Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/wglm20

Predicting transphobia among cisgender women and men: The roles of feminist identification and gender conformity

Sarah E. Conlin, Richard P. Douglass & Emma H. Moscardini

To cite this article: Sarah E. Conlin, Richard P. Douglass & Emma H. Moscardini (2021) Predicting transphobia among cisgender women and men: The roles of feminist identification and gender conformity, Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 25:1, 5-19, DOI: 10.1080/19359705.2020.1780535

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2020.1780535

JOURNAL OF GAY & LESBIAN MENTAL HEALTH
2021, VOL. 25, NO. 1, 5–19
https://doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2020.1780535

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Predicting transphobia among cisgender women and men: The roles of feminist identification and gender conformity

Sarah E. Conlin, PhD, Richard P. Douglass, PhD, and Emma H. Moscardini, BS

Department of Psychology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

ABSTRACT

Introduction: This study examined feminist identification and conformity to traditional gender norms as predictors of transphobic attitudes.

Method: Data was collected among an online, MTurk sample of 290 adult cisgender women and men.

Results: Feminist beliefs and self-labeling were independently associated with decreased transphobia among cisgender women, but not among cisgender men. Conformity to the masculine norms of heterosexual self-presentation and emotional control were significantly, independently associated with increased transphobia, whereas risk-taking was associated with decreased transphobia. Conformity to the traditional feminine norm of Sexual Fidelity was significantly associated with increased transphobia.

Conclusions: Practical and policy implications are discussed.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 31 May 2019
Revised 1 June 2020
Accepted 5 June 2020

KEYWORDS
LGBT; discrimination; gender identity

The tenets of modern feminist theory suggest that feminist identification and feminist endorsement of nontraditional conceptions of gender may be protective factors against transphobia (e.g., Enns et al., 2012). However, a limited amount of research has examined related predictors of transphobia (e.g., Adams et al., 2016; Elischberger et al., 2016; Worthen, 2012). In order to comprehensively examine feminist- and gender-related predictors of transphobia, we drew from feminist theory to examine the associations between transphobia and (a) conformity to traditional gender norms, (b) self-reported femininity and masculinity, (c) liberal feminist beliefs, and (d) feminist self-labeling. Building from previous research suggesting gender differences in levels of transphobia (Nagoshi et al., 2008; Warriner et al., 2013), we examined these associations separately among cisgender women and men to determine whether findings diverged.

Theoretical framework: Multicultural feminist theory

Modern multicultural feminist theory emphasizes the importance of sociocultural and political context and strives to promote equality and affirm

CONTACT Sarah E. Conlin sconlin@ufl.edu Washington College, Department of Psychology, 300 Washington Ave, Chestertown, MD 21620, USA.

diversity from an intersectional perspective (Conlin, 2017). Because traditional gender roles maintain inequality, a belief in gender *equality* is likely a necessary first step to affirming gender diversity. Modern feminist theorists critique traditional views of gender that are theorized to maintain gender inequalities calling for scholars to acknowledge the complexities of sex and gender and their intersections with other forms of inequality (e.g., racism, classism; Enns et al., 2012).

Serano (2013) also critiques conceptualizations of gender and feminism that exclude transgender individuals. Serano advocates for an inclusive feminist movement and argues that exclusion based on gender identity stems from sexism, or the valuing of some gender identities above others. Taken together, inclusive multicultural feminism challenges sexism by rejecting the "policing [of] gender and sexuality" (Serano, 2013, p. 2). These critiques of traditional understandings of gender are essential to modern, multicultural, trans-inclusive feminisms (e.g., Enns et al., 2012; Serano, 2013). Thus, modern feminist theory provides a framework of acceptance for the many variations of gender identities and expressions that exist and a call for equality across these differences. Following these theoretical propositions, we propose feminist identification and gender conformity as predictors of transphobia among our cisgender sample.

Proposed predictors

Feminist ideology and self-labeling

Previous research suggests that feminist ideology and self-labeling are variables that may inversely predict transphobia. To illustrate, sexism has been found to positively correlate with transphobia or related attitudes (i.e., heterosexism) among cisgender women and men (Nagoshi et al., 2008; Whitley, 2001). Liberal political ideology, which has been found to correlate with feminist identification (Liss et al., 2001), also has been found to predict supportive attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals (Woodford et al., 2012). The present study focuses on transphobia specifically because although research has found heterosexist attitudes to highly correlate with transphobic attitudes, it has also suggested that attitudes toward transgender individuals may be less positive than those toward LGB individuals (Norton & Herek, 2013).

Moreover, Worthen (2012) measured the link between feminist self-labeling and transphobia directly and found feminist identification to positively correlate with supportive attitudes toward transgender individuals. Finally, supporting our examination of cisgender women and men separately, women have been found to identify with feminism to a greater extent than men (Houvouras & Scott Carter, 2008). For instance, Houvouras and Scott

Carter (2008) found that 36.3% of female college student participants—recruited via a convenience sample of students in introductory sociology classes—self-identified as feminists, compared to only 21.4% of male participants, and this difference was statistically significant. Aligning with our theoretical framework of multicultural feminism and its critique of traditional or exclusive views of gender (Enns et al., 2012; Serano, 2013), we hypothesized feminist identification (i.e., beliefs and self-labeling) to negatively predict transphobia.

Conformity to traditional gender norms

Conformity to traditional gender norms may also predict transphobia among cisgender men and women. Previous research has suggested that traditional gender role attitudes and variables related to endorsement of traditional gender roles (e.g., benevolent sexism in men and women, rape myth acceptance in women only) are positively associated with transphobia (Adams et al., 2016; Nagoshi et al., 2008; Tebbe & Moradi, 2012) in cisgender men and women. To illustrate, Adams et al. found discomfort with violation of traditional gender norms was positively associated with transphobia among a cisgender sample.

Previous research has also demonstrated that cisgender men report higher levels of transphobia compared to cisgender women (Nagoshi et al., 2008; Tebbe & Moradi, 2012). Keiller (2010) found that conformity to traditional masculine norms was linked to negative attitudes toward lesbians and, to an even greater extent, gay men, but did not examine attitudes toward transgender individuals. Moreover, Sánchez and Vilain (2012) found negative views toward femininity were positively associated with internalized homophobia among a sample of gay men. Offering a theoretical lens to these findings, Kimmel and Aronson (2004) argued that traditional, hegemonic masculinity is inherently homophobic, because it inspires in men fears of other men, of loss of manhood, and of being perceived as feminine in any way.

Additional research has begun to examine which *specific* aspects of traditional masculinity predict transphobia (e.g., homophobic sentiments) and which do not. For instance, Keiller (2010) examined subscales of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (11 subscales, CMNI; Mahalik et al., 2003) as predictors of attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women, and found that only some subscales (i.e., Disdain for Homosexuals) were particularly important predictors. Moreover, Elischberger et al. (2016) examined the relationship between CMNI and Conformity to Feminine Norms (CFNI) subscales (short versions, 9 subscales; Parent & Moradi, 2009, 2010, respectively) and negative attitudes toward transgender youth and found that men's heterosexual self-presentation and power over

women subscales were significant predictors of negative attitudes. In addition, they found women's Sexual Fidelity and Involvement with Children subscales had significant positive associations with negative attitudes. However, when considered in light of factors such as social political views and religion, these were no longer significant predictors. Elischberger et al. (2016) concluded that conformity to feminine norms had little impact on negative attitudes overall, but that conclusion contrasts the research reviewed above suggesting traditional gender role conformity or attitudes to be a key predictor of transphobic attitudes. Thus, the present study aimed to clarify these findings by examining attitudes toward transgender individuals more broadly (versus specifically youth) and assessing whether these predictors would be independent from identification with feminism and participants' self-ratings.

Above and beyond reported conformity to norms, the present study took into account participants' self-ratings with respect to masculinity and femininity, which previous research has failed to consider. Because gender norms and expressions are considered fluid (Kimmel & Aronson, 2004), self-ratings are also a helpful way to determine whether participants' endorsement of conformity on our scales aligns or diverges with their own views of their masculinity or femininity. If participants define masculinity or femininity in nontraditional ways, for instance, this variable may be an independent predictor of our outcomes. Taken together, we drew from the reviewed research and hypothesized that conformity to traditional gender norms would independently predict increased transphobia in our sample.

The present study

The goal of our study is to gain a better understanding of the roles of feminist identification and gender role conformity in attitudes toward transgender individuals, and whether these processes operate differently for cisgender women and men. Previous research supports our examination of feminist- and gender-related predictors of transphobia, yet no previous study has examined our hypothesized predictors in a comprehensive manner, assessing for independent associations among cisgender women and men. We hypothesized that endorsement of feminism (beliefs and self-labeling) would inversely predict transphobia, and that conformity to traditional gender norms would positively predict transphobia. Moreover, we aimed to determine which specific elements of traditional gender role conformity were salient predictors, and thus we examined each subscale of our conformity measures (CMNI and CFNI) separately.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics.

Characteristic	*N*	%	*M*	*SD*
Participants	291			
Age (years)			36.95	13.16
Race/Ethnicity				
White/European American/Caucasian	216	74.2		
African/African-American/Black	26	8.9		
Hispanic/Latina/o American	23	7.9		
Asian/Asian American	17	5.8		
Asian Indian	4	1.4		
Arab American/Middle Eastern	2	0.7		
American Indian/Native American/First Nation	1	0.3		
Other race or ethnicity	2	0.7		
Sexual orientation				
Heterosexual	263	90.1%		
Bisexual	10	3.4%		
Lesbian	5	1.7%		
Gay	4	1.4%		
Pansexual	3	1.0%		
Asexual	3	1.0%		
Other	1	0.3%		
Gender				
Cisgender woman	181	62.2%		
Cisgender man	109	37.5%		
Another Gender Identity	1	.3%		

Method

Participants

Participants completed the present study through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), which is an online survey platform that allows participants to complete research surveys for credit at Amazon.com. The average completion time for this brief survey was approximately 10 minutes. Data collection took place and was concluded in January, 2017. Participation was limited to adults residing in the United States. We excluded participants who identified as transgender or gender-nonconforming ($n = 1$). Demographic information is presented in Table 1.

Previous research has suggested that data collected via MTurk is comparable to other samples, including university student, community, and social media samples (Buhrmester et al., 2011; Casler et al., 2013; Goodman et al., 2013). Goodman et al. (2013) reviewed the benefits and limitations of MTurk data collection and concluded that overall, MTurk participants are reliable and demonstrate few significant differences from other samples. Yet, additional research suggests that MTurk, and convenience samples more broadly, may not be representative of population samples (Mullinix et al., 2015). Mullinix et al. caution against concluding that convenience samples are necessarily generalizable to a broader population of interest, and highlight that attributes of convenience samples, such as MTurk, may change over time. With these limitations in mind, Mullinix et al. recommend utilizing convenience samples as a "testing grounds" (p. 133) for

social science research. Thus, convenience samples such as MTurk are useful in providing a necessary foundation that population studies may build upon in the future.

Measures

Liberal feminist ideology

We assessed feminist ideology using the liberal feminist attitudes and ideology scale (LFAIS; Morgan, 1996). Participants responded to the 60-item LFAIS scale using a 6-point Likert scale, which ranged from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* (Morgan, 1996). One question was removed because it referenced The Equal Rights Amendment, which may not be familiar to all participants. Example items include: "Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history" and "A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man" (Morgan, 1996). This scale is scored by summing all individual items, with higher total scores signifying higher feminist ideology. Researchers have found the test-retest correlation to be .83 and Cronbach's alpha to range from .83 to .94 (Morgan, 1996). In the present study, the estimated internal consistency reliability of scale scores was $\alpha = .84$ among women, and .83 among men.

Feminist self-labeling

Feminist self-identification was measured via a Likert scale. Specifically, participants rated their agreement using a 6-point Likert scale with the statement "I am a feminist," ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Similar single item assessments of feminist identification have been used in past research, including both continuous and dichotomous measures (Houvouras & Scott Carter, 2008; Liss et al., 2000, 2001; McCabe, 2005; Moradi et al., 2012; Roy et al., 2007).

Conformity to feminine norms

We measured conformity to feminine norms using the Conformity to Feminine Norms Index (CFNI). The original version of CFNI is an 84-item, 8-factor measure created by Mahalik et al. (2005). Factors include: Nice in relationships, thinness, modesty, romantic relations, domestic, care for children, sexual fidelity, and invest in appearance (Mahalik et al., 2005). Example questions include: "Taking care of children is extremely fulfilling," "I would feel guilty if I had a one-night stand," and "I would be happier if I were thinner" (Mahalik et al., 2005). Participants respond to scale measures using a 4-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. We used the abbreviated 45-item CFNI-45 (CFNI-45; Parent & Moradi, 2010),

which was also modified to include nine factors, or sub-scales (splitting "Nice in relationships" into two factors: "Sweet and nice" and "relational"), and which demonstrates superior data-model fit to the original. Consistency between the CFNI and the CFNI-45 was demonstrated with correlations ranging from .87 to .97 (Parent & Moradi, 2010). Researchers have found the Cronbach's alpha to range from .68 to .89 (Parent & Moradi, 2010). In the present study, the estimated internal consistency reliability for the total scale scores was $\alpha = .79$. Internal consistency reliabilities for sub-scales were as follows: $\alpha = .70$ for Sweet and Nice, $\alpha = .77$ for Relational, $\alpha = .85$ for Thinness, $\alpha = .77$ for Modesty, $\alpha = .81$ for Romantic Relations, $\alpha = .81$ for Domestic, $\alpha = .92$ for Care For Children, $\alpha = .87$ for Sexual Fidelity, and $\alpha = .79$ for Invest In Appearance.

Conformity to masculine norms

We measured conformity to traditional masculine norms (i.e., hegemonic masculinity) using the Conformity to Masculinity Norms Index (CMNI). The original version of the CMNI has 94 questions and covers 11 factors (Mahalik et al., 2003). Factors include: Emotional control, Playboy, winning, self-reliance, violence, risk-taking, power over women, dominance, primacy of work, pursuit of status, and disdain for homosexuals (or "heterosexual self-presentation" as termed by Parent & Moradi, 2009; Mahalik et al., 2003). Example questions include: "I would be furious if someone thought I was gay," "In general, I will do anything to win," "I hate asking for help," and "I tend to keep my feelings to myself" (Mahalik et al., 2003). Participants respond to scale measures using a 4-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. We used the abbreviated 46-item inventory (CMNI-46) developed by Parent and Moradi (2009), which also removes two of the original factors, and includes 9 sub-scales (Dominance and Pursuit of Status). Researchers have found that the CMNI-46 corresponds with the CMNI-original with correlation scores ranging from .89 to .98 (Parent & Moradi, 2009). In the present study, the estimated internal consistency reliability for the total scale scores was $\alpha = .86$. Internal consistency reliabilities for sub-scales were as follows: $\alpha = .83$ for emotional control, $\alpha = .82$ for Playboy, $\alpha = .81$ for winning, $\alpha = .73$ for self-reliance, $\alpha = .83$ for violence, $\alpha = .79$ for risk-taking, $\alpha = .84$ for power over women, $\alpha = .84$ for primacy of work, and $\alpha = .89$ for heterosexual self-presentation.

Transphobia

To measure transphobia among cisgender men and women, we used the Transphobia Scale developed by Nagoshi et al. (2008). Participants

Table 2. Pearson product-moment correlations of all study variables (cisgender women).

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Transphobia	–				
2. Feminist self-identification	−.66**	–			
3. Liberal feminist beliefs	−.62**	.65**	–		
4. Conformity to feminine norms	.21**	−.14	−.13	–	
5. Self-rated femininity	.17*	.03	−.13	.30**	–
Mean	30.72	3.83	49.65	123.29	1.76
Standard Deviation	14.60	1.68	8.06	11.75	.72

**$p < .01$.
*$p < .05$.

responded to the 9-item scale using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from *completely disagree* to *completely agree* (Nagoshi et al., 2008). Sample questions include: "I avoid people on the street whose gender is unclear to me" and "I believe that a person can never change their gender" (Nagoshi et al., 2008). Research has found good internal consistency with the transphobia scale, obtaining a Cronbach's alpha of .82 (Nagoshi et al., 2008). In the present study, the estimated internal consistency reliability for the total scale scores was $\alpha = .93$ among women, $\alpha = .90$ among men. Items for the Transphobia Scale are provided in Appendix.

Self-rated femininity and masculinity

Similarly to feminist identification, we asked participants to rate their own masculinity and femininity using Likert scale items. Single item measures of self-rated feminist identification are common in the literature (Houvouras & Scott Carter, 2008; Liss et al., 2000, 2001; McCabe, 2005; Moradi et al., 2012; Roy et al., 2007). Translating this practice to self-rated femininity and masculinity, participants responded to the question: "How masculine would you consider yourself to be?" and "How feminine would you consider yourself to be?" on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from *not at all* to *very*.

Procedure

This IRB-approved study was completed by participants through Qualtrics, an online survey software. The presentation order of all scales was randomized to control for potential priming effects. Prior to completing the survey, all participants were required to complete an informed consent. Participants who provided consent continued to the survey and their responses were anonymously recorded to maintain confidentiality.

Results

We report bivariate correlations and descriptive statistics for all study variables in Tables 2 and 3. Using t-tests to compare means, cisgender women

Table 3. Pearson product-moment correlations of all study variables (cisgender men).

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Transphobia	–				
2. Feminist self-identification	−.34**	–			
3. Liberal feminist beliefs	−.43**	.42**	–		
4. Conformity to masculine norms	.46**	−.16	−.51**	–	
5. Self-rated masculinity	.29**	−.19*	−.18	.22*	–
Mean	36.73	2.58	40.67	110.89	1.78
Standard Deviation	13.37	1.66	9.52	15.46	.75

**$p < .01$.
*$p < .05$.

Table 4. Regression summary with standardized coefficients, standard errors, and significance values (cisgender women).

	Outcome: Transphobia		
Variable	*β*	*SE*	*p*
Feminist self-identification	−0.42	0.05	<.001
Liberal feminist attitudes and ideology (LFAIS)	−0.25	0.09	0.002
Sexual fidelity	0.16	0.07	0.01
Sweet and nice	−0.12	0.08	0.09
Care for children	0.11	0.06	0.10
Self-rated femininity	0.07	0.09	0.26
Thinness	0.05	0.06	0.39
Invest in appearance	0.03	0.06	0.64
Domestic	0.03	0.06	0.68
Romantic relations	0.02	0.07	0.73
Modesty	0.00	0.07	0.97
Relational	0.00	0.06	1.00
$R^2 = .55$			

reported significantly less ($p = .001$) transphobia and significantly more feminist beliefs (higher LFAIS scores) and feminist self-labeling ($p < .001$ for both) than men.

We hypothesized that liberal feminist beliefs (LFAIS) and feminist self-labeling would inversely predict transphobia, and that conformity to traditional gender norms and self-reported masculinity would positively predict transphobia. To test these hypotheses, we performed two simultaneous multiple regressions, one examining these relations among cisgender men and another among cisgender women (Table 4 and Table 5, respectively). Multiple regression analyses control for the associations among independent variables. To handle missing data ($n = 14$ for women, $n = 15$ for men), we used the default listwise exclusion method. The skewness and kurtosis statistics of all variables were less than $|1.0|$, indicating acceptable normality.

With respect to cisgender men ($n = 94$), the regression explained 66.7% of variance in transphobia. Unexpectedly, liberal feminist ideology, feminist self-labeling, and self-reported masculinity did not significantly predict transphobic beliefs in our regression analysis ($p > .05$). With respect to specific masculine norms, Heterosexual Self-Presentation was the largest

Table 5. Regression summary with standardized coefficients, standard errors, and significance values (cisgender men).

	Outcome: Transphobia		
Variable	*β*	*SE*	*p*
Heterosexual self-presentation	0.55	0.08	<.001
Emotional control	0.20	0.08	0.02
Risk-taking	−0.19	0.08	0.02
Feminist self-identification	−0.17	0.05	0.06
Power over women	0.11	0.09	0.32
Violence	0.06	0.07	0.41
Liberal feminist attitudes and ideology (LFAIS)	−0.09	0.10	0.42
Playboy	−0.06	0.07	0.44
Primacy of work	−0.02	0.07	0.82
Self-rated masculinity	0.02	0.10	0.84
Self-reliance	0.01	0.07	0.86
Winning	0.01	0.07	0.87
$R^2 = .67$			

predictor of transphobia ($\beta = .55$). Risk-taking also inversely predicted transphobia ($\beta = -.19$), and Emotional Control positively predicted transphobia ($\beta = .20$). No other CMNI subscale was a significant independent predictor in our regression analysis ($p > .05$).

With respect to cisgender women ($n = 167$), the model explained 54.6% of total variance. In support of our hypotheses, liberal feminist beliefs (LFAIS) and, to an even greater extent, feminist self-identification were significant, negative predictors of transphobia ($\beta = -.25$ and $-.42$, respectively). Sexual Fidelity was also a small but positive and significant predictor ($\beta = .16$). Self-rated femininity was not a significant predictor of transphobia, and no other CFNI subscale was a significant independent predictor in our regression analysis ($p > .05$).

Discussion

The present study examined feminist identification (beliefs and self-labeling) and conformity to traditional gender norms as predictors of transphobia among a sample of cisgender adults. Our findings demonstrate the need for a more nuanced examination of the ways in which gender conformity may contribute to transphobia. Moreover, our results highlight significant gender differences with respect to the role of feminist identification.

Regarding gender conformity, conformity to the masculine norm of Heterosexual Self-presentation was the largest, independent predictor of transphobia among cisgender men, replicating previous research (Elischberger et al., 2016; Keiller, 2012). The norm of Risk-Taking was associated with decreased transphobia, and Emotional Control was positively associated with transphobia. One possible explanation for these findings is that both emotional intelligence (which includes *attention* to

emotions, as opposed to control or suppression) and risk-taking have been associated with the personality trait of openness to experience (Nicholson et al., 2005; Schutte et al., 1998). Openness to experience has in turn been associated with reduced homophobia and transphobia (Cullen et al., 2002; McCullough, 2016). Moreover, although these masculine norms (Heterosexual self-presentation, emotional control, and risk-taking) demonstrated significant links with transphobia in the present study, no other norms demonstrated a significant effect. This finding diverges from previous research with respect to the Power over Women subscale (Elischberger et al., 2016). One explanation for this difference is that most participants did not endorse this norm in the present study, with the majority of responses falling within the disagree range. Finally, participants' self-rated masculinity also did not significantly predict transphobia, suggesting an important distinction between specific gender norms and participants' broader definitions of masculinity. Overall, our findings suggest that some specific, traditional norms that we associate with hegemonic masculinity, such as Heterosexual Self-presentation, likely contribute to transphobia, whereas other norms do not.

For cisgender women, the traditional feminine norm of Sexual Fidelity was positively associated with transphobia. Previous research has suggested that traditional values may be positively associated with transphobia, supporting our finding related to Sexual Fidelity (e.g., McCullough, 2016). Self-rated femininity was not a significant predictor, again highlighting the importance of examining specific feminine norms. Finally, women reported less transphobia overall, replicating previous findings (Nagoshi et al., 2008; Tebbe & Moradi, 2012). Taken together, our findings also challenge the notion that conformity to traditional norms consistently predicts transphobia, instead suggesting that it depends on the specific gender norm (e.g., while our results suggest that Heterosexual Self-presentation may predict transphobia among cisgender men, the Risk-Taking norm may be associated with decreased transphobia).

With respect to feminist identification, we found that for women, liberal feminist beliefs and, to an even greater extent, self-labeling were the largest independent predictors of transphobia in the expected directions (i.e., both were associated with decreased transphobia). On the other hand, neither liberal feminist ideology nor feminist self-labeling were significant, independent predictors among cisgender men. One explanation for this gender difference may be that men reported significantly less feminist beliefs and less acceptance of the feminist label (i.e., labeled as a "feminist" to a lesser degree; $p < .001$ for both). Because relatively few men endorse feminist beliefs and self-identification, it follows that the same protective functioning may not apply.

Clinical significance

With respect to programs, policies, or interventions geared toward reducing transphobia, our findings suggest the importance of examining specific gender norms that may promote transphobia. In addition, interventions should attend to gender differences with respect to feminist identification as a protective factor (e.g., cisgender men are likely to identify with feminism less). Ultimately, we hope that consideration of these differences and complexities will improve success of efforts aimed toward bias-reduction.

With respect to psychotherapy, it is important from a feminist perspective to understand the sociocultural context of a client's presenting concerns (Enns et al., 2012), including possible sources of biases, which the present study helps elucidate. Understanding biases on the part of both clients and clinicians may be especially beneficial for therapists seeking to take on added roles as allies, advocates, or activists for social change, aligning with the social justice focus of the field of psychology (American Psychological Association (APA), 2010).

Limitations

Further research is needed to explore gender differences with respect to feminist identification and associated outcomes. For instance, our non-significant findings may be linked to men's relatively low rates of reported feminist identification, which future research may seek to explore in this context. Future research should also seek to develop and test interventions aimed toward bias-reduction. Additionally, future research may also seek to assess gender expressions such as femininity and masculinity across genders. The present study was limited in assessing self-rated femininity exclusively among cisgender women, and masculinity exclusively among cisgender men. Finally, future research may seek to explore additional factors (e.g., political identification) that may be associated with transphobia or cis-normativity.

With respect to study limitations, cross-sectional data is limited because it does not allow us to draw causal conclusions. Thus, longitudinal research will also be needed to determine causality. Additionally, this study was limited by lack of attention to intersectionality (Cole, 2009) in shaping participants' views, instead focusing specifically on experiences related to gender.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Ethics statement

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

References

Adams, K. A., Nagoshi, C. T., Filip-Crawford, G., Terrell, H. K., & Nagoshi, J. L. (2016). Components of gender-nonconformity prejudice. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2016.1200509

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*(1), 3–5. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610393980

Casler, K., Bickel, L., & Hackett, E. (2013). Separate but equal? A comparison of participants and data gathered via Amazon's MTurk, social media, and face-to-face behavioral testing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(6), 2156–2160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.05.009

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *The American Psychologist*, *64*(3), 170–180. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564

Conlin, S. E. (2017). Feminist therapy: A brief integrative review of theory, empirical support, and call for new directions. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *62*, 78–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2017.04.002

Cullen, J. M., Wright, L. W., Jr., & Alessandri, M. (2002). The personality variable openness to experience as it relates to homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *42*(4), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v42n04_08

Elischberger, H. B., Glazier, J. J., Hill, E. D., & Verduzco-Baker, L. (2016). "Boys don't cry" or do they? Adult attitudes toward and beliefs about transgender youth. *Sex Roles*, *75*(5-6), 197–214. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0609-y

Enns, C. Z., Williams, E. N., & Fassinger, R. E. (2012). Feminist multicultural psychology: Evolution, change, and challenge. In E. N. Williams & C. Z. Enns (Eds.) *The Oxford handbook of feminist counseling psychology* (pp. 3–26). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199744220.013.0001

Goodman, J. K., Cryder, C. E., & Cheema, A. (2013). Data collection in a flat world: The strengths and weaknesses of Mechanical Turk samples. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *26*(3), 213–224. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1753

Houvouras, S., & Scott Carter, J. (2008). The F word: College students' definitions of a feminist. *Sociological Forum*, *23*(2), 234–256. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1573-7861.2008.00072.x

Keiller, S. W. (2010). Masculine norms as correlates of heterosexual men's attitudes toward gay men and lesbian women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *11*, 38–52. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017540

Kimmel, M. S., & Aronson, A. (2004). *Men and masculinities: A social, cultural, and historical encyclopedia*. ABC-CLIO.

Liss, M., Hoffner, C., & Crawford, M. (2000). What do feminists believe? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *24*(4), 279–284.[Database] https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2000.tb00210.x

Liss, M., O'Connor, C., Morosky, E., & Crawford, M. (2001). What makes a feminist? Predictors and correlates of feminist social identity in college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *25*(2), 124–133. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00014

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *4*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3

Mahalik, J. R., Morray, E. B., Coonerty-Femiano, A., Ludlow, L. H., Slattery, S. M., & Smiler, A. (2005). Development of the conformity to feminine norms inventory. *Sex Roles*, *52*(7-8), 417–435. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-3709-7

McCabe, J. (2005). What's in a label? The relationship between feminist self identification and "feminist" attitudes among US women and men. *Gender & Society*, *19*, 480–505. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243204273498

McCullough, J. R. (2016). *Correlates and predictors of anti transgender prejudice* [Doctoral dissertation]. Georgia State University,

Moradi, B., Martin, A., & Brewster, M. E. (2012). Disarming the threat to feminist identification: An application of personal construct theory to measurement and intervention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *36*(2), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312440959

Morgan, B. L. (1996). Putting the feminism into feminism scales: Introduction of a Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS). *Sex Roles*, *34*, 359–390. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF0154780

Mullinix, K. J., Leeper, T. J., Druckman, J. N., & Freese, J. (2015). The generalizability of survey experiments. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, *2*(2), 109–138. https://doi.org/10.1017/XPS.2015.19

Nagoshi, J. L., Adams, K. A., Terrell, H. K., Hill, E. D., Brzuzy, S., & Nagoshi, C. T. (2008). Gender differences in correlates of homophobia and transphobia. *Sex Roles*, *59*(7-8), 521–531. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9458-7

Nicholson, N., Soane, E., Fenton-O'Creevy, M., & Willman, P. (2005). Personality and domain-specific risk taking. *Journal of Risk Research*, *8*(2), 157–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/1366987032000123856

Norton, A. T., & Herek, G. M. (2013). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward transgender people: Findings from a national probability sample of US adults. *Sex Roles*, *68*(11-12), 738–753. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0110-6

Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory and development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *10*, 175. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015481

Parent, M. C., & Moradi, B. (2010). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Conformity to Feminine Norms inventory and development of an abbreviated version: The CNFI-45. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *34*(1), 97–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01545.x

Roy, R. E., Weibust, K. S., & Miller, C. T. (2007). Effects of stereotypes about feminists on feminist self-identification. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*(2), 146–156. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00348.x

Sánchez, F. J., & Vilain, E. (2012). "Straight-acting gays": The relationship between masculine consciousness, anti-effeminacy, and negative gay identity. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *41*(1), 111–119. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9912-z

Serano, J. (2013). *Excluded: Making feminist and queer movements more inclusive*. Seal Press.

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *25*(2), 167–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00001-4

Tebbe, E. N., & Moradi, B. (2012). Anti-transgender prejudice: A structural equation model of associated constructs. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *59*(2), 251–261. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026990

Warriner, K., Nagoshi, C. T., & Nagoshi, J. L. (2013). Correlates of homophobia, transphobia, and internalized homophobia in gay or lesbian and heterosexual samples. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *60*(9), 1297–1314. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.806177

Whitley, B. E. (2001). Gender-role variables and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Sex Roles*, *45*, 691–721. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015640318045

Woodford, M. R., Silverschanz, P., Swank, E., Scherrer, K. S., & Raiz, L. (2012). Predictors of heterosexual college students' attitudes toward LGBT people. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *9*(4), 297–320. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2012.716697

Worthen, M. G. (2012). Heterosexual college student sexual experiences, feminist identity, and attitudes toward LGBT individuals. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *9*(2), 77–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2012.649613

Appendix: The transphobia scale (Nagoshi et al., 2008)

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