and gender (i.e., male, female), as measured by the demographics questionnaire, between feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SFI; Szymanski, 2004), feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000), and self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995)?

**Hypothesis 2A.** Female participants will have higher ratings than male participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 2B.** White participants will have higher ratings than non-White participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy.

**Research Design**

The current study utilized data collected from undergraduate and graduate students at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, South Carolina. This study consisted of a quantitative, correlational survey research design that examined relationships among demographic factors (i.e., gender, race), feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy. Correlational research allows researchers to
assess the relationship between variables without manipulation, while also identifying strength and direction of the relationship (Smith & Davis, 2007). However, correlational research design does not allow the research to determine cause and effect relationships among variables (Smith & Davis, 2007). Prior to beginning the study, I obtained approval from the University of South Carolina’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once I received approval, I began data collection.

The current study included undergraduate and graduate students who volunteered to participate. Students who agreed to participate in the study completed either a paper version or an online version of the assessment (Survey Monkey). Students began the survey by reading the study information form (see Appendix B) and were then prompted to provide consent to participate. If students chose not to continue with the assessments, or wished to discontinue the survey at any time, they were allowed to do so without penalty. Participants then completed: (a) a researcher designed demographic form; (b) a scale assessing feminist self-identification; (c) a scale assessing feminist perspectives; (d) a scale assessing self-efficacy. Participants’ demographics are also included in subsequent chapters. A more detailed discussion of the methodology for this study is provided in Chapter 3 of this paper.

**Methodology**

Prior to beginning this study, I received approval from the University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). Data was collected in accordance with IRB guidelines. See IRB approval letter in Appendix A.

**Participants**

Participants for the study were enrolled as undergraduate or graduate students at
the University of South Carolina. There are currently 24,864 undergraduate students enrolled at the University, with this population being 46% male and 54% female. There are 8,108 graduate students enrolled at USC, comprised of 59% females and 41% males. Minorities comprise 21.6% of the undergraduate student population and 31.6% of the graduate student population. I contacted programs such as University 101 (containing approximately 4,000 students), FemCo (a feminist student organization), the Counselor Education and Supervision undergraduate minor program (containing approximately 250 students) and Education Specialist (EdS) program, National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC; historically African American or multicultural fraternities and sororities), and large undergraduate introductory courses (e.g., Psychology, Technology, Public Health) in order to recruit participants. I engaged in both active (e.g., face-to-face) and passive (e.g., email, word of mouth) recruitment strategies. Upon IRB approval, I obtained permission from course instructors and program coordinators to briefly speak with their students about participating in the study (i.e., active recruitment). Additionally, I sent emails about the study to professors who taught large undergraduate classes and requested they send study information to their students via email or Blackboard (i.e., passive recruitment). Yancey, Ortega, and Kumanyika (2006) noted that active recruitment strategies are more effective with culturally diverse participants, hence my intention to partner with programs for minority students (i.e., NPHC, TRIO programs). However, I received few responses in my attempts to contact organizations or groups which contained members of color. Therefore, I did not get the opportunity to utilize active recruitment strategies with some of these groups.

In order to be included in the study, participants had to be at least 18 years of age
and enrolled as an undergraduate or graduate student at the University of South Carolina. Nonprobability sampling (specifically, convenience sampling) was utilized to obtain participants for this study. Convenience sampling is less expensive, has fewer time-constraints, and participants can be recruited with relative ease (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). Despite its benefits, this sampling strategy may lead to an inadequate representation of various groups in a sample (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). This limitation of the study will be further discussed in Chapter 5. However, since little is known about the relationship between feminism and self-efficacy for men and minorities, convenience sampling may provide insight into whether or not a problem exists in a biased sample. Because convenience samples are typically already biased (Rubin & Babbie, 2011), uncovering the relationship between feminism and self-efficacy for men and minorities in a biased sample may provide valuable information into how to proceed in future studies with these two groups (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). In other words, if no significant differences exist for men and minorities on the outcome variables compared to women and non-minority participants in the biased sample, it may be unlikely that significant differences would exist in an unbiased sample (Rubin & Babbie, 2011).

I conducted an a priori analysis using G*Power 3.0.10 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Butchenew, 2008) to determine sample size and adequate power with each of the anticipated analyses. A priori power analyses helped determine the sample size necessary for adequate power (Balkin & Sheperis, 2011; Cohen, 1992), with larger sample sizes leading to less likelihood of a type II error, higher statistical power, and larger effects (Balkin & Sheperis, 2011). The a priori analysis conducted for the current dissertation utilized an alpha level of .05, moderate effect size of .06 (Cohen, 1992), and a
recommended power of .80 (Cohen, 1992). G*Power indicated a sample of 107 in order to achieve adequate power for research question one. The power analysis conducted for research question two indicated a sample of 265 participants for adequate power. Because a larger sample size ($n=265$) was indicated for research question two, the goal is to recruit at least 300 participants in order to avoid committing a Type II error. A Type II error occurs when the researcher fails to reject a false null hypothesis (Rubin & Babbie, 2011), meaning that the researcher reports finding no significant differences between groups when such differences may actually exist.

**Instruments**

The following instruments were administered to study participants: (a) a researcher designed demographic form; (b) Feminist Perspectives Scale-Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000); (c) General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995); and (d) Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF; Szymanski, 2004). In order to determine the level of reliability of each measure, a reliability analysis was performed for each instrument to determine Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$). Data for the each instrument’s reliability in this study is discussed in Chapter 4 of this dissertation. All instruments were completed by participants online using Survey Monkey, and results were transferred to SPSS for analysis.

**Demographics questionnaire.** The researcher-developed demographics questionnaire was collected basic demographic information from study participants. The form included questions about gender, age, years of education, year in school (e.g., freshman, sophomore, first year Master’s), and race. The demographics questionnaire was administered at the end of the survey. See Appendix C for a copy of the demographic
Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FSP3). The Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FSP3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000) is a 36-item scale which assessed feminist attitudes and feminist behavior. Of the 36 items on the instrument, 30 items measure feminist attitudes and 6 items measure feminist behavior. The 30 attitudinal items are comprised of 6 subscales: (a) Conservative; (b) Liberal Feminist; (c) Radical Feminist; (d) Social Feminist; (e) Cultural Feminist; (f) Woman of Color/Womanist). Responses were totaled for each subscale to obtain a total attitudinal score for each of the six subscales. These scores were then summed together to obtain a total score for feminist attitudes (i.e., Femscore3). Responses for the behavioral items were summed separately in order to produce a total score for feminist behavior (i.e., Fembehave3). The FSP3 has shown to have a high internal consistency for Femscore ($\alpha = .85$), although some of the subscales have shown alpha reliability $\leq .70$. However, Henley, Spalding, & Kosta (2000) suggested using a larger sample size (a sample of 209 was used in the development of the short version of this instrument) in order to increase reliability for the subscales.

General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE). The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) measured beliefs about general self-efficacy. The GSE is a 10 item scale which assesses one’s belief in their ability to respond to difficult situations and cope with associated obstacles. The 4 point Likert scale measured the extent to which each item applied to the participant, ranging from not at all true (1) to exactly true (4). Participant total scores can range from 10 to 40, with higher scores indicating higher general self-efficacy. The GSE has shown good internal consistency, ranging from .75 to
Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF). The Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF; Szymanski, 2004) is a 4 item scale which assessed explicit feminist identity and support of the goals and values of the feminist movement. Participants rated items on a 5 point Likert scale based on their level of agreement or disagreement with each item. A total SIF score was obtained by summing all 4 items, with higher scores indicating stronger identification as a feminist. Szymanski (2004) found an alpha reliability of .93 for the SIF.

Data Analyses

I conducted a preliminary analysis of the data in order to identify any outliers, missing data, and violations of assumptions. I used two statistical analyses to explore the two research questions for this study. I utilized a multiple regression to examine the relationships among the constructs of feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy (research question one) for all participants. For research question one, feminist self-identification (as measured by the SIF total score) and feminist perspectives (as measured by Femscore3 total score and Fembehave3 total score) served as the independent variables, while self-efficacy (as measured by the GSE total score) served as the dependent variable. I also tested for any violations of the assumptions of normality, multicollinearity, and singularity. I utilized a two-way factorial MANOVA to examine what differences exist for various races (e.g., White, African American, Hispanic) and gender (i.e., male, female) for feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy (research question two). For research question two, the independent variables were race and gender, while the dependent variables were self-identification as a feminist.
(as measured by the SIF total score), feminist perspectives (as measured by Femscore3 total score and Fembehave3 total score), and self-efficacy (as measured by the total GSE score). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 23.0, was utilized for all data analyses.

In order to ensure protection of participants’ rights, data were only be reported in aggregate form, with no identifying information connecting participants to their responses. All data were contained on a password protected laptop, and I was the only person with access to the data.

**Definition of Terms**

Following, I operationally defined terms or phrases for the purposes of the current study:

*Feminist:* Researchers have been unable to agree on a singular definition for what it means to be a feminist (Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011). While there are many interpretations of the term feminist, the term is largely viewed as a combination of one’s willingness to self-label as a feminist, espoused beliefs, and the connection between self-labeling and the endorsement of feminist beliefs (Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011). Some researchers have also highlighted the importance of understanding the label of feminist as being both an individual and collective identity (Kelly, 2015). And although the term feminist is typically connected to cohesive political ideas, some scholars underscore the connection of the feminist label to social movements and contexts (Kelly, 2015; Reger, 2012). The term feminist, for the purposes of this study, is defined as “a person who believes in the social, political, and economic equality of the sexes” (Adichie, 2012).

*Feminist self-labeling:* Feminist self-labeling is the act of identifying as a
feminist. More specifically, self-labeling as a feminist is “a binary choice that either links, or does not link, a woman to feminists as a social group” (Yoder, Tobias, and Snell, 2011). This label may be adopted publicly (i.e., proclaiming to be feminist to others) or privately (i.e., considering oneself to be a feminist without identifying as a feminist to other people) (Kelly, 2015; Leaper & Arias, 2011; Myaskovsky & Witting, 1997).

However, some scholars view feminist self-labeling as part of a feminist identity continuum (Aronson, 2003; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004), which may be more applicable to individuals who came of age during “third wave” feminism (Kelly, 2015). As such, this study includes a measure that assesses for feminist identity and self-labeling on a continuum (see Chapter 3).

**Feminism:** For the purposes of this study, feminism is defined as a political and social movement focused on political, social, and economic equality between men and women (Kelly, 2015). Reger (2012) further explains the complexity of the term by saying that feminism can simultaneously be both “everywhere” (i.e., influential on a person’s worldviews, culture, and social norms) and “nowhere” (i.e., explicit feminist activism is limited or unseen).

**Self-efficacy:** Self-efficacy one’s belief in their capacity to achieve a desired outcome (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is a component of self-esteem that influences an individual’s perception of his or her ability to obtain expected results (Eisele & Stake, 2008). An important aspect of social cognitive theory, Bandura (1997) explains that self-efficacy affects an individual’s feelings (e.g., anxiety, depression), thoughts (e.g., motivation, decision making), and actions (e.g., effort, recovery from setbacks). Additionally, Bandura (1977) suggests the following four factors significantly impact
one’s self-efficacy: (a) mastery experiences; (b) social modeling; (c) social persuasion; and (d) physiological factors.

**Limitations**

One limitation of this study is that it is unknown if students who choose to participate in the study are similar to those who do not choose to participate on their identification as feminists, self-efficacy levels, perspectives on feminism, and intentions to engage in activism. For example, participants who chose to engage in this study may have done so because they already have strong, polarized feelings or views (positive or negative) towards feminism, which could skew data. Nonprobability sampling (specifically, convenience sampling) was utilized to obtain participants for this study. Although convenience sampling is less expensive and has fewer time-constraints than other sampling methods, it may lead to an inadequate representation of various groups in my sample (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). However, the researcher can attempt to improve convenience sampling by making efforts to control and to assess the representative nature of the survey sample (Henry, 1990). For example, I recruited participants from majors who are not typically included in research on feminism and self-efficacy (e.g., Public Health, Exercise Science, Technology). Additionally, I compared sample demographics to those of the USC student population to assess representativeness (see Chapter 3).

This study was also delimited to students who were in undergraduate or graduate study at one four year institution in the Southeast. This limitation could also affect both the internal and external validity of the study, as geographic location may have impacted participants’ views on feminism and feminist perspectives. Additionally, using one university in the Southeast affects the generalizability of results to the general population
of young adults (Rubin & Babbie, 2011).

An additional limitation was the norming populations for the instruments utilized in this study. For example, the Feminist Perspectives Scale (FPS3) was normed on predominantly White and Asian undergraduates. Therefore, results may vary for members of other ethnic groups and for graduate students. The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) was originally normed on German citizens; however, it has since been normed on individuals from 25 different countries (including the United States). The Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF) was normed on predominantly White, gay or bisexual undergraduate women and therefore may not reflect similar outcomes for students of color, males, or students who do not identify as gay or bisexual.

**Summary**

Despite the potential positive benefits of identifying as a feminist, negative stereotypes and beliefs about feminism continue to discourage men and women from self-labeling. By examining the relationships among self-identification as a feminist, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy, findings from this study may aid counselors and counselor educators in better supporting and understanding how to work with young adult students or clients. And as feminism continues to become a more popular issue or identity being adopted, counselors and counselor educators have an ethical responsibility to better understand its impact on clients, supervisees, and students, as well as how their own beliefs about women and feminism can affect their work with others. Subsequent chapters review current literature on feminist labeling, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy (Chapter 2), discuss the methodology of the current study (Chapter 3), provide results from the current study (Chapter 4), and discuss conclusions and suggestions for
future research on the proposed topic (Chapter 5).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to find relevant articles for this topic, I utilized the Encore search engine provided by The Thomas Cooper Library at the University of South Carolina. I used “feminism,” “feminist label,” “feminist identification,” “feminist self-labeling,” “feminist beliefs,” “feminist perspectives,” “feminist attitudes,” “self-esteem,” “self-efficacy.” Upon researching these terms, I noticed the Sex Roles and Psychology of Women Quarterly were two journals that published the most articles related to my topic. I then conducted a search of my terms within these specific journals. In reading journal articles, I also used the references listed in previous research to locate possible articles for the current study.

While women have been at the forefront of each wave of the feminist movement, men have become the focus of campaigns like the United Nation’s HeForShe (2015), which encourages support and activism from males in order to end gender inequality across the world. And while men and women frequently report agreeing with feminist ideas and tenets, they rarely self-label as feminists due to fear that they will be perceived negatively and inaccurately by others (Anderson, 2009; McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Because identifying as a feminist can impact self-esteem, self-efficacy, and desire to engage in advocacy (Elise & Stake, 2008; Leaper & Arias, 2011; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999; Wiley et al., 2012; Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011) it is an important area of inquiry for
counselors and counselor educators. For example, empowerment is an important component of feminism, and individuals who feel more empowered about an issue may feel more encouraged and more capable to enact change on behalf of that issue (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Zimmerman, 1995). The proposed link between empowerment and advocacy may illuminate important knowledge regarding the relationship between self-efficacy and advocacy in general. However, women’s gender consciousness and collective action efforts have typically been weaker than that of other groups, despite women generally being more aware of gender issues than men (Aronson, 2003).

Additionally, research in this area of inquiry has underrepresented perspectives of men, minorities, or lower socioeconomic status participants. This chapter discusses previous research regarding the evolution of feminism, factors affecting feminist identification, and the relationships between and among feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy. A discussion of the theoretical framework and brief summary of this chapter are also included.

**Evolution of Feminism**

As society and cultural context has continued to change over time, so have the goals and ideologies of feminists (Phillips & Cree, 2014). Although feminism may have begun before the late 1840s, it was during this time period that the first collective efforts for women’s rights began (Phillips & Cree, 2014). Today, there is some debate as to whether we are in a third wave of feminism, or if we have crossed into a fourth wave. While previous waves of feminism have included more singular views and identities for group members, feminism today consists of more varied opinions about what it means to be a feminist and how identification as a feminist is expressed (Heywood & Drake, 1997;
Aronson, 2003). Information about each wave, along with the current state of feminism, is discussed below.

**First Wave of Feminism (Late 1840s-1920s)**

With urban industrialization and a move towards more liberal politics in the late 19\(^{th}\) century came the first wave of feminism in the United States. The Industrial Revolution resulted in more women finding full-time work outside of the home, which also provided women with various opportunities to engage in discussions about social and political issues. First wave feminists focused on a variety of issues affecting women and children, such as: (a) the right for women to own property; (b) women’s suffrage; (c) access to higher education; (d) protecting women and children from prostitution; and (e) raising the age of sexual consent for women (Cree, 1996). First wave feminists also believed that women were morally superior to men and rooted their goals in the idea that men and women “inhabited separate spheres,” with the hope of bringing female influence into a male-dominated world (Phillips & Cree, 2014). However, this wave mostly consisted of middle-class, heterosexual White women and did not take into account perspectives of other classes, races, or sexual orientations (Phillips & Cree, 2014).

**Second Wave of Feminism (Early 1960s-Late 1980s)**

Women’s work and family lives were transformed yet again both during and after World War II. In the post-WWII world, political views became more liberal and women’s roles both inside and outside the home continued to evolve. By the 1960s, the civil rights movement and Vietnam War were heavy influences on the increasingly radical political ideologies and activist efforts. This context can be seen throughout the second wave of feminism, when feminists began to see “individual, social and political
inequalities as inevitably interlinked,” (Phillips & Cree, 2014) as evidenced by the introduction of the feminist slogan “the personal is political” during this time frame. Second wave feminists continued their focus on some of the same issues as first wave feminists (i.e., equality in educational access, protection of women from prostitution) (Cree, 1996). However, the introduction of the contraceptive pill influenced second wave feminists’ interest in reproductive rights for women (including abortion), equality in the workplace, and rape and domestic violence against women (Phillips & Cree, 2014). Additionally, all of the societal changes during this time helped illuminate that differences do exist among women, and that feminists had not been including the perspectives of women who were not White or middle-class (Ramazanoglu, 1989).

**Third and Fourth Waves of Feminism (Late 1980s-present)**

The third wave of feminism embraced more ambiguity regarding the definition of what it means to be a feminist. Third wave feminists accepted the idea of different feminist ideologies, saw gender as an expression not a biological condition, and encouraged the involvement of men in feminism (Phillips & Cree, 2014). Feminists also began examining intersections of gender and other forms of oppression (Wrye, 2009). Although feminist ideology continues to evolve, there is currently some debate as to whether or not we have entered into a fourth wave of feminism. Proponents of a fourth wave argue that technology and media have vastly changed how we are presently viewing and understanding what it means to be a feminist (Phillips & Cree, 2014). With various campaigns aimed at increasing awareness of feminist issues (e.g., BanBossy, LikeAGirl, HeForShe), social media and endorsement of feminism by public figures has re-ignited conversations about what the feminist label means and who can claim it. For
young adults who have come of age in the 21st century (i.e., Millennials, Generation Y), technology and social media are viewed as a normal part of life, and therefore exert powerful influence over this and younger generations. However, Zucker (2004) argues that education, personal relationships, and personal struggles are greater influences on feminist identity and perceptions of feminism, whereas exposure to media creates barriers to feminist identification. Young adults use sites like Twitter and Facebook to share political thoughts and opinions with the world. And with the continued evolution of feminism, the parameters of feminist characteristics regarding sexuality, employment, and reproduction also continue to expand. The most recent wave of feminism has also developed a “call-out culture” in which social media is used to address all forms of oppression in an effort to include and support minority groups, working to eliminate power differentials and eradicate previous negative perceptions about feminists (Phillips & Cree, 2014).

**Factors Affecting Feminist Identification**

While men and women frequently report agreeing with feminist ideas and tenets, they rarely self-label as feminists (McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Despite potential positive benefits to identifying as feminist, a variety of factors inhibit individuals from self-labeling as a feminist. Negative stereotypes and beliefs about feminism, gender socialization, minority status, and gender all impact one’s choice regarding whether or not they identify as a feminist.

**Negative Perceptions of Feminism and Feminists**

One explanation for the negative beliefs about feminists and feminism is the development and maintenance of negative stereotypes (Dottolo, 2011). Even when
women do label themselves as feminists, they believe that “typical” feminists are different than them and more radical in their views (Anderson, 2009; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Negative portrayals of feminists in the media contribute to these beliefs and may make people hesitant to identify with a group that is not valued or seen in a positive light (Wiley et al., 2012). Roy et al. (2007) found that college-aged women who were exposed to positive portrayals of feminists were twice as likely to identify with feminism compared to women exposed to negative or neutral portrayals. When investigating the reasons behind the hesitation to self-label as a feminist, one of the most frequently expressed reasons from both men and women is the fear that they will be perceived negatively and inaccurately by others (Anderson, 2009; McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Zucker, 2004). For example, research has shown that while feminist women are thought of as being more intelligent, confident, and productive, they are also thought of as being lesbians, less attractive, and volatile (McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Suter & Toller, 2006; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Men who identify as feminists are typically seen as being less masculine, more likely to be gay, and less attractive than non-feminist men (Anderson, 2009; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). However, women rated feminist men as being more warm, affectionate, and kinder than men in general (Anderson, 2009). Anderson (2009) posits that this more negative stigma for feminist men may be due to the fact that the feminist label is most commonly linked to women. So while feminist men may be seen more positively than non-feminist men, they typically do not receive as much respect (Wiley et al., 2011). Liss, Hoffner, and Crawford (2000) even found that women who identify as feminists still consider other feminists to be more radical in their thinking and behavior. Alexander and Ryan (1997) found that only one
out of thirty-six women self-identified as a feminist without attempting to qualify the label with statements about her background, sexuality, and specific feminist beliefs. Twenge and Zucker (1999) also found that overall women viewed feminists as being “not like me.” Further, women in this study felt that others possess extremely negative stereotypes and views about feminists, even if the participants themselves did not share the same views. These studies illuminate the deep impact that negative stereotypes of feminism have on those who self-label as feminists. Feminist men are often characterized as being gay, less masculine, and having more stereotypically feminine qualities (e.g., emotional, submissive, physically weaker) (McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). Dottolo (2011) also asserted that feminism is often demonized because in-groups react with fear and anger when out-groups make attempts to gain more power; therefore, stereotypes are created and maintained in an effort to preserve the status quo.

However, research has suggested that having positive perceptions of feminists and feeling connected to women can buffer the fear of being perceived negatively by others and increase the likelihood that someone will self-identify as a feminist (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Roy, Weibust, & Miller; 2007; Wiley et al., 2012). Even brief exposure to positive portrayals of feminists has shown to positively influence perceptions of feminism, as well as increase the desire to participate in collective action for women (Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Wiley et al., 2012). Roy, Weibust, and Miller (2007) tested this notion in a study of 414 undergraduate female psychology students. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three paragraph conditions: (1) positive stereotypes about feminists; (2) negative stereotypes about feminists; or (3) control
paragraph that discussed a general topic unrelated to feminism. After reading the paragraph, participants completed a feminist attitudes scale, measure of feminist identification, gender identification scale, and performance self-esteem measure. Lastly, participants completed an assessment to measure their perceived ability to evaluate the paragraph they read. Roy, Weibust, and Miller (2007) found that participants in the positive portrayal group were nearly twice as likely (30.8%) to label themselves as feminists compared to the negative portrayal group and control group, whose scores were not significantly different from each other (18% and 16.7%, respectively). However, Roy et al. (2007) indicated that women exposed to the positive portrayal condition did not significantly differ from the negative portrayal or control groups on their scores for endorsement of feminist attitudes. Women in the positive portrayal group who identified as feminists had greater nontraditional gender role attitudes and higher performance self-esteem (“expressing confidence about one’s ability to meet challenges” [Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007]) than participants in the other two groups. The sample in this study consisted of predominantly white, heterosexual females, as is the case with most of the studies mentioned in this chapter.

**Gender Socialization and Gender Beliefs**

Feminism often seems to be viewed as an oppositional, exclusive idea from masculinity for men and from femininity for women. Twenge and Zucker (1999) asked college students to develop a story based on one of two prompts: (a) “Michelle calls herself a feminist,” or (b) “Michael calls himself a feminist.” While participants wrote positive statements about both Michael and Michelle, there were significantly more negative assertions written about both the feminist man and feminist woman; however,
more negative statements were written about Michael compared to Michelle (e.g., "Michael is a cross-dresser by night"). Further, participants in the study more often attributed assertive or masculine characteristics to Michelle and weaker or more feminine qualities to Michael. However, Breen and Karpinski (2008) found that when asked to comparatively rate non-feminist and feminist women, feminist women were overall rated more positively than non-feminist women. Conversely, participants in the study rated feminist men much lower than non-feminist men. Breen and Karpinski (2008) did not report a difference in how participants rated feminist men compared to feminist women, Anderson (2009) performed a t test on the available data from the original Breen and Karpinski (2008) study and found that participants rated feminist men significantly less favorably than feminist women. Gourley and Anderson (2007) had somewhat different findings when they asked college-aged students to rate a female feminist speaker, a male feminist speaker, a female non-feminist speaker, and a male non-feminist speaker. Overall ratings for the feminist speakers (both male and female) and for the non-feminist speakers (both male and female) did not significantly differ; nevertheless, students were more likely to label the male feminist speaker as being gay or bisexual compared to the other speakers. Anderson (2009) also produced contradictory findings regarding ratings of feminist men and feminist women, with participants rating the term “feminist man” more favorably than “feminist woman.” And while women’s ratings for “feminist woman” were not significantly different from their ratings for “man” or woman,” men’s ratings for “feminist woman” were the lowest of all of the other aforementioned terms. Further, Anderson (2009) found that men and women in the study rated feminist men as being less masculine and more likely to be gay. And while women in the study rated
feminist men more favorably than non-feminist men overall, they also rated them as less sexually attractive than non-feminist men. Therefore, this study will compare men’s and women’s feminist identity and perceptions on feminism in order to understand existing similarities and differences.

**Minorities, Men, and Feminism**

While several studies have investigated how such issues affect White college-aged women, perspectives from ethnic and racial minorities and men in the same age group have not been well represented. Previous research has suggested that status as a minority may make individuals more likely to engage in advocacy for other minority groups (Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Wiley et al., 2012), some researchers believe that this may not be the case with feminism, as it may only align with the issues and experiences of White, middle class women (Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). And while some female feminists do not believe that men should be a target of feminist campaigns, hooks (1984) presented the following argument: “since men are the primary agents maintaining and supporting sexism and sexist oppression, they can only be successfully eradicated if men are compelled to assume responsibility for transforming their consciousness and the consciousness of society as a whole.” Despite the common belief that feminism is only for women, men are also directly affected by anti-feminist perspectives; this is because, like women, men are not an “ahistorical, universal, and foxed category of analysis” (Mohanty, 1988). These antifeminist perspectives, sometimes referred to as “postfeminism” are rooted in the belief that gender and sexual equality has been achieved, ruling feminism as outdated and unnecessary (O’Neill, 2015).

In order to assess for gender differences in perceptions about feminists, Anderson
(2009) randomly assigned 404 college students to complete semantic differential ratings (Pierce et al., 2003) for one of four groups: (a) “man;” (b) “woman;” (c) “feminist man;” or (d) “feminist woman.” Participants were then asked to complete a demographics questionnaire and a feminist identification assessment (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997). On the feminist identification assessment, participants were asked to select one of the following statements regarding their stance on the feminist label: (1) I do not consider myself a feminist at all, and I believe that feminist are harmful to family life and undermine relationship between men and women; (2) I do not consider myself a feminist; (3) I agree with some of the objectives of the feminist movement but do not call myself a feminist; (4) I agree with most of the objectives of the feminist movement but do not call myself a feminist; (5) I privately consider myself a feminist but do not call myself a feminist around others; (6) I call myself a feminist around others; or (7) I call myself a feminist around others and am currently active in the women’s movement. The corresponding numbers indicate the level of feminist identification; therefore, a higher number indicates stronger identification as a feminist and a lower number indicates weaker identification as a feminist. The majority of men in the study (59.7%) did not identify as feminists by selecting one of the first two statements, but 32.6% of men said that they agreed with some feminist objectives but did not call themselves feminists (which was the most popular choice of female participants in the study [45.4%]). However, less than 1% of men identified as feminist either publicly or privately compared to nearly 7% of women.

Wiley et al. (2012) also sought to illuminate men’s perspectives on feminism. In their study, they presented male participants with one of three paragraphs: (1) positive
portrayal of feminist men; (2) negative portrayal of feminist men; (3) a history of feminism that did not mention feminist men (control condition). Participants then completed a scale to measure feminist solidarity and an assessment for collective action intentions. Both measures asked items that were rated on a 7-point Likert scale, with scores being averaged; higher scores indicated higher levels of the measure variables. Wiley et al. (2012) found that the brief exposure to positive portrayals of feminist men positively influenced participants’ score on the feminist solidarity scale and the collective action scale, while negative portrayals did not decrease scores on either measure. Therefore, providing permission for men to be feminists and emphasizing positive characteristics of feminist men may transform negative beliefs about feminist men. These results underscore the importance of having positive portrayals of feminists, how such portrayals influence self-labeling and advocacy intentions, and why the impact of increased media exposure about feminism may be important to understand. Wiley et al. (2012) also posited that it may not be the presence of negative stereotypes that impact men’s beliefs about feminism and feminist identification, but that it instead may be largely impacted by the absence of overall positive regard for feminist men. This may also hold true for minority groups, as positive portrayals of minority feminists may not be as available.

**Masculinity.** Ideas of masculinity and manhood are just as rigid as notions of femininity and womanhood, and when men exhibit characteristics that are deemed more appropriate for women they are viewed as being less manly (Ratele, 2013). For example, men are traditionally taught that emotional expression (e.g., crying) indicates weakness or femininity (Wallace, 2007). Mahalik and colleagues (2003) proposed the following
traditional masculinity norms: winning, emotional control, risk-taking, power over women, violence, dominance, playboy (i.e., being emotional uninvolved in sexual relationships), primacy of work, self-reliance, disdain for homosexuals, and pursuit of status. When men ascribe to traditional masculinity, they are more likely to experience greater psychological distress (Mahalik et al., 2003), to engage in substance abuse (Mahalik, Lagan, & Morrison, 2006), and to exhibit hostile behavior (Jackupcak, Tull, & Roemer, 2005). Black men who exhibit traditionally masculine behaviors may experience poorer mental health outcomes, such as depression and low self-esteem (Mahalik, Pierre, & Wan, 2006). Further, Ratele (2013) purports that Black men may feel even more pressure to fulfill societal expectations of manhood, as race may be a competing force with gender. For example, although a Black man may be in a dominant position as a male, they may still feel subordinate and experience oppression because of their race; therefore, they may feel the need to overcompensate with traditional masculinity in order to counteract feeling subordinate due to their race. However, some research has indicated that Black men define masculinity differently, including concepts of responsibility, maturity, sacrifice, and accountability in their definition (Mincey et al., 2014).

Men ascribing to traditional masculinity norms has also been shown to negatively affect their female partners. For example, women reported lower relationship satisfaction and self-worth (Burn & Ward 2005) and higher levels of anxiety and depression (Rochlen & Mahalik, 2004) when their male partners embodied traditional masculinity. Further, traditionally masculine husbands in heterosexual, dual-career households were less likely to share childcare and housekeeping responsibilities with their wives, despite both partners having equitable income (Mintz & Mahalik, 1996). Research has also suggested
that traditionally masculine men are more violent in general (Courtenay, 2000), and they are more likely to engage in relationship violence (Mahalik, Aldarondo, Gilbert-Gokhale, & Shore, 2005) and sexual assault (Locke & Mahalik, 2005). This demonstrates the feminist understanding that the sociopolitical context of male privilege negatively impacts the psychological, social, economic, and political development of both men and women (Brady-Amoon, 2011).

**Intersectionality.** Intersectionality acknowledges that every person has multiple identities (e.g., race, class, gender), which create interdependent systems of discrimination (Love, 2016). As individuals occupy different roles, they have different access to power and resources, acting as the oppressed in some settings and the oppressor in others (Alinia, 2015). In other words, a Black man may be privileged in some settings due to his gender, but in other settings his is penalized (i.e., oppressed) due to his race. Although individuals occupy multiple identities, those who have competing identities may sometimes feel like they have to choose one identity over the other. For example, like Black men, Black women may feel torn between their race and gender when issues of inequality arise. No matter what identity they choose, they will be “taking sides against the self” (Collins, 2000). Historically, Black women have chosen to take the side of race instead of gender, possibly realizing that Black men are also still oppressed (Alinia, 2015). Therefore, Black women may choose to unite against the common enemy of racial inequality, “ignoring internal injustice” (i.e., injustice against women) (Collins, 2000), possibly decreasing the number of Black women who engage in activism for issues other than racism.

While the struggle of each oppressed group is related to other social justice issues,
each group’s experience is also dependent of other social justice problems (Alinia, 2015). In other words, oppressed groups are created and defined in relation to each other; however, inequity of power and resource access between those groups still remains. Collins (2000) argues that self-reflexivity, dialogue across oppressed groups, and mutual support is needed. Collins (2000) further suggests that in order to enact political change, groups must stop identifying people as either the oppressed or the oppressor, and instead recognize individual and group identities. Collins’ (2000) notion of mutual support across oppressed groups also strengthens the argument that minority status may increase the likelihood that an individual will engage in supporting minority groups outside of their own (Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Wiley et al., 2012).

**Black feminism.** The experience of Black women in America is unique and complex due to similar experiences with racism, sexism, and stereotyping (Love, 2016). Black feminism focuses on this unique experience, acknowledging the intersectionality of identities like race, class, and gender. Additionally, Black feminism highlights the relationship between power and knowledge, while also questioning the notion of objective knowledge (Alinia, 2015). Another tenet of Black feminist thought is that no one group can obtain power without oppressing other groups; this is based on the belief that each group decides which form of oppression is most important, thereby deeming others as less important (Alinia, 2015). Black feminists also believe that power flows among one’s privileged identities, providing varying levels of privilege and resources depending on the setting (Collins, 2000). Additionally, Black feminism focuses on activism and shared history, with the shared experiences of being a Black women in America being essential for consciousness raising and mobilizing resistance efforts
(Collins, 2000). However, Black feminism also acknowledges that the collective identity of “Black woman” contains internal differences due to varying positions in sexual orientation, social class, education, age, and religion. These internal differences are important to note, as saliency of oppression type may impact an individual’s ability to view other forms of oppression as equally important. Further, because traditional feminism has previously focused primarily on the issues more salient to White women, it is important to understand why individuals who ascribe to Black feminism may not support some feminist issues. Additionally, if an individual is unaware of what traditional feminism is due to a lack of education about the topic (Kelly, 2015), it is also unlikely that they would be informed about Black feminism. Consequently, a lack of education about Black feminism, combined with a belief that traditional feminism is only for White women, may reduce the likelihood of African American women identifying as feminists.

**Impact of geographic region.** Because data for the current study was collected solely in the southeastern United States, it is important to understand the potential impact of geographic region on feminist identification and perspectives. Traditionally, individuals living in the northern United States and individuals living in the southern United States are thought to have different, and often opposing, views on issues like politics and gender role expectations. Southerners are expected to be more religious and more traditional in their views on gender roles compared to non-southerners (Hurlbert 1989; Rice and Coates, 1995; Twenge, 1997). Additionally, research suggests regional differences for racial attitudes and gender-role attitudes, with white southerners exhibited more racial prejudice than northerners (Kulinski et al., 1997). While traditional gender attitudes are encouraged for both southern men and women, expectations for women’s
behavior are more defined and more mandated by culture than expectations for men’s behavior (Suior & Carter, 1999). It is also important to note the impact of religion and political affiliation on gender role attitudes and feminist perspectives, as the south is a predominantly conservative, Christian region. In a study conducted by Lottes and Kuriloff (1992), individuals who were more politically liberal were less accepting of traditional masculinity and negative attitudes about homosexuality, more accepting of feminist attitudes, and less traditional in attitudes about female sexuality. Further, Morgan (1987) found that religious devoutness was a significant predictor of traditional gender role attitudes.

**Relationship between Feminism and Self-Efficacy**

Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as one’s belief in their capacity to achieve a desired outcome. An important component of social cognitive theory, self-efficacy affects an individual’s feelings (e.g., depression, anxiety, depression), thoughts (e.g., motivation, decision making, academic achievement), and actions (e.g., anticipating outcome scenarios, exertion of effort, recovery from setbacks) (Bandura, 1997). Further, one’s belief in their self-efficacy determines the initiation of coping behaviors, the amount of effort presented, and the amount of time someone will continue to exert effort when they encounter obstacles (Bandura, 1997). This seems particularly important for individuals who publically identify as feminists, as higher self-efficacy may act as a buffer when they face adverse experiences related to the feminist label. Additionally, because individuals with high self-efficacy are more likely to select challenging environments, they may already be prepared for obstacles that arise out of the declaration of their feminist identity. Bandura (1977) also posited that self-efficacy beliefs are derived from the
following four sources: (a) performance accomplishments; (b) vicarious experiences; (c) verbal persuasion; and (d) physiological states. Performance accomplishments are an individual’s experiences with mastery and are the most influential factor in determining self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). When an individual successfully executes a task or a skill, that success serves as evidence of his or her ability to accomplish that goal, thereby increasing their self-efficacy. Conversely, failure will likely decrease an individual’s self-efficacy. Vicarious experiences (i.e., modeling) provide individuals with external examples of a target goal being obtained. In other words, if individuals see other people succeeding at a task, they may be more likely to believe that they can be successful at accomplishing that same task. While this factor is not as influential as mastery experiences in increasing self-efficacy, it may be particularly useful for individuals who have low levels of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Verbal persuasion, or social persuasion, is direct encouragement or discouragement from another person that has the ability to impact an individual’s perceived self-efficacy. Finally, self-efficacy can be impacted by physiological states. When an individual experiences emotional or physical responses to a stressor, it is his or her interpretation of those responses that can impact levels of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). In other words, if a person experiences heart palpitations and a fluttering sensation in their stomach before giving a speech, his or her self-efficacy may be negatively impacted if he or she perceives those responses as an indicator of unpreparedness. However, individuals with higher self-efficacy are more likely to identify such sensations as normal psychological responses to stress (Bandura, 1977). By adjusting any one of these four factors, an individual is thereby impacting their self-efficacy beliefs.
Roy, Weibust, and Miller (2007) found that women exposed to positive portrayals of feminists not only had greater nontraditional gender role attitudes, but also had higher performance self-esteem, which the researchers defined as “expressing confidence about one’s ability to meet challenges.” (p. 154). This definition of performance self-esteem is almost identical to the definition of self-efficacy used in the current study. Adoption of feminist beliefs has also been linked with higher body satisfaction, feeling more attractive, and having an increased ability to cope with societal pressures about appearance expectations (Kinsaul et al., 2014). Further, Kinsaul et al. (2014) found that self-efficacy was a significant predictor of such factors for college-aged women. In the same study, self-efficacy explained more variance in beliefs about one’s body than feminism itself, suggesting that self-efficacy is a crucial piece in understanding the mental health of college-aged women. And while identification as a feminist may encourage positive mental health, identifying as a feminist may not be as important as an individual adopting feminist attitudes due to the negative stereotypes about feminists (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Twenge & Zucker, 1999). In other words, feminist identification may not be necessary for positive mental health outcomes because of the heavy stigmatization of the feminist label.

Zucker (2004) examined the effect of feminist identity on feminist activism in college-aged women. Participants completed a feminist identification measure, a feminist consciousness assessment, a questionnaire inquiring about favorable conditions for adopting feminist identity (i.e., exposure to feminism through education, personal relationships, and personal struggles), a questionnaire about barriers to feminist identification, two measures to assess feminist activism (i.e., Feminist Identity
Development Scale [Bargad & Hyde, 1991]), and a behavioral index created by the researchers). Results suggested that being exposed to feminism in various contexts influences feminist identification; in particular, participants who identified as feminists had more exposure to feminism in the favorable conditions categories. Further, the feminists in the study rated higher on feminist consciousness and experiences of sexism compared to non-feminists and egalitarians (i.e., participants who agreed with feminist ideas but did not label themselves as feminists). Lastly, participants who identified as feminists were more likely to engage in feminist activism, regardless of favorable conditions or barriers to feminist identification. This finding illuminates the link between feminism and advocacy, suggesting that feminist identification is a better predictor of social justice participation, even if individuals are faced adverse conditions or possible negative consequences.

**Theoretical Foundation**

**Feminist Theory**

Feminist theory shares many common threads with multicultural counseling theories (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; Goodman et al., 2004) that are currently taught in counselor education programs. Such similarities between feminist and multicultural principles include: (a) identifying social oppression as a contributor to mental health issues; (b) the belief that mental health symptoms are often the result of oppressive conditions, not of pathology; and (c) the importance of clients learning ways to cope with oppression in their everyday lives (Goodman et al., 2004).

Another core component of feminist theory is the call for on-going self-evaluation. Without being aware of deeply rooted, automatic biases and stereotypes,
counselors and counselor educators are unaware of how racial dynamics and their conceptualization of treatment and pathology interfere with their thoughts, behaviors, and reactions to clients (Helms & Cook, 1999). Similarly, awareness of one’s biases and prejudices allows counselors and counselor educators to be aware of their inability to be value-free and to clarify such values in a transparent manner with clients, students, or supervisees (Enns, 1997). Because multicultural approaches are highly valued in today’s counselor education programs, understanding feminist theory as well seems like a logical next step for counselor educators. For example, both feminist and multicultural approaches place a heavy emphasis on social justice, acknowledging that “social justice work is the social context in addition to or instead of the individual” (Goodman et al., 2004, p. 795). And while feminism has been criticized for originating from a place of White privilege and power (Dill, 1983), evolving feminist perspectives are more inclusive and aware of the experiences and worldviews of non-White women (Goodman et al., 2004). Feminist theory also lends itself to this study because of its focus on empowerment and facilitating consciousness raising (Corey, 2009). Empowerment consists of one’s perceived personal power, as well as one’s general sense of positive self-regard, which includes self-esteem and self-efficacy (Kinsaul et al., 2014). Group consciousness is a concept which consists of both group identification (e.g., feminist self-labeling) and awareness of existing inequities, with the intention to take action on behalf of the group (Kinsaul et al., 2014).

**Social Cognitive Theory**

Social cognitive theory can also be used to help understand the constructs being examined in this study, particularly with the college-aged population. Social cognitive
theory (SCT) posits that individuals’ beliefs in their abilities to influence the environment shape their actions in order to produce desired outcomes (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). As societal views on sexual mores, family structure, and gender roles continue to evolve, stereotypes continue to be influenced primarily by culture, not by inherent biological differences between men and women (Khajehpour, Ghazvini, Memari, & Rhamani, 2011). Khajehpour et al. (2011) elaborate on this idea by suggesting that modeling is the most powerful means of transmitting cultural values, attitudes and behaviors, and thought patterns across generations. While modeling can occur through direct observation of others, media may also serve as a source from which individuals model behavior. When modeling occurs, the observer extracts underlying rules of behaviors and goes slightly beyond what they have observed, generating new patterns of behavior (Khajehpour, 2011). However, emotional state and preconceptions the observer possesses serve as prejudicial influences. This underscores the important roles of stereotypes and portrayals of feminists and feminism in media. However, Khajehpour et al. (2011) found that self-efficacy beliefs are vital in the attainment and maintenance of gender stereotypes and beliefs about appropriate behavior. Because young adults tend to be more susceptible to the media’s influence on their behavior and beliefs (Austin, Vord, Pinkleton & Epstein, 2008; Jackson, 2005), using a social cognitive theory lens to explain the potential power of this influence on feminist identification may be useful. Further, tenets of social cognitive theory may help explain why individuals choose to identify or not identify as feminists (e.g., learning as a cognitive process in a social context, vicarious reinforcement). Social cognitive theory may also help to explain the relationship between self-efficacy and advocacy, as those with higher levels of self-efficacy may persist with
action despite unfavorable circumstances as long as they believe their efforts will produce the expected results (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Social cognitive theory also helps explain how observed behavior (i.e., modeling) can influence values, attitudes, and thoughts, thereby affecting stereotypes and regulation of gender roles that are typically associated with the feminist label (Khajehpour et al., 2011). Thus, incorporating feminist theory and social cognitive theory (SCT) provides both a political/social lens and a learned behavior (i.e., modeling) lens through which to view the impact of feminist labeling and feminist perspectives on self-efficacy in undergraduate and graduate students.

**Summary**

While previous studies have examined variables related to feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy, there have been gaps in the research. One of the biggest gaps is related to diversity among samples. The majority of previous studies have investigated how such issues affect primarily White, college-aged, middle-class women, with perspectives from ethnic and racial minorities and men in the same age group being underrepresented. Subsequent chapters discuss the methodology of the current study (Chapter 3), provide results from the current study (Chapter 4), and discuss conclusions and suggestions for future research on the proposed topic (Chapter 5).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Despite women being more aware of gender-related issues than men, women’s gender consciousness and collective action efforts have been weaker than that of other groups (Aronson, 2003). Previous research on such issues have primarily examined the impact on White, college-aged women, either excluding or underrepresenting male and minority perspectives (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Kinsaul et al., 2014; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999; Zucker, 2004). While some researchers believe that minority status makes an individual more likely to support minority groups outside of their own (Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Wiley et al., 2012), other researchers speculate that feminism may be an exception due its origins in White, middle-class culture (Aronson, 2003; Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). In an effort to be more inclusive, third wave feminism consists of more diverse views on feminist identity and expression of that identity, a contrast to the more singular views of previous waves of feminism (Aronson, 2003; Heywood & Drake, 1997). Such variance in beliefs may cause confusion, possibly contributing to the reluctance to self-label as a feminist while still aligning with feminist perspectives (Kelly, 2015). Researchers have suggested that feminist perspectives are linked with positive mental health outcomes such as higher perceived physical attractiveness, a more positive body image (Kinsaul, Curtin, Bazzini, & Martz, 2014), and improvement in coping with societal pressures (Rubin, Nemeroff, & Russo, 2004). Due to the potential benefits of
feminist identification, as well as the continuous evolution of what it means to be a feminist, examining how young adults view feminism and how they incorporate the label and perspectives into their identities is important for counselors and counselor educators. By understanding how students or clients incorporate the feminist label and feminist perspectives into their identity can potentially provide guidance for their work with students or clients while also encouraging a more trusting, collaborative relationship.

Thus, the current dissertation aimed to (a) examine relationships among feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy; and (b) explore existing differences for race and gender on feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy in undergraduate and graduate students.

**Research Questions & Hypotheses**

This study explored the relationships among demographic variables (e.g., race, gender), feminist perspectives, feminist identification, and self-efficacy in young adults. As such, the following research questions were examined.

**Research Question 1**

What relationship exists among feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy? Specifically, can feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF, Szymanski, 2004), and feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000) predict self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995)?

**Hypothesis 1A.** Feminist identification ratings and feminist perspectives ratings are positively correlated with self-efficacy ratings.
**Hypothesis 1B.** Higher ratings for feminist self-identification and feminist perspectives will predict higher self-efficacy for young adults.

**Research Question 2**

What differences exist among various races (e.g., White, African American, Hispanic) and gender (i.e., male, female), as measured by the demographics questionnaire, between feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SFI; Szymanski, 2004), feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000), and self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995)?

**Hypothesis 2A.** Female participants will have higher ratings than male participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 2B.** White participants will have higher ratings than other ethnicities for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy.

**Research Design**

Prior to beginning the study, I sought approval from the University of South Carolina’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). This study consisted of a quantitative, correlational survey research design and examined the relationships among demographic factors, feminist perspectives, feminist self-labeling, and self-efficacy in undergraduate and graduate students. Once I received IRB approval, I began data collection. This study utilized data collected from undergraduate and graduate students from the University of South Carolina who were at least 18 years old. After providing consent to participate in the study, participants completed (a) a researcher-developed demographics questionnaire;
(b) the Self-Identification as a feminist scale (SIF; Szymanski, 2004); (c) the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000); and (d) the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995).

**Participants**

Participants in this study included undergraduate and graduate students who were currently enrolled at the University of South Carolina. There are currently 24,864 undergraduate students enrolled at the University, with this population being 54% female and 46% male. There are 8,108 graduate students enrolled at USC, comprised of 59% females and 41% males. Minorities comprise 21.6% of the undergraduate student population and 31.6% of the graduate student population. I contacted programs such as University 101 (containing approximately 4,000 students), FemCo (a feminist student organization), the Counselor Education and Supervision undergraduate minor program (containing approximately 250 students) and Education Specialist (EdS) program, National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC; historically African American or multicultural fraternities and sororities), and large undergraduate introductory courses (e.g., Psychology, Technology, Public Health) in order to recruit participants. I engaged in both active (e.g., face-to-face) and passive (e.g., email, word of mouth) recruitment strategies. Upon IRB approval, I obtained permission from course instructors and program coordinators to briefly speak with their students about participating in the study (i.e., active recruitment). Additionally, I sent emails about the study to professors who taught large undergraduate classes and requested they send study information to their students via email or Blackboard (i.e., passive recruitment). Yancey, Ortega, and Kumanyika (2006) noted that active recruitment strategies are more effective with culturally diverse
participants, hence my intention to partner with programs for minority students (i.e., Men of Color Initiative, TRIO programs).

In order to be included in the study, participants had to be at least 18 years of age and enrolled as an undergraduate or graduate student at the University of South Carolina. Nonprobability sampling (specifically, convenience sampling) was utilized to obtain participants for this study. Researchers may employ convenience sampling because compared to other sampling methods (a) it is more cost effective; (b) it has less restrictions for obtaining participants; and (c) it may be more feasible for a particular population (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). For the current study, White students and women comprise the majority of both undergraduate and graduate students (see Table 3.1), with an even larger gap existing between the percentage of White students and racial minority students. Therefore, attempting to obtain equal numbers for the smaller groups (i.e., males and minorities) for this study was less feasible considering the population demographics.
### Table 3.1

*Comparing Sample and Population (USC) demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>USC</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Minority Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, convenience sampling may lead to an inadequate representation of various groups in a sample (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). This limitation of the study will be further discussed in Chapter 5. Since little is known about the relationship between feminism and self-efficacy in men and minorities, convenience sampling may provide insight into whether or not a problem exists in a biased sample. Because convenience samples are
typically already biased (Rubin & Babbie, 2011), examining the relationship between feminism and self-efficacy in men and minorities in a biased sample can provide valuable information into how to proceed in future studies with these two groups (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). In other words, if no significant differences exist for men and minorities on the outcome variables compared to women and non-minority participants in the biased sample, it may be unlikely that significant differences would exist in an unbiased sample (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). In attempt to counteract some of the issues related to convenience sampling (e.g., biased results, unrepresentative sample), I recruited participants from majors outside of liberal arts fields (e.g., Public Health, Technology, Business), as these majors may have less exposure to feminism and feminist perspectives through coursework.

I conducted an *a priori* analysis using G*Power 3.0.10 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Butchnew, 2008) to determine sample size and adequate power with each of the anticipated analyses. Statistical power is the probability that a false null hypothesis will be rejected, thereby not committing a Type II error (Fink, 2013). In other words, power is the capacity to detect the effect of a test if that effect does in fact exist. *A priori* power analyses helped determine the sample size necessary for adequate power (Balkin & Sheperis, 2011; Cohen, 1992), with larger sample sizes leading to less likelihood of a Type II error, higher statistical power, and a larger effect size (Balkin & Sheperis, 2011). In other words, adequate power, a smaller likelihood of error, and larger effects, increase the generalizability and trustworthiness of the results. However, as the likelihood of a Type II error decreases, the likelihood of committing a Type I error (reporting significant results when results were not significant; i.e., a false positive) increases (Fink, 2013). The
A *priori* analysis conducted for the current dissertation utilized an alpha level of .05, moderate effect size of .06 (Cohen, 1992), and a recommended power of .80 (Cohen, 1992). Because effect size was not reported for previous studies (e.g., Eisele & Stake, 2008; Kinsaul et al., 2014; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Twenge & Zucker, 1999; Zucker, 2004), a moderate effect size was chosen for the current study. G*Power* indicated a sample of 107 in order to achieve adequate power for research question one. The power analysis conducted for research question two indicated a sample of 265 participants for adequate power. Because the second power analysis indicated a larger sample size ($N = 265$) for research question two, the goal is to obtain at least 265 participants in order to avoid committing a Type II error. A Type II error occurs when the researcher fails to reject a false null hypothesis (Rubin & Babbie, 2011), meaning that the researcher reports finding no significant differences between groups when such differences may actually exist. A larger sample size increases the power of the test, which in turn decreases the likelihood of failing to reject a false null hypothesis (i.e., Type II error; Fink, 2013). Very few previous studies included response rates in their studies (Jackson, 2005; Szymanski, 2004; Zucker, 2004). Of the studies which included response rates, Jackson (2005) reported an average response rate of 70%; however, the researcher did not specify the format of the survey (i.e., web, paper). Additionally, this particular survey did not examine constructs similar to those in the current study. Only the population used in this study was similar (i.e., young adults). Szymanski (2004) and Zucker (2004) reported response rates of 35% and 30%, respectively; however, these studies utilized mail surveys instead of web surveys, which will be the method of administration for the current study. Dillman Smyth, and Christian (2009) report that the
tailored design method can yield a response rate of up to 70% for mail surveys. Conversely, Dill et al. (2009) note that electronic surveys yield lower response rates. In a meta-analysis of 49 studies, Cook, Heath, and Thompson (2000) found an average response rate of 35% for electronic surveys. Therefore, 35% will be the expected response rate for the current study.

**Measures**

The following instruments were administered to study participants: (a) a researcher-developed demographic form; (b) Feminist Perspectives Scale-Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000); (c) General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995); and (d) Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF; Szymanski, 2004). In order to determine the level of reliability of each measure, a reliability analysis was conducted for each instrument to determine Cronbach’s alpha (α). All instruments will be completed online using Survey Monkey, and results will be exported to SPSS for analysis.

**Demographics Questionnaire**

The demographics questionnaire collected basic demographic information from study participants. The form included questions about gender, age, years of education, year in school (e.g., freshman, sophomore, first year Master’s), and race. The demographics questionnaire consisted of 10 questions and was administered after participants had completed all other assessments. See Appendix C for a sample of the demographic form.

**Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3)**

The FPS3 (Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000) is a 36-item interval scale which
assesses feminist attitudes and feminist behavior. Of the 36 items on the instrument, 30 items measured feminist attitudes and 6 items measure feminist behavior. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with the first 30 items on a 7 point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). For the last six items, participants were asked to reflect on how true they feel each item is of themselves. The 7 point Likert scale for the last six items ranged from very untrue of me (1) to very true of me (7). The 30 attitudinal items were comprised of 6 subscales: (a) Conservative; (b) Liberal Feminist; (c) Radical Feminist; (d) Social Feminist; (e) Cultural Feminist; and (f) Woman of Color/Womanist. Responses for each subscale can be summed, with higher scores indicating greater agreement with the corresponding subscale. These scores are then summed together to obtain a total score for feminist attitudes (i.e., Femscore3). Responses for the behavioral items are summed separately in order to produce a total score for feminist behavior (i.e., Fembehave3). Femscore3 can range from 25 to 175, while Fembehave3 can range from 5 to 35, with higher scores indicating greater agreement with feminist attitudes and higher levels of feminist behaviors, respectively.

The FPS3 has shown high internal consistency for Femscore (α = .85), although some of the subscales have shown alpha reliability ≤ .70. The FPS3 has shown to be positively correlated with a longer, 78 item version of the Feminist Perspectives Scale (FPS2; Henley et al., 1998) and with FPS3 retest scores, showing large effect sizes ($r ≥ .05$). Additionally, the feminist subscales were positively correlated with each other, demonstrating moderate to large effect sizes ($r ≥ .60$ to .85). However, Henley et al. (2000) suggested using a larger sample size (a sample of 209 was used in the development of the short form being used in this study) in order to increase reliability for
the subscales. This instrument was normed on over 300 male and female undergraduate students representing ethnically diverse backgrounds (i.e., 25-31% White, 28-48% Asian, 10-18% Latino/a, 4-8% African American, 5-6% multiethnic, and 7-8% foreign born). However, the largest two groups on which the instrument was normed were Whites and Asians. Therefore, this instrument may not be as accurate when administered to members of other ethnic groups.

**General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)**

The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) measured beliefs about general self-efficacy. The GSE is a 10 item scale which assesses one’s belief in their ability to respond to difficult situations and cope with associated obstacles. The 4 point Likert scale measured the extent to which each item applied to the participant, ranging from *not at all true* (1) to *exactly true* (4). Participant total scores can range from 10 to 40, with higher scores indicating higher general self-efficacy. The GSE was originally in German but it has been translated into 33 different languages, to include English. Scholz and colleagues (2002) conducted a study analyzing the psychometric properties of the GSE with data from 19,120 participants (7,243 men, 9,198 women, and 2,679 did not provide their gender) from 25 countries. Internal consistency was between .75 and .91 for the GSE, with the United States data demonstrating a Cronbach’s alpha value of .87. Across the 25 countries, participant age ranged from 12 to 94, with an average age of 25 years old (*SD* = 14.7). However, of the only 50.4% of participants who indicated their profession, only about one-third (34.7%) identified as students. Further, no information about race or sexual orientation was indicated in this study.
Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF)

The SIF (Szymanski, 2004) encompassed 4 items designated to assess (a) both public and private identification as a feminist and (b) support of the goals and values of the feminist movement. Participants rated items on a 5 point Likert scale based on their level of agreement or disagreement with each item, ranging from strongly disagree (0) to strongly agree (4). A total SIF score was obtained by summing all 4 items, with higher scores indicating stronger identification as a feminist. Szymanski (2004) found an alpha reliability of .93 for the SIF, with inter-item correlations ranging from .81-.89. The SIF was also positively correlated with other measures of attitudes towards feminism ($r = .75-.76$). The instrument was normed on 227 women between ages 18 and 72 (mean age=38.25), with 85% being White. Of the 227 participants, 82% identified as lesbians, 15% as bisexual, and 3% as being unsure about their sexual orientation. Although the age range of participants differs greatly from that of this study, the majority of participants had either a graduate/professional degree (54%) or a four year undergraduate degree (26%).

Procedures

After obtaining IRB approval from the University of South Carolina, I began recruiting participants. Participants were recruited using both active (e.g., face-to-face) and passive (e.g., email) recruitment. Yancey et al. (2006) emphasized the importance of using active recruitment methods when attempting to include minority groups, suggesting that active recruitment is more effective than passive recruitment with minority populations. Participants who completed the survey online were provided with a website link to access the survey on Survey Monkey. Prior to beginning the study, participants
were prompted to review the informed consent before continuing the survey. Participation in the study was voluntary and participants could choose to discontinue their participation at any time without penalty. If participants chose to continue the survey, they then completed the FPS3, GSE, and SIF. After completing the FPS3, GSE, and SIF, participants completed the researcher-generated demographic form, which inquired about information such as age, race, and gender. Finally, participants were given the option to supply their name and email address for the chance to win one of four $25 Visa gift cards. Participants’ names and email addresses were not connected to their survey responses, as participants who entered the gift card drawing were asked to send me an email containing only their name and preferred email address. Finally, no identifying information was collected on the survey, and all data was reported in aggregate form.

Variables

For research question one, feminist perspectives (as measured by the FPS3) and feminist identification (as measured by the SIF) served as independent variables while self-efficacy (as measured by the GSE) served as the dependent variable. For research question two, race and gender (as measured by the demographics questionnaire) served as the independent variables while feminist identification (as measured by the SIF), feminist perspectives (as measured by the FPS3), and self-efficacy (as measured by the GSE) served as dependent variables.

Data Analyses

I conducted a preliminary analysis of the data in order to identify outliers, missing data, and violations of assumptions. I conducted two statistical analyses to evaluate the aforementioned research questions. A linear multiple regression examined the
relationships among the constructs of feminist self-identification (as measured by the SIF total score), feminist perspectives (as measured by Femscore3 total score, and Fembehave3 score), and self-efficacy (as measured by the GSE total score) for all participants. Linear multiple regressions test for how much unique variance the independent variables contribute to the depend variables (Pallant, 2013). In other words, a linear multiple regression examines the relationship between each independent variables and the dependent variable. I also tested for outliers, missing data, and any violations of the assumptions of normality, multicollinearity, and singularity. A two-way factorial MANOVA examined differences between various races (e.g., White, African American, Hispanic) and gender (i.e., male, female) for feminist self-identification (as measured by the SIF total score), feminist perspectives (as measured by Femscore3 total score, and Fembehave3 total score), and self-efficacy (as measured by GSE total score).

SPSS was utilized for all statistical procedures for this study. In order to protect participants’ rights, data was only reported in aggregate form with no identifying information connecting participants to their responses. All data was contained on a password protected laptop, and I was the only person with access to the data.

**Summary**

The current dissertation intended to (a) examine relationships among feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy; and (b) explore existing differences for race and gender on feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy in undergraduate and graduate students. A series of assessments for the abovementioned variables of interest were administered to 305 participants. For this study, I utilized a multiple regression and a two-way factorial MANOVA to analyze the
data obtained from participants. For research question one, the independent variables included feminist identification and feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy served as the dependent variable. For research question two, the independent variables were race and gender, while feminist perspectives, feminist identification, and self-efficacy were dependent variables. Results of the current study can be found in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The current study examined the relationships among feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy in young adults. By investigating the relationship and predictive ability of feminist self-labeling and feminist perspectives on self-efficacy, more knowledge can be gained about possible factors that may influence levels of self-efficacy in young adults. Further, identifying the relationship among feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy for various demographic groups can contribute much needed data to the existing literature, which is primarily based on the relationships among these constructs for White women. Data analyses were conducted utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 23.

Sampling and Data Collection Procedures

The target population for this study was young adults (ages 18-39) who were enrolled as either undergraduate or graduate students at the University of South Carolina. Convenience sampling was utilized to obtain participants for this study because compared to other sampling methods (a) it is more cost effective; (b) it has less restrictions for obtaining participants; and (c) it may be more feasible for a particular population (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). For the current study, White students and women comprise the majority of both undergraduate and graduate students with an even larger gap existing between the percentage of White students and racial minority students. Therefore, attempting to obtain equal numbers for the smaller groups (i.e., males and
minorities) for this study was less feasible considering the population demographics. In order to obtain participants, I contacted 29 professors/instructors who were teaching introductory courses in various departments (e.g., Public Health, Psychology, Counselor Education, Information Technology) to acquire permission to collect data in their classes. Of the 29 professors I contacted, 10 did not respond to my request and eight agreed to disperse my study information to their students via email or Blackboard. The remaining 11 professors/instructors allowed me to attend their classes to collect data. One of the 19 instructors also distributed the study information to 30 students at Limestone College (included in the invited number of 1248 mentioned below); however, I received no responses from students at this institution. Additionally, of the eight student groups that I contacted, one dispersed the study information through their group’s listserv. The remaining four groups allowed me to attend their meetings to collect data.

Potential participants were invited to complete the survey in either a paper or online format. When professors provided participants details about the survey via Blackboard, they included a link to Survey Monkey. When I spoke to potential participants face-to-face, I explained the purpose of the study and provided interested participants with a paper version of the survey. Upon the completion of the survey (in both formats), participants had the option of providing their names and email addresses to be entered into a gift card drawing. Participants’ names or contact information were in no way connected to their survey responses, as no identifying information was collected on the survey itself.
Descriptive Data Results

Response Rate

Overall, 1,248 potential participants received invitations to participate in the study. Initially, a total of 319 participants responded, yielding a response rate of 25.6%. However, eight participants did not complete all assessments, thereby reducing the response rate to 24.9%. Finally, six participants fell outside of the desired age range (18-39) for young adults, yielding a useable response rate of 24.4% for 305 participants. The response rate for participants who received face-to-face invitations (e.g., active recruitment) was 96.9%, while the response rate for the online version of the survey (e.g., passive recruitment) was 11.4%. However, a lower response rate is common for electronic data collection procedures.

Participant Demographics

Following are descriptive statistics for the 305 participants who participated in the study. The women comprised the majority of participants \((n = 228, 74.8\%)\), compared to men \((n = 77, 25.2\%)\). Of the participating females, 176 \((77.2\%)\) identified their ethnicity as White/Caucasian, while 52 \((22.8\%)\) identified as a racial/ethnic minority. Of the participating males, 58 \((75.3\%)\) identified their ethnicity as White/Caucasian, while 19 \((24.7\%)\) identified as a racial/ethnic minority. See Tables 4.1 and 4.2 for additional demographics related to ethnicity.
Table 4.1

Frequencies of Participants by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2

Frequencies of Participants by Gender and Racial Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White female</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 39, with a mean age of 22.05 (SD = 3.79).

Undergraduate students comprised 76.4% (n = 233) of the sample, while graduate students comprised the remaining 23.6% (n = 72) of participants. The average years of education for participants was 15.77, and the mean number of credit hours in which
participants were enrolled was 14.04. Most participants reported that they were not currently in a relationship ($n = 158, 51.8\%$), and the majority of participants identified as heterosexual ($n = 261, 85.6\%$). See Table 4.3 for additional demographics related to student status and sexual orientation.

Table 4.3

*Frequencies of Participants by Student Status and Sexual Orientation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student, Ed.S</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student, PhD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feminist Identification**

The Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF; Szymanski, 2004) measured feminist identification. The SIF is a four item scale that assess (a) both public and private
identification as a feminist, and (b) support of the goals and values of the feminist movement. The items contain a 5 point Likert scale based on level of agreement or disagreement with each item, ranging from *strongly disagree* (0) to *strongly agree* (4). Cronbach’s α assessing internal consistency of the SIF was .93, indicating strong internal consistency of the scale (Pallant, 2013). Internal consistency is important because it demonstrates the degree to which all scale items are measuring the same construct (Pallant, 2013). Participant total scores for the SIF ranged from 0 to 16 ($M = 10.31$, $SD = 4.35$). Because each of the four items inquires about a different facet of feminist identity, descriptive data and measures of central tendency are included in Tables 4.4 and 4.5.

Table 4.4

*Descriptive Statistics for Individual SIF Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$Mdn$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself a feminist.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I identify myself as a feminist to other people.</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist values are important to me.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the goals of the feminist movement.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5

*Frequencies for Level of Agreement with SIF Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider myself a feminist.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I identify myself as a feminist to other people.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist values are important to me.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the goals of the feminist movement.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feminist Perspectives**

The Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000) assessed feminist attitudes and behavior. The FPS3 is a 36 item instrument, with 30 items measuring feminist attitudes and six items measuring feminist behavior. Items are rated on a 7 point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7) for the attitudinal items and from *very untrue of me* (1) to *very true of me* (7) for the behavioral items. The 30 attitudinal items are comprised of six subscales: (a) Conservative; (b) Liberal Feminist; (c) Radical Feminist; (d) Social Feminist; (e) Cultural Feminist; and (f) Woman of Color/Womanist. A total score for attitudes (i.e., Femscore3) is obtained by summing five of the subscales (excluding Conservative), and a total score for behavior (Fembehave3) is obtained by summing items 32 to 36. Cronbach’s alpha assessing internal consistency of the Femscore3 and Fembehave3 was .84 and .86.
respectively, indicating good internal consistency of the scales (Pallant, 2013). Cronbach’s alpha for the subscales ranged from .58 to .86, with only four of the subscales demonstrating acceptable internal consistency (α ≥ .7). Low internal consistency indicates that the items on the scale are not measuring the same underlying construct (Pallant, 2013). Internal consistency can be negatively impacted by low number of questions, poor interrelatedness of items, and heterogeneous constructs (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011); therefore, the subscales with lower than acceptable internal consistency may contain items that do not measure the same, intended constructs. See Table 4.6 for additional psychometrics for the FPS3. Low internal consistency for some subscales is common in previous research which uses the FPS3 (Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000). Henley, Spalding, & Kosta (2000) suggested using a larger sample size (a sample of 209 was used in the development of the short version of this instrument) in order to increase reliability for the subscales; however, using a sample size of 305 did not increase subscale reliability. Due to low internal consistency of some of the scales and small sample sizes for men and racial minorities, subscale scores for the FPS3 were not used in analysis.

**Self-Efficacy**

The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) measured beliefs about general self-efficacy. The GSE is a 10 item scale that assesses one’s belief in their ability to respond to difficult situations and cope with associated obstacles. The 4 point Likert scale measures the extent to which each item applies to the participant, ranging from *not at all true* (1) to *exactly true* (4). Participant total scores ranged from 21 to 40 ($M = 33.53$, $SD = 4.27$), with higher scores indicating higher general self-efficacy.
Cronbach’s alpha assessing internal consistency of the GSE was .86, indicating good internal consistency of the scale (Pallant, 2013).

Table 4.6

*Psychometric properties for the FPS3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite subscale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femscore3</td>
<td>114.71</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>28-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspective subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>5-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Feminist</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>8-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical Feminist</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>5-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Feminist</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Feminist</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>5-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman of Color/Womanist</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>5-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

The following section reviews the results of preliminary analyses for the data, as well as the results of the analyses for the two research questions and their accompanying hypotheses. All data was analyzed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS, Version 23). An alpha level of .05 was utilized to confirm that 95% of the variance was due to the relationship between variables, not due to sampling error (Fink, 2013).
Statistical Assumptions

I conducted preliminary analyses to test for missing data, outliers, and assumptions. Missing data existed for participants who completed the survey. See Table 4.7 for missing data by assessment. Initial examination of missing data revealed eight participants who did not complete all items on the assessments. Therefore, sum scores could not be calculated for those corresponding assessments. Of the eight participants who did not complete the survey, five participants discontinued the survey before completing the first assessment (FPS3). The remaining three participants completed the FPS3 and did not complete the other two assessments. Because the majority of these participants were missing total scores for the three assessments, and less than 5% of the data was missing (Sterner, 2011), listwise deletion excluded these cases from all data analysis.

Table 4.7

*Missing Data by Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIF</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>8 (2.5%)</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPS3</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>5 (1.6%)</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>8 (2.5%)</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scatterplots and normal probability plots tested for assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity, with their residuals identifying any potential outliers. No assumptions were violated for the two types of analyses used in this study: standard
multiple regression and two-way, factorial MANOVA. Prior to each analysis, an examination of univariate and multivariate outliers is presented.

Finally, I conducted a Pearson correlation to determine possible covariates. I utilized participant age, years of education, and number of credit hours as intended covariates. The Pearson correlation revealed no relationship between the intended covariates and SIF, Fembehave3, and Femscore3 total scores. However, a relationship existed between the three intended covariates and GSE total scores (see Table 4.8). Therefore, I controlled for GSE total scores by age, years of education, and credit hours by conducting two separate ANCOVAs. Gender and minority served as independent variables and GSE total scores served as the dependent variable.

Table 4.8

*Pearson Correlations for Participant GSE Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of Education</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * denotes significance at the .01 level

The first ANCOVA tested for differences in male and female participants’ GSE scores while controlling for age, years of education, and credit hours. Levene’s test revealed no violation of the assumption of homogeneity. ANCOVA results indicated no significant differences existed between men and women, $F(1, 299) = .053, p = .818, \eta_p^2 = .000, \text{observed power} = .056$. Participants’ GSE scores did not differ significantly by gender. See Table 4.9 for means and standard deviations.
Table 4.9

*Descriptive statistics for GSE by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>33.51</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second ANCOVA tested for differences in White and non-White participants’ GSE scores while controlling for age, years of education, and credit hours. Levene’s test revealed no violation of the assumption of homogeneity. ANCOVA results indicated no significant differences existed between White and non-White participants, $F(1, 299) = .073$, $p = .787$, $\eta^2_p = .000$, observed power = .058. Participants’ GSE scores did not differ significantly by minority status. See Table 4.10 for means and standard deviations.

Table 4.10

*Descriptive Statistics for GSE by Minority Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>33.47</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>33.72</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results of Data Analysis**

**Research Question 1**

The first research question asks: What relationship exists among feminist self-
identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy? Specifically, can feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF, Szymanski, 2004), and feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000) predict self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995)?

For the standard multiple regression utilized to answer this question, no violations of normality, linearity, or homoscedasticity existed. No univariate outliers existed on the normal probability plot or scatterplot, as residual values fell between -3.3 and 3.3 (Pallant, 2013). An investigation of Mahalanobis distances revealed no multivariate outliers, as no cases exceeded the chi-square critical value (16.27) associated with three independent variables. I tested for multicollinearity by examining the collinearity statistics of tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF). Multicollinearity occurs when two or more predictor variables are highly correlated \((r \geq .9)\). In other words, one variable could be predicted by the other variable or variables (Pallant, 2013), creating redundancy and interfering with determining unique predictors. Because tolerance values were greater than .10 and VIF values were below 10, no violations of multicollinearity occurred (Pallant, 2013).

I conducted the following regression analysis utilizing feminist identification (total SIF score) and feminist perspectives (Fembehave3 and Femscore3 total scores) as predictor variables. Self-efficacy (total GSE score) served as the dependent variable. Results for research question one and the associated hypotheses are presented below.

**Hypothesis 1A.** The first hypothesis postulated that feminist identification ratings and feminist perspectives ratings would be positively correlated with self-efficacy
ratings. The following table (Table 4.11) presents the Pearson correlations of feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy. As the table displays, a weak, positive relationship was found for only one variable (i.e., Fembehave3). Therefore, hypothesis 1A was partially supported.

**Hypothesis 1B.** The second hypothesis postulated that higher ratings for feminist self-identification and feminist perspectives would predict higher self-efficacy for young adults. The following table (Table 4.12) shows the predictive ability of each independent variable.

**Table 4.11**

*Pearson Correlations for Feminist Identification, Perspectives, and Self-Efficacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>Feminist Identification</th>
<th>Feminist Attitudes</th>
<th>Feminist Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identification</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Attitudes</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Behavior</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * denotes significance at the .05 level*
Table 4.12

*Predicting Relationship between Feminism and Self-Efficacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identification</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Attitudes</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Behavior</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.82*</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * denotes significance at the .05 level

Only one predictor variable, feminist behavior (Fembehave3) was a significant predictor of self-efficacy at the .05 level ($p < .001$). Therefore, the hypothesis was partially supported. The $r^2$ value indicates that approximately 8% of the variance in self-efficacy scores can be accounted for by the given model (see Table 4.13). The $r^2$ value ($r^2 = .05$) also indicates a small effect size, meaning that any effect smaller than .10 indicates the relationship has little practical significance (Cohen, 1992).

Table 4.13

*Model Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine how well the independent variables predict the dependent variable, I assessed values presented in the ANOVA table (Table 4.14). Overall, the
model was significant, $F(3, 301) = 5.44, p < .001$. However, feminist behavior was a unique, significant predictor of general self-efficacy. Therefore, higher ratings for feminist behavior are more likely to predict higher ratings for general self-efficacy. Further, when scores for feminist behavior are predicted to increase by one, scores on self-efficacy would increase by .23.

Table 4.14
ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>284.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.76</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5245.74</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5530.01</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Two

The second research question asks: What differences exist among various races (e.g., White, African American, Hispanic) and gender (i.e., male, female), as measured by the demographics questionnaire, between feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SFI; Szymanski, 2004), feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000), and self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwazer & Jerusalem, 1995)?

For the two-way factorial MANOVA utilized to answer this question, no violations of normality or linearity existed. Scatterplots revealed no univariate outliers;
therefore the assumption of linearity was not violated (Pallant, 2013). For research question two, there are four dependent variables: (a) feminist attitudes scores; (b) feminist behavior scores; (c) general self-efficacy scores; and (d) feminist identification scores. I tested for multicollinearity and singularity by examining the correlations between the dependent variables. Because none of the correlations for dependent variables were greater than .70, the assumptions of multicollinearity and singularity were not violated (Pallant, 2013). The assumption of homogeneity was not violated, as the significance value for Box’s M test was .56. Because the significance was greater than .05, this means there are no significant differences between the covariance matrices across groups (Pallant, 2013). Levene’s test of equality of variances revealed a violation of the assumption of equal variances for gender on GSE scores, $F(3, 301) = 3.075, p = .028$. I utilized Pillai’s Trace instead of Wilk’s Lambda and adjusted the alpha level to .01 to account for violations of equal variances (Pallant, 2013).

I conducted the following factorial MANOVA utilizing gender and minority status as independent variables. The four dependent variables were: (a) feminist attitudes scores; (b) feminist behavior scores; (c) general self-efficacy scores; and (d) feminist identification scores. Results for research question two and the associated hypotheses are presented below.

**Hypothesis 2A.** The first hypothesis postulates that female participants will have higher ratings than male participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives (made up of feminist behaviors and feminist attitudes), and self-efficacy. Results indicated a main effect for gender and the combined dependent variables, $F(4, 298) = 4.74, p = .001$; Pillai’s Trace = .06; $\eta_p^2 = .06$. Table 4.15 illustrates the between subjects
statistics for gender.

Table 4.15

Between Subjects Statistics by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes significance at the .05 level

An inspection of mean scores revealed that women (n = 228) reported significantly higher scores for feminist behaviors, feminist attitudes, and feminist identification than men (n = 77). Therefore, the first hypothesis is partially supported. Table 4.16 displays descriptive statistics for gender and the four dependent variables.
Table 4.16

*Differences between Gender and Dependent Variables*

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist attitudes*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>105.72</td>
<td>22.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95.99</td>
<td>26.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist behavior*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>33.51</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist identification*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * denotes significance between groups at the .05 level

**Hypothesis 2B.** The second hypothesis postulates that White participants will have higher ratings than non-White participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy. Results indicated no main effect for minority status and the combined dependent variables, $F (4, 298) = 1.19$, $p = .32$; Pillai’s Trace = .02; $\eta^2_p = .02$. Therefore, the second hypothesis is not supported by the data. In other words, White participants did not have higher ratings than non-White participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives (made up of feminist behaviors and feminist attitudes), and self-efficacy. Tables 4.17 illustrates the between subjects statistics for...
minority status. Additionally, there was no significant interaction between gender and minority status, $F(4, 298) = 1.00, p = .41$.

Table 4.17

*Between Subjects Statistics for Minority Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender*Minority Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. **p value was .051 before being rounded*

Because the effect size values for *minority* and for *gender*\**minority status* were less than .10, the strength of the relationships was not significant.

**Summary**

The purpose of conducting the current study was to determine the relationship among feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy for young adults as it relates to counselor education. Additionally, I sought to identify what differences
existed between gender and minority status for the aforementioned constructs. A total of two research questions and four hypotheses were utilized to understand the relationship between feminist identification, feminist behavior, feminist attitudes, and general self-efficacy. Survey data was collected from 305 participants who are enrolled as graduate or undergraduate students at the University of South Carolina. I utilized standard multiple regression and two-way factorial MANOVA to analyze the data. Results only partially supported two of the four hypotheses. Regression analysis only partially support of research question one and hypothesis 1B, identifying feminist behavior as the only significant predictor of self-efficacy. Factorial MANOVA revealed a significant main effect between gender and three of the four dependent variables; however, no significant main effect was identified between minority status and the four dependent variables.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The current study examined the relationship among feminist identification, feminist perspectives, participant demographic factors, and self-efficacy for young adults who are enrolled as either undergraduate or graduate students at the University of South Carolina. Three hundred five participants completed all three assessments and the demographics questionnaire. The study aimed to (a) examine relationships among feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy; and (b) explore existing differences for race and gender on feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy in undergraduate and graduate students. These aims resulted in two research questions. Research question one examined the predictive ability of feminist identification and feminist perspectives (which consists of feminist behaviors and feminist attitudes) on self-efficacy. Research question two examined differences among race and gender for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy. Following is a brief discussion of the study results, limitations to the study, and implications for practice and future research.

Overview of Findings

Feminist Identification and Perspectives as Predictors of Self-Efficacy

The first research question asked: What relationship exists among feminist self-identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy? Specifically, can feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SIF,
Szymanski, 2004), and feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000) predict self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995)? Two hypotheses were identified for research question one. Both hypotheses utilized self-efficacy total scores as the dependent variable, with feminist self-identification, feminist attitudes, and feminist behaviors as predictors. The first hypothesis for research question one postulated that feminist identification and feminist perspectives (consisting of feminist behaviors and feminist attitudes) would be positively correlated with self-efficacy. The second hypothesis postulated that higher feminist identification and feminist perspectives scores would predict higher self-efficacy scores. I conducted a standard multiple regression to examine the predictive relationship among the four aforementioned constructs.

Results indicated that neither feminist identification nor feminist attitudes were significant predictors of self-efficacy. However, feminist behavior was identified as a significant predictor of general self-efficacy, with Pearson correlations indicating a small, positive correlation between feminist behavior and self-efficacy. This relationship indicates that higher scores for feminist behavior are more likely to predict higher levels of self-efficacy. Although the strength of the relationship between feminist behavior and self-efficacy does not indicate practical significance, previous research has typically included advocacy in its examination of the relationship between feminism and self-efficacy. While prior research has demonstrated a positive relationship between feminist perspectives and self-efficacy (Eisele & Stake, 2008), this may be partially explained by the positive relationship between nontraditional gender role attitudes and self-esteem.
(Szymanski, 2004), which are components of feminist perspectives and self-efficacy. If an individual feels more empowered (empowerment is also a component of feminism) about an issue, they may feel more encouraged and more capable (i.e., self-efficacy) to engage in advocacy for the corresponding group (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Zimmerman, 1995). By not including advocacy as a construct in this study, an important piece may have been left out of the equation to determine relationships between feminism and self-efficacy. However, while advocacy is a tenet of feminist behavior, feminist behavior encompasses other components. Therefore, the current research contributes new knowledge about the relationship between feminism and self-efficacy. Further, the current results may highlight a more complex understanding of contributors to general self-efficacy.

The current study indicated no relationship between feminist identification and self-efficacy. This finding does not support previous research, which suggested that feminist self-labeling bridges the relationship between feminist perspectives and self-efficacy (Eisele & Stake, 2008). Despite agreeing with feminist perspectives, men and women are often reluctant to identify as feminists, either publicly or privately (Kelly, 2015). This reluctance may be due to fear of being perceived negatively or inaccurately by others (Anderson, 2009; McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004), or due to a lack of education about feminism (Kelly, 2015). Results from the current study support such research, with fewer participants identifying as a feminist (54.8%), despite acknowledging feminist values as important (67.5%) and supporting feminist goals (70.2%). Further, over half (54.8%) of participants considered themselves feminists, but just over one third (38.7%) identified as such to others. These
findings are comparable to previous research on discrepancies between feminist identification and supporting feminist perspectives. In a study conducted by Anderson (2009), the majority of men in the study (59.7%) did not identify as feminists, but 32.6% of men said that they agreed with some feminist objectives but did not call themselves feminists (which was the most popular choice of female participants in the study [45.4%]). Including an assessment of why participants did or did not identify (publically or privately) would have provided more depth to the current study. Additionally, knowing whether or not someone has been exposed to or has a knowledge of feminism may also be important in explaining choices about feminist self-labeling, as Zucker (2004) suggested that being exposed to feminism in various contexts influences feminist identification.

Race and Gender Outcomes

The second research question asked: What differences exist among various races (e.g., White, African American, Hispanic) and gender (i.e., male, female), as measured by the demographics questionnaire, between feminist self-identification, as measured by the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (SFI; Szymanski, 2004), feminist perspectives, as measured by the Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000), and self-efficacy, as measured by the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE; Schwazer & Jerusalem, 1995)? Both hypotheses utilized feminist identification, feminist behaviors, feminist attitudes, and self-efficacy as dependent variables. However, hypothesis one included gender as the independent variable, while hypothesis two utilized race as the independent variable. The first hypothesis postulated that women would have higher scores than men on all assessments. The second assessment postulated
that White participants would have higher scores on all assessments compared to non-White participants. I conducted a two-way factorial MANOVA to examine outcomes between gender and race for feminist identification, feminist perspectives (attitudes and behaviors), and self-efficacy.

Results indicated statistically significant differences in feminist attitudes, feminist behaviors, and feminist identification between men and women. On average, women reported higher scores for all three constructs. These findings underscore previous research on minority status, which suggests that minorities (e.g., women) may be more likely to support groups outside of their own because of their own status as a minority (Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Wiley et al., 2012). Because postmodern feminist perspectives include attitudes of inclusion and advocacy behaviors, these findings are consistent with those of earlier research. Higher scores for women on the FPS3 suggest stronger gender consciousness than that of males in this study, challenging previous research in which women have demonstrated weaker understanding about how gender affects one’s experiences in the world (Aronson, 2003). Research conducted by Zucker (2004) attempts to highlight the importance of feminist consciousness, with feminists in the study rating higher on feminist consciousness and experiences of sexism compared to non-feminists and egalitarians (i.e., participants who agreed with feminist ideas but did not label themselves as feminists). Non-feminist and egalitarian participants may have rated lower on experiences of sexism due to their lower feminist consciousness. By being unaware of the role that gender plays in one’s experiences in the world, non-feminist and egalitarian participants may have been unable to recognize instances of sexism when they are actually occurring. If individuals are unable to identify occurrences of sexism, they
may also be unable to identify when such experiences are impacting their health, attributing their symptoms to other factors.

While women reported higher total scores for feminist identification, examining data for the four items that comprise the SIF reveals new knowledge about gender differences for various facets of feminist identity. For example, over half of men (55.8%) identified feminist values as being important to them (item 3). The same percentage of men (55.8%) also reported supporting the goals of the feminist movement (item 4). Additionally, the majority of women (61.4%) and over one third of men (35.1%) reported identifying as a feminist (item 1). This is in contrast to results of Anderson’s (2009) study, in which less than 1% of men identified as feminist either publicly (to others) or privately (to themselves) compared to nearly 7% of women. This suggests that more men and more women may be claiming the feminist label both publicly and privately, although more than half (53.2%) of men and over one third (31.6%) of women in this study reported that they did not identify as a feminist to other people (item 2). The adoption of the private feminist label was significantly higher for women in this study compared to women in previous research (7%; Anderson, 2009). For women, this item revealed the highest percentage for disagreement of any of the four items.

A discrepancy between public and private feminist identification was evident across gender, with more male and female participants identifying privately (M = 54.8%) as a feminist than identifying as a feminist publicly (M = 38.7%). This finding echoes previous research that both men and women may be reluctant to identify as a feminist to others, even if they consider themselves to be a feminist (Kelly, 2015). This finding supports previous research that suggests the fear of being perceived negatively by others
can prevent the adoption of the label (Anderson, 2009; McCabe, 2005; Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). Although both men and women face this fear, it may be particularly influential for men due to notions of masculinity being arguably more rigid than notions of femininity (Ratele, 2013).

Results indicated no significant differences in feminist identification, feminist attitudes, or feminist behaviors between White and non-White participants. This finding challenges speculation from previous research that minorities may not support feminism due to its origination in White, middle-class culture (Aronson, 2003; Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Williams & Wittig, 1997; Zucker, 2004). This may be due, in part, to the current wave of feminism being more inclusive and diverse in its views and expression of feminist identity (Aronson, 2003; Heywood & Drake, 1997). Conversely, no significant differences for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy also do not support previous research which suggests that minority status makes an individual more likely to support minority groups outside of their own (Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995; Wiley et al., 2012). However, due to the low numbers of minority participants, the results from this study may not be an accurate representation of non-Whites’ views on feminism and self-efficacy. Previous research has also suggested that where an individual is in their racial identity impacts their views on feminism (Martin & Hall, 1992; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997). Martin and Hall (1992) purported that the further along an African American woman is in her racial identity, the more likely she is to view feminism as important. Similarly, Myaskovsky and Wittig (1997) found that African American women who had stronger racial identities were more likely to have been exposed to feminism, to recognize racial discrimination, and to support
collective action. Therefore, including a measure of racial identity for racial minorities may aid in explaining differences between White participants and participants of color in their feminist identification, support of feminist perspectives, and levels of self-efficacy.

**Limitations of the Study**

The current study contained limitations to both internal and external validity. Internal validity refers to the confidence that an outcome was the result of the studied variable, while external validity refers to the extent of generalizability of results to the population (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). Selection bias was a threat to internal validity, as participants who chose to complete the online version of the study may have chosen to do so because they have strong views, either positive or negative, about feminism. In other words, students who were willing to participate may be more or less interested in the topics of feminism and self-efficacy than the general population. This may have particular meaning for participants who were recruited through passive strategies (and completed the online version), who may have participated because they had higher motivation to do so. While motivation to participate in the study may have been due to polarized views about feminism, additional instructor incentives may have also played a role in motivating students to participate. Some instructors offered additional incentives (beyond the gift card drawing offered to all participants) to their students who chose to participate in the study.

The use of convenience sampling to obtain participants was a threat to the external validity of the study. This sampling method can bias results because it is impossible to determine if the sample is representative of the overall population and may have led to an inadequate representation of groups in my sample (Rubin & Babbie, 2011).
However, since little is known about how men and minorities feel about the variables that will be examined in this study, convenience sampling may provide insight into whether or not a problem exists in a biased sample. For example, there was a significant difference between men and women for feminist identification and feminist perspectives, which supports previous research comparing men’s and women’s support of feminism. Further, because convenience samples are typically already biased (Rubin & Babbie, 2011), uncovering the perspectives on feminism of men and minorities in a biased sample can provide valuable information into how to proceed in future studies with these two groups (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). In other words, since no significant differences existed between White and non-White participants on the outcome variables, it may be unlikely that significant differences would exist in an unbiased sample (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). However, because there were unequal groups for White and non-White participants, this may not be the case.

While the sample obtained for this study appeared demographically similar to the population at the University of South Carolina, results may be difficult to generalize to similar populations across the country. Specifically, because the University is located in the Southern region of the United States, participants’ formative experiences surrounding feminism and self-efficacy may not be comparable to those of individuals living in other geographic regions. This may be particularly true for the participants who identified as racial minorities, as the South has historically held more negatively biased views of such groups.

Diversity within the sample may have also impacted the results. While my original goal was to obtain equal numbers for racial and gender categories for this study,
participation from minorities and men was significantly lower than that of Whites and women. This is consistent with previous research on feminism and self-efficacy, which has also had lower representation of men and minorities. Because of the over-representation of Whites and women in this study, it is difficult to draw conclusions about male and minority participants’ views on the measured constructs. Additionally, results indicating no difference between White and non-White participants for research question two are subject to Type II error due to the low, unequal numbers of minority participants. A Type II error occurs when the researcher fails to reject a false null hypothesis (Rubin & Babbie, 2011), meaning that the researcher reports finding no significant differences between groups when such differences may actually exist. Higher, equal numbers between groups also contribute to higher power (Rusticus & Lovato, 2014) and larger effects, leading to less likelihood of a type II error (Balkin & Sheperis, 2011). In other words, having higher, equal numbers of non-White participants may have changed the results for research question two, indicating a significant difference between White and non-White participants on the measured constructs.

Therefore, future research should utilize probability sampling methods (e.g., stratified random sampling) in order to ensure equal representation of groups. Further, the decision to combine non-White participants into one group did not allow for examination of individual racial category data. However, some categories (e.g., Native American, Pacific Islander) did not have enough participants to perform data analysis, contributing to the decision to combine the groups.

Some items on the FPS3 did not represent more modern, diverse feminist perspectives, potentially impacting results. For example, gendered items on the FPS3
positioned the male as the perpetrator and the woman as the victim of the oppression; however, modern feminist perspectives support the idea that like women, men are also negatively impacted by gender inequality and oppression (Mohanty, 1988). Further, some items on the FPS3 made assumptions about participants’ lives or intentions that were rooted in traditional gender norms. For example, item 31 stated, “My wedding was, or will be, celebrated with a full traditional ceremony,” assuming that participants desired to get married if they were not already. Similar assumptions were found in item 33 and item 35, regarding the assumption of religion and of desire for children, respectively. Lastly, item 36 stated, “I often encourage women to take advantage of the many educational and legal opportunities available to them,” which assumes that all women have equal access to multiple educational and political resources. This assumption is related to the intersectionality of identities, which is a central focus of modern feminist perspectives.

Finally, subscores for the FPS3 were not used in data analysis. Only four of the six subscales demonstrated acceptable internal consistency (α ≥ .7). Additionally, the small sample size for men and racial minorities prevented the use of subscale scores. Differences may have existed between men and women, and between White and non-White participants for feminist perspectives. However, inclusion of additional variables in my analyses would have decreased the observed power.

**Implications**

**Counselor Education**

The aim of this study was to identify the significance and role of feminism in determining self-efficacy in young adults. While results identified feminist behavior as a predictor of self-efficacy, neither feminist identification nor feminist attitudes correlated
with levels of general self-efficacy within the sample. However, feminist identification and feminist perspectives were significantly higher for women compared to men. This finding is noteworthy, considering the typical composition of Master’s level counseling programs. Because these programs generally contain more women than men, understanding that feminism may be a significant part of their identities is important when thinking about program curriculum. Including more knowledge about feminist theory in coursework may allow faculty to cater to an already present identity within students, as the majority of participants in this study identified as supporting feminist values and goals. For example, dedicating an entire course to feminism, or creating a hybrid multiculturalism/feminism course may help increase students’ knowledge feminist theory. Having feminist speakers, counselors, and supervisors may also provide more context to and a better understanding of feminist theory for students. The rationale for this suggestion is that students may have no prior exposure to feminists (or, more likely, they may not have been exposed to individuals who publicly identify as feminists). This may also provide vicarious experiences (modeling; Bandura, 1977) with feminism for students; by being exposed to successful feminist clinicians, students may feel that they can also exhibit feminist behaviors successfully. Because modeling is a contributing factor for self-efficacy, providing opportunities for exposure to feminism may increase their confidence in their ability to engage in feminist behaviors. Additionally, interacting with positive feminist models may challenge pre-existing negative or inaccurate stereotypes they have about the feminist label. Previous research has suggested that even brief exposure to positive portrayals of feminists can positively influence perceptions of feminism, as well as increase the desire to participate in collective action for women
(Roy, Weibust, & Miller, 2007; Wiley et al., 2012). Further, research has found that self-identifying with a group increases the likelihood of activism on behalf of that group (Leaper & Arias, 2011; Wiley et al., 2012; Zucker, 2004).

Incorporating more education about feminism in counselor education curriculum may also help educate individuals who cite a lack of knowledge about feminism as the reason they do not identify as such (Kelly, 2015). Further, requiring a class-wide advocacy project based on feminist issues, along with a corresponding research paper, may also aid in (a) gaining accurate knowledge about feminist issues (both through research and practical experience); (b) encouraging feminist identification through the impact of the group experience (i.e., feminist labeling becomes the social norm of the class); and (c) inciting student interest in and understanding of advocacy in the field. If students realize that they can successfully engage in advocacy (i.e., performance accomplishments; Bandura, 1977), they may be more likely to persist in their advocacy behaviors. Further, continued mastery experiences with advocacy and other feminist behaviors may also increase their perceived self-efficacy.

For counselors, supervisors, and counselor educators, understanding the relationship among such factors will not only help them better understand the worldview of clients who do not ascribe to traditional gender roles, but it may also encourage self-reflection on the impact that gender stereotyping and sexism can have on interactions with and treatment of clients and counselors-in-training. This is relevant to the results of this study because the majority of participants reported supporting goals of the feminist movement and identified feminist values as being important to them. Because feminism typically does not align with traditional gender roles and norms, being
undereducated about feminism puts counselors at risk of providing biased treatment to clients based on their own values and unintentionally supporting traditional gender concepts (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; DeVoe, 1990; Good, Gilbert, & Scher, 1990). This imposition of values is addressed in the ACA Code of Ethics (2014), which states that counselors must be aware of their own values, resist imposing those values, and “seek training in areas in which they are at risk of imposing their own values onto clients” (A.4.b). DeVoe (1990) found that participating in advocacy efforts and feminist consciousness raising helped make counselors more aware of feminist issues, resulting in increased insight into power differentials between men and women and awareness of how sexist values can negatively impact relationships. Therefore, counselors, supervisors, and counselor educators have an ethical responsibility to become more educated on feminism in order to better inform their work with clients, supervisees, and students. Finally, the common threads between feminist theories and multicultural counseling theories (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; Goodman et al., 2004), which are woven throughout counselor education programs, make the incorporation of feminism a logical next step for curriculum.

**Counseling Practice**

Results from the current study indicated that the majority of participants were in agreement of supporting feminist goals and of viewing feminist value as being important to them. These findings have strong implications for counselors in their work with young adults. For example, because power imbalance is a significant focus of feminism, young adult clients who ascribe to feminist perspectives may value a more egalitarian relationship with their counselors. If left unacknowledged, this power differential can
negatively impact the client-counselor relationship by ignoring the client’s expertise on their own lives. Additionally, counselors who may be unaware of or undereducated about feminist perspectives risk making inaccurate interpretations of client problems, imposing their own traditional values, implementing techniques and strategies that reflect the counselor’s perspectives instead of the client’s, and establishing goals that do not meet client needs and perspectives (Ivey et al., 2011). In order to better meet the needs of feminist young adult clients, counselors do not have to be experts in feminist therapy; however, being informed about the tenets of feminism and feminist therapy can prevent some of the aforementioned issues.

Feminism’s view on oppression as a contributor to physical and mental health is also important for counselors to understand. Through the feminist lens, client issue arise from experiences of oppression and power imbalance (Brady-Amoon, 2011); therefore, feminist clients may reject the idea of diagnosis altogether. In other words, they may identify their symptoms as being normal responses to oppression, not as psychopathology. To the counselor who is undereducated about feminism, this may present as client resistance to treatment, further impacting how the counselor interacts with the client in regards to goal setting and treatment planning. Counselors are not expected to divorce their theoretical orientations; however, it is their professional responsibility to utilize techniques and strategies that best fit a client’s needs. Being knowledgeable about feminist therapy, which addresses such issues through collaborative, nonhierarchical counselor-client relationships, can aid counselors in aligning with their feminist client’s needs and worldviews. Awareness of feminism and feminist perspectives can also aid in illuminating similarities between feminist and
multicultural theories in counseling, which are woven throughout counselor education programs. Combining multicultural and feminist counseling theories may help counselors better address issues of social justice, privilege and oppression in their work with clients. In fact, Fassinger and Gallor (2006) cite being informed about both perspectives as a necessary prerequisite for social justice and advocacy work with clients.

**Research**

In order to gain more understanding of the relationship between feminism and self-efficacy, more research is needed on specific factors that contribute to feminist identity. While there is previous qualitative research on feminist identity, scant research exists on how such influential factors may interact with general self-efficacy beliefs. Results also revealed higher mean scores for supporting feminist goals ($M = 70.2\%$) than for public ($M = 38.7\%$) and private ($M = 54.8\%$) feminist identification. Therefore, more research is needed to identify what has encouraged or prevented individuals from adopting the label despite adopting feminist values and perspectives. For example, qualitative inquiry into contributing factors for feminist identification may provide deeper explanations about differences between groups, as well as between public and private identification. Additionally, examining the relationship among individual SIF items, feminist attitudes, and feminist behaviors may provide further knowledge about differences for public and private identity, as well as for support and value of feminist perspectives. Further, incorporating a measure of racial identity might also help explain feminist identification reasoning in racial minorities (Martin & Hall, 1992; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997).

While advocacy was not a focus of this study, understanding how self-efficacy
impacts advocacy, for self and for others, is also an area of further research. Previous research has suggested a relationship among feminism, self-efficacy, and advocacy, and such a relationship may provide insight into what increases young adults’ decision to engage in advocacy efforts. Zucker (2004) suggested that participants who identified as feminists were more likely to engage in feminist activism, regardless of favorable conditions or barriers to feminist identification. This may illuminate the link between feminism and advocacy, suggesting that feminist identification is a better predictor of social justice participation, even if individuals are faced adverse conditions or possible negative consequences. However, because one’s belief in their self-efficacy determines the initiation of coping behaviors, the amount of effort presented, and the amount of time someone will continue to exert effort when they encounter obstacles (Bandura, 1997), this seems particularly important for feminists engaging in advocacy. Individuals who publically identify as feminists, as well as individuals who engage in collection action, are bound to face adverse experiences related to both the feminist label and advocacy. This may illuminate important knowledge regarding how the relationship among feminist identification, self-efficacy, and advocacy affects the desire of clients, students, and supervisees to engage in advocacy for any group or issue. Therefore, utilizing a measure of advocacy in future research may aid in identifying whether a group identity (e.g., feminist) or self-efficacy beliefs predicts advocacy intentions, providing guidance for counselor educators on how to motivate students to fulfill their ethical and professional obligation as advocates. In other words, findings may provide suggestions for what may be more important when discussing advocacy intentions in class: (a) an individual’s self-efficacy levels (and how to increase them); or (b) an individual’s group identifications
(and how to strengthen them).

More research should be conducted on how men and minorities differ in their views on feminist self-labeling and feminist perspectives. This was a goal of the current study; however, due to the use of convenience sampling and overrepresentation of women and White participants, generalizability of results is low. In recruiting male and minority participants, making initial contact with these groups at events where they are well-represented would have allowed for more active recruitment opportunities. Although face-to-face recruitment was the end goal for these groups, initial introductory emails about the study were unsuccessful in peaking participation interest from male and minority groups and organizations. Therefore, without an invitation from male and minority groups and organization, I was never able to obtain participation through active strategies. This resulted in inadequate representation of both groups in the current study, and therefore results could not be generalized to the overall population of male and minority young adults. The numbers for minority participants in the current study was likely most impacted by this, as active recruitment strategies are more effective with culturally diverse populations (Yancey, Ortega, & Kumanyika, 2006).

Utilizing probability sampling would have also increased generalizability of results. In stratified random sampling, the population is divided into strata (i.e., subgroups) and a desired number or proportion of participants are selected from each stratum (e.g., White men, White women, Minority men, Minority women) for the sample (Fink, 2013). Stratified random sampling allows the researchers to choose a sample that represents groups in desired proportions (Fink, 2013). Therefore, employing stratified random sampling in future research will allow researchers to obtain equal numbers for
groups in the sample while also allowing random selection of participants for each group. It is important to understand men’s perspectives on feminism because they have historically been seen as the oppressor of women. Minorities’ perspectives on feminism are needed in order to learn more about how minority status influences advocacy, as well as to identify whether minorities see postmodern feminism as being inclusive of and relevant to them.

Of the assessments used in this study, not all were normed on diverse samples. Additionally, the FPS3 may not have included feminist perspectives that represent late third/early fourth wave feminism. Creating an instrument which includes more current feminist perspectives may provide a better measure for whether or not participants support feminism as it stands today. For example, future instruments might include questions about (a) the use of social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) to address forms of oppression in an effort to include and support minority groups (Phillips & Cree 2014); (b) the intersection of gender and other forms of oppression (Wrye, 2009); and (c) the encouragement of male involvement in the feminist movement (Phillips & Cree, 2014). Additionally, items should be more focused on egalitarianism across identities, not specific to gender. For example, gendered items on the FPS3 positioned the male as the perpetrator and the woman as the victim of the oppression; however, modern feminist perspectives support the idea that like women, men are also negatively impacted by gender inequality and oppression (Mohanty, 1988). Future instruments should include items that explore the impact of gender inequity and masculinity on men. Further, some items on the FPS3 made assumptions about participants’ lives or intentions that were rooted in traditional gender norms. For example, item 31 stated, “My wedding was, or
will be, celebrated with a full traditional ceremony,” assuming that participants desired to get married if they were not already. Similar assumptions were found in item 33 and item 35, regarding the assumption of religion and of desire for children, respectively. Lastly, item 36 stated, “I often encourage women to take advantage of the many educational and legal opportunities available to them,” which assumes that all women have equal access to multiple educational and political resources. This assumption is related to the intersectionality of identities, which is a central focus of modern feminist perspectives. Therefore, items on future instruments should also be examined for inclusivity across multiple identities. Contrasting the more singular views of earlier feminist waves, these suggestions reflect some of the more varied views of third/early fourth wave feminism (Aronson, 2003; Heywood & Drake, 1997).

**Conclusion**

Results from the current study indicated feminist behavior as a predictor of self-efficacy. Additionally, results indicated no differences between White and non-White participants for feminist identification, feminist perspectives, or self-efficacy. However, women had significantly higher scores for the feminist identification and feminist perspectives, which is consistent with previous research comparing men and women on these constructs.

Results suggest counselor educators should consider incorporating feminism into their curriculum when teaching young adults, as the majority of participants in this study reported supporting goals of the feminist movement and identified feminist values as important to them. For these same reasons, supervisors and counselors who work with young adults should also consider a place for feminism in their practice in order to better
understand the worldview of supervisees and clients who adopt such perspectives.

Researchers should continue to research factors that impact self-efficacy, feminist identification, and feminist perspectives. Obtaining qualitative (and perhaps observational) data on factors that contribute to young adults’ decisions to adopt the feminist label and perspectives, both publicly and privately, may help identify additional connections between feminism and self-efficacy. Additionally, incorporating a measure of racial identity may aid in identifying contributing factors to feminist identification.
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APPENDIX B – STUDY INFORMATION FORM

Study Information Form
Examining the Effect of Feminist Self-Labeling and Feminist Perspectives on Self-Efficacy of Young Adults

You are being invited to participate in a research study that will include approximately 300 participants. You can read this form and agree to participate in the study, or you may decline to participate. You have been asked to take part in this research study because (a) you are currently enrolled as an undergraduate or graduate student at the University of South Carolina; and (b) you are at least 18 years old. All information collected is anonymous, as you will not be asked any identifying information.

Researchers: The person doing the research is Tiffany L. Rogers, M.Ed, NCC, Doctoral Candidate in the Counselor Education and Supervision program at the University of South Carolina.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of this study is to understand the relationships among feminist identification, feminist perspectives, and self-efficacy in young adults (undergraduate and graduate students).

What you will be asked to do in this study: You will be asked to complete a series of questions that will ask you about (a) demographic information, such as age, ethnicity, student status, gender, sexual orientation, relationship status; (b) whether or not you identify as a feminist (Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale); (c) your level of agreement on feminist perspectives (Feminist Perspectives Scale – Short Form); and your level of self-efficacy (General Self-Efficacy Scale). You will be completing these questions either in person (paper version) or online (on Survey Monkey).

Voluntary participation: You should take part in this study only because you want to. There is no penalty for not taking part in this study, and you may discontinue your participation in the study at any time.

Time required: It will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaires.
Risks: The risks for participating in this research is minimal. The risk will be no greater than the risks normally encountered in everyday life.

Benefits: Aside from contributing to new knowledge about feminism and self-efficacy, you can choose to enter a drawing to win one of four $25 gift cards after participating in the study.

Confidentiality: Your participation in this study is confidential. No identifying information is collected, thus individual participants cannot be linked to specific responses. If you choose to be entered into the gift card drawing, your email address will not be connected to your responses.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: Tiffany L. Rogers, M.Ed, NCC, Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education and Supervision, Department of Educational Studies at the University of South Carolina. Email: ttrogers@email.sc.edu
APPENDIX C – DEMOGRAPHICS FORM

1. Age: ______

2. Please indicate your ethnicity (select all that apply):
   a. American Indian/Alaska Native
   b. Asian
   c. Black/African American
   d. Hispanic/Latino(a)
   e. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   f. White/Caucasian
   g. Other

3. Please indicate your gender.
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Transgender

4. Please indicate your sexual orientation.
   a. Heterosexual
   b. Lesbian
   c. Gay
   d. Bisexual
   e. Other

5. Are you currently in a relationship?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. Please indicate your degree status.
   a. Undergraduate
   b. Graduate
7. Please indicate your student status.
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Graduate Student, Master’s
   f. Graduate Student, EdS
   g. Graduate Student, Doctoral

8. Please indicate your total years of education. _________________

9. In how many credit hours are you currently enrolled? ______________

10. What is your
    major/program? ____________________________________________________________________
**APPENDIX D – SELF IDENTIFICATION AS A FEMINIST**

*Instructions*: Please circle one option for each statement below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I consider myself a feminist.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I identify myself as a feminist to other people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feminist values and principles are important to me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I support the goals of the feminist movement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E – FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES SCALE – SHORT FORM

Measure of Social Attitudes (FPS3; Henley, Spalding, & Kosta, 2000)

Instructions: Please circle one answer for each statement below, based on your level of agreement or disagreement with the corresponding item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>START HERE</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A man’s first responsibility is to obtain economic success, while his wife should care for the family’s needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Women of color have less legal and social service protection from being battered than white women have.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People should define their marriage and family roles in ways that make them feel most comfortable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The government is responsible for making sure that all women receive an equal chance at education and employment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. By not using sexist and violent language, we can encourage peaceful social change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Homosexuals need to be rehabilitated into becoming normal members of society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The workplace is organized around men’s physical, economic, and sexual repression of women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rape is best stopped by replacing the current male oriented culture of violence with an alternative culture based on more gentle, womanly qualities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Men's control over women forces them to be the primary caretakers of children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Making women economically dependent on men is capitalism's subtle way of encouraging heterosexual relationships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Men need to be liberated from oppressive sex role stereotypes as much as women do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Putting women in positions of political power would bring about new systems of government that promote peace.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Men use abortion laws and reproductive technology to control women's lives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Romantic love supports capitalism by influencing women to place men's emotional and economic needs first.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Racism and sexism make double the oppression for women of color in the work environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Beauty is feeling one's womanhood through peace, caring, and non-violence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Using &quot;he&quot; for &quot;he and she&quot; is convenient and harmless to men and women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>It is a man's right and duty to maintain order in his family by whatever means necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Being put on a pedestal, which white women have protested, is a luxury women of color have not had.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Social change for sexual equality will best come by acting through federal, state, and local government.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Romantic love brainwashes women and forms the basis for their subordinations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Women's experience in life's realities of cleaning, feeding people, caring for babies, etc. makes their vision of reality clearer than men's.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. In rape programs and workshops, not enough attention has been given to the special needs of women of color.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. It is the capitalism system which forces women to be responsible for child care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Women should not be assertive like men because men are the natural leaders of earth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Marriage is a perfect example of men's physical, economic, and sexual oppression of women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. All religion is like a drug to people, and is used to pacify women and other oppressed groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Bringing more women into male-dominated professions would make the professions less cut-throat and competitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Capitalism forces most women to wear feminine clothes to keep a job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Discrimination in the workplace is worse for women of color than for all men and white women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions: Please circle one answer for each statement below, based on how true or untrue the corresponding item is of you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUE HERE

31. My wedding was, or will be, celebrated with a full traditional ceremony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. I actively try to integrate a communal form of work with a communal form of family life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VU</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>LU</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I attend a place of worship that has changed the language of its prayer books and hymnals to reflect the equality of men and women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I use &quot;she&quot; rather than &quot;he&quot; generically, that is, to refer to an unknown person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I take my child to a racially-mixed child care center (or will when I have a child).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I often encourage women to take advantage of the many educational and legal opportunities available to them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F – General Self-Efficacy Scale

**Instructions:** Please circle one option for each statement below, based on how true the corresponding item is of you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Barely true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If someone opposes me, I can find means and ways to get what I want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If I am in a bind, I can usually think of something to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>No matter what comes my way, I’m usually able to handle it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>