

Intersectional Masculinities and Gendered Political Consciousness: How Do Race, Ethnicity and Sexuality Shape Men's Awareness of Gender Inequality and Support for Gender Activism?

Catherine E. Harnois¹

Published online: 15 November 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2016

Abstract Gendered political consciousness refers to having an awareness of gender inequality, viewing this inequality as illegitimate, and supporting collective efforts to bring about greater gender equality. The present study draws from social psychology, theories of masculinities, and intersectionality to assess the factors associated with men's political consciousness of gender. Multivariate regression analyses of data from the U.S.-based 2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study ($N = 598$) (American National Election American National Election Study 2012) highlights how social statuses of race/ethnicity and sexuality—along with beliefs about racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities—correlate with men's awareness of gender inequality and support for women fighting for greater gender equality. Results show that Non-Hispanic Black men and married men are significantly more likely than are non-Hispanic White men and unmarried men to see high levels of gender inequality. Men who see high levels of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities are also significantly more likely to perceive high levels of gender inequality. Bivariate analyses show that Non-Hispanic Black men, as well as men who see high levels of other inequalities, are also more likely than are other men to support women fighting for greater gender equality, but in multivariate regression models these effects are eclipsed by political ideology—the single best predictor of men's support for women fighting for gender equality. Results underscore the need to differentiate awareness of gender inequality and support for efforts to challenge gender inequality, and they highlight the potential of

intersectionality for conceptualizing men's gendered political consciousness.

Keywords Gendered political consciousness · Intersectionality · Masculinity · Social psychology · Identity · Race · Gender · Sexuality · Sex role attitudes

Gendered political consciousness is a multidimensional concept that involves being aware of gender inequality, viewing this inequality as illegitimate, and supporting collective efforts to bring about greater gender equality (Gurin 1985; Gurin et al. 1980; Mansbridge and Morris 2001). Those who hold a strong gendered political consciousness are more likely to support public policy addressing gender inequalities and are more likely to engage in collective action (Clayton and Crosby 1992; Drury and Kaiser 2014). The development and maintenance of gendered political consciousness is thus crucial if existing gender inequalities are to be remedied.

Existing research on gendered political consciousness highlights the importance of gender. Women are more likely than men are to claim gender as a central social identity (Burn et al. 2000), to perceive higher levels of gender inequality (Davis and Greenstein 2009), and to perceive high levels of gender discrimination and sexual harassment (Becker and Swim 2011; Landrine and Klonoff 1997). Women are also more likely than men are to self-identify as feminist and to participate in feminist organizations and feminist activism (Ferree and Hess 2000; Huddy et al. 2000; Schnittker et al. 2003).

Although men in the United States are less likely than women are to hold a gendered political consciousness, many men in fact do. Existing research shows that a substantial proportion of men perceive gender inequality as a persistent problem (Drury and Kaiser 2014; Harnois 2010; Kane 2000),

✉ Catherine E. Harnois
harnoise@wfu.edu

¹ Department of Sociology, Wake Forest University,
Winston-Salem, NC 27109, USA

reject rigid gender roles, and support gender egalitarianism (Davis and Greenstein 2009; Gerson 2010); furthermore, some men actively participate in feminist activism and organizations (Bridges 2010; Messner 1997; Messner and Greenberg 2015). Qualitative research is replete with examples of gender egalitarian and pro-feminist men, but due to the relative lack of large-scale representative research in this area, little is known about the factors associated with men's political consciousness of gender.

Although seldom explicitly linked, research on intersectional masculinities offers important insights for analyzing men's gendered political consciousness. A key theme within this research is that gender hierarchies not only privilege men above women, as well as masculinity above femininity, but also privilege some men, as well as some versions of masculinity, over others. Race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, and other inequalities shape the resources upon which men draw when enacting masculinity, and they also structure the social contexts in which these performances take place. These inequalities also shape the extent to which men benefit from gender inequality—what Connell (1995, p. 79) refers to as the “patriarchal dividend.”

Building on this research, I analyze two dimensions of men's gendered political consciousness—beliefs about the extent of gender inequality and support for women fighting for greater gender equality—and investigate the socio-demographic and ideological factors associated with these beliefs. The data analyzed come from the 2012 American National Election Study – Evaluations of Government and Society Study (EGSS 4), a nationally representative probability sample of English-speaking adults in the United States. Before analyzing these data, I review the existing research on gendered political consciousness and the circumstances in which it develops in the U.S. context. Scholarship on intersectional masculinities complements this research, highlighting the ways in which multiple social statuses “work with and through one another” (Baca Zinn and Thornton Dill 1996, p. 326) to shape men's consciousness of, and investment in, existing gender inequalities.

Gendered political consciousness—also referred to as “gendered oppositional consciousness” (Mansbridge and Morris 2001) and “feminist consciousness” (Conover and Sapiro 1993; Henderson-King and Stewart 1994; Reingold and Foust 1998)—is a multidimensional concept combining an awareness of gender inequality with a belief in the illegitimacy of gender inequality and with support for collective action to address these inequalities (Gurin 1985). Although these three dimensions often overlap, Gurin and colleagues argue that they are conceptually distinct (Gurin et al. 1980; Gurin and Townsend 1986). Some individuals might be highly aware of gender inequality, while also believing that these inequalities are inevitable and/or legitimate. In other cases, individuals might recognize high levels of gender inequality

and view this inequality as illegitimate, but stop short of supporting collective efforts for social change (Gurin 1985). Although existing research has examined a wide range of gender-related attitudes and beliefs, including sexist attitudes (e.g., Glick and Fiske 1996), attitudes about women (Spence et al. 1973), and gender roles (Brooks and Bolzendahl 2003; Miller and Borgida 2016), the concept of gendered political consciousness focuses more specifically on beliefs about gender inequality and the extent to which these beliefs are coupled with a collective-action orientation to address this inequality.

Predictors of Gendered Political Consciousness

The vast majority of research on gendered political consciousness focuses on women (e.g., Gurin and Townsend 1986; Harnois 2015; Henderson-King and Stewart 1994). Social psychological research consistently finds that women who hold a strong gender-based identity are more likely to hold a strong gendered political consciousness (Gurin 1985; Iyer and Ryan 2009). In addition, women who are divorced or who were never married are more likely to hold a gendered political consciousness compared to those currently married or widowed (Reingold and Foust 1998). Younger women, those with liberal political orientations, and those with higher levels of education also tend to hold higher levels of gendered political consciousness (Harnois 2015; Reingold and Foust 1998).

Far fewer studies have examined the factors associated with men's gendered political consciousness. Davis and Robinson's (1991) early work in this area found that, as of the mid-1980s, men's educational attainment and income were not significantly related to men's awareness of gender inequality, although both were significantly and negatively associated with men's support for efforts to reduce gender inequality. Iyer and Ryan's (2009) more recent work found that whereas *women* who identify strongly with the social group *women* were *more* likely to perceive gender inequality as illegitimate, *men* with a strong gender-based identity were *less* likely than were other men to see gender inequality as illegitimate. As Iyer and Ryan note, however, their findings are limited by the study's failure to include key sociodemographic variables, such as race, age, or socioeconomic status.

Closely related to research on gendered political consciousness is research examining the correlates of gender ideology. Within this research, gender ideology is typically operationalized in terms of respondents' beliefs about gendered roles, with scant attention given to other aspects of gender ideology, such as perceptions of inequality and views about social change (Hamilton et al. 2011; Harnois 2013). Those who support the idea of “separate spheres” for women and men are said to hold a “traditional gender ideology,” and those who challenge these roles are said to have a more “egalitarian” or

“liberal” gender ideology (Davis and Greenstein 2009; Gerson 2010). Longitudinal research has consistently found that, in the United States, younger cohorts are significantly more liberal in their gender ideologies than are older cohorts (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Pampel 2011; Schnittker et al. 2003).

Research examining racial/ethnic differences in men’s gender ideology has overwhelmingly focused on comparisons of Blacks and Whites, and it offers inconsistent findings (Kane 2000). One early study found that Black men, on average, scored higher than White men did on their performance of masculinity, but that Black and White men were similar in terms of gender ideologies (Hershey 1978). Ransford and Miller (1983, p. 58) used data from the 1970s to investigate gender ideologies and concluded that Black men were, as a group, “substantially more traditional” in their gender ideologies than were White men. Blee and Tickamyer (1995) analyzed data from roughly the same time period, however, and found very different results. Whereas Black men were more traditional than were White men with respect to gender arrangements in the public and private spheres, Black men were consistently more liberal in their beliefs about working women. Ciabattari’s (2001) more recent analysis found that Black men were more liberal than White men were in their attitudes towards employed mothers, but also found that the two groups were similar in their beliefs about separate spheres for women and men. Hispanic men, in contrast, did not differ from non-Hispanic White men in their beliefs about employed mothers, but were more conservative concerning beliefs about separate spheres. Studies focusing specifically on Black men’s beliefs about gender inequality (as opposed to gendered roles) have consistently found Black men to perceive high levels of gender inequality and to be strong supporters of gender-justice projects (Harnois 2010; Hunter and Sellers 1998; Simien 2006).

Social psychological research emphasizes that individuals’ material interests, along with their exposure to egalitarian ideas and situations, play an important role in shaping gender ideologies. Married men benefit financially when their spouses work for pay, for example, and this may increase the likelihood of men’s holding a liberal gender ideology (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Davis and Greenstein 2009). Although there is evidence that people of all genders stand to gain from greater gender equality (Banaszak and Plutzer 1993; Bennett 2006; Holter 2014), men’s comfort with existing gender norms, as well as their *perception* of gender equality as a threat to their own well-being, likely strengthens their investment in maintaining existing gender hierarchies (Ridgeway and Correll 2004). Exposure to, and comfort with, gender egalitarianism can come about by growing up in egalitarian families, by living in more egalitarian societies, and through educational experiences. Research suggests that these experiences are all predictive of liberal gender ideologies

among men in the United States (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Davis and Greenstein 2009; Pampel 2011).

Taken as a whole, research on men’s gendered political consciousness is limited by the relative shortage of large-scale, generalizable studies and by the near absence of research analyzing data from recent years. That research which does exist offers inconsistent findings, likely due to changes in men’s gender ideologies over the past several decades as well as the various aspects of gender consciousness and gender-related attitudes examined (Kane 2000). A further limitation of existing research is that it seldom situates men’s gendered political consciousness in relation to intersecting inequalities and masculinities. As discussed in the following, recent research draws attention to the ways in which race, sexuality, class, and ethnicity work together to shape men’s relationship with masculinity, as well as with gender more generally. Like social psychological research, masculinities research emphasizes that men’s investment in the dominant ideals of masculinity are structured by their material interests, as well as their exposure to egalitarian ideals. A central claim of intersectional masculinities research, however, is that race, ethnicity, sexuality, and class expose men to a broad range of social justice issues, and they also shape men’s investment in maintaining gender inequality.

Intersectional Masculinities and Gendered Political Consciousness

Intersectionality is a broad-based theoretical perspective that conceptualizes race, class, gender, sexuality, and other systems of inequalities as interlocking and mutually constitutive (Cole 2009; Collins 2015; Shields 2008). A central tenet of intersectionality is that individuals always experience gender in combination with multiple social statuses, as well as within the context of multiple social hierarchies (Baca Zinn and Thornton Dill 1996; Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1991). Gender works with and through other systems of inequality at multiple levels of society. At the micro-level, individuals—be they women, men, transgender, or gender-queer—always experience gender and other social statuses simultaneously. At the macro-level, racial, gender, and sexuality-based hierarchies work together to structure organizations, institutions, and physical spaces, which often reinforce these inequalities.

Research on masculinities also conceptualizes gender as intersecting with other systems of inequality. Early research emphasized that men’s performance of masculinity varied greatly and showed that it was structured in part by sexuality, race, class, and age (Connell 1995; Hershey 1978; Plummer 1981). Because all people occupy multiple social statuses and claim multiple identities, performances of masculinity are interconnected with performances of race, ethnicity, class, age, and other social identities (Bettie 2003; Collins 2004; Pascoe

2007). At the more macro-level, inequalities of race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality help structure the social-spatial contexts in which masculinity is enacted. Whether it is within the home, the workplace, the military, a classroom, prison, or a public park, expectations of masculinity, as well as individuals' performances of masculinity, are shaped by the institutions and broader social contexts in which they are situated (Collins 2004; Pascoe 2007; Ricciardelli et al. 2015).

Scholars of intersectional masculinities theorize gender not only as a hierarchy in which men and masculinity are privileged over women and femininity, but also as a hierarchy within which some men, and some versions of masculinity, are systematically privileged over others (Connell 1995; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). The authority, respect, status, and material benefits associated with masculinity—what Connell (1995, p. 79) terms the “patriarchal dividend”—are not distributed evenly across social groups. Race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality shape not only the ways in which men enact masculinity, as well as the contexts within which these performances take place, but also the extent to which men are able to benefit from gender inequality.

Scholarly research that focuses on intersectional masculinities or on gendered political consciousness is seldom explicitly linked. As described previously, holding a gendered political consciousness involves having an awareness of gender inequalities, viewing these inequalities as illegitimate, and supporting collective efforts to bring about greater gender equality. Social psychological research emphasizes that individuals' interests, along with their exposure to egalitarian ideas and situations, help to structure men's gender attitudes and beliefs. Research on intersecting masculinities, however, emphasizes that race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality structure the benefits men gain from the gender hierarchy. Men who are disadvantaged with respect to sexuality, race, ethnicity, and/or class lack full access to the power and privileges of masculinity. Although men in low-status groups, like those in high-status groups, oftentimes reinforce gender inequality (Connell 1995; Pascoe 2007), men who are systematically disadvantaged, compared to men in more privileged groups, may be less invested in its maintenance. By definition, men who are socially, economically, and/or politically advantaged benefit from the status quo. Men who are disadvantaged, in contrast, have less to lose and, in many cases, much to gain from a more egalitarian social structure.

In addition to structuring men's material interests, inequalities of race, ethnicity, sexuality, and class may structure men's exposure to egalitarianism. Whereas previous research has emphasized exposure to *gender* egalitarian ideals and situations as predictive of gendered political consciousness, an intersectional perspective urges a consideration of how men's exposure to (and involvement in) other social justice issues may shape men's consciousness of gender. At the macro-level, race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality are built into the major

institutions and organizations in society (e.g., housing, education, the criminal justice system, the economy). By structuring the social-spatial contexts that men (and women) inhabit, these inequalities also structure the types and extent of inequality that individuals are likely to encounter (Feagin 1991; Roscigno 2007). Men who have been “exposed to” issues of inequality and social justice more broadly, who are attuned to issues of racial/ethnic, class, and sexuality-based inequalities, may be more likely than other men are to be aware of gender-based inequalities, as well as more likely to hold a gendered political consciousness.

Although known existing research has not examined these ideas directly, attitudinal research suggests that individuals who hold liberal gender ideologies are more likely to also hold liberal ideas about racial/ethnic inequality (Reingold and Foust 1998), sexuality (Powell et al. 2010), and politics (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Conover and Sapiro 1993; Reingold and Foust 1998). My own (Harnois 2015) analysis of women's gendered political consciousness found that perceptions of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities were positively correlated both with perceptions of gender inequality and with support for women fighting for gender equality. Messner and colleagues' (2015) qualitative work illustrates how men's experiences with a wide range of inequalities might also facilitate a political consciousness of gender. Many of the activist men they interviewed came to the anti-violence against women movement via involvement with other social movements (e.g., the New Left) and from personal experiences with racial/ethnic and class-based inequalities.

Whereas in some cases a political consciousness of class, for example, might facilitate a consciousness of gender, in other cases individuals may develop an awareness of multiple inequalities concurrently. King (1988), for example, argued that Black women's experiences with racial, gender, and class-based inequalities help generate a political consciousness of multiple inequalities. White et al.'s (1997) work provides further support for this idea, and suggests that it may also extend to men. Among the African American anti-rape activists White and colleagues interviewed, many women *and men* held a political consciousness of gender that was intertwined with a political consciousness of race (see also Curtin et al. 2015).

The Present Study

Although existing research on men's gendered political consciousness is both sparse and inconsistent, existing scholarship suggests that men's gendered political consciousness is shaped by a combination of material interests in gender inequality and exposure to egalitarian ideals. Highlighting the intersection of gender with race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality, intersectional masculinities research both complements and

extends this perspective. Men in low-status groups gain fewer rewards from the gender hierarchy, and thus they may be less invested in its maintenance. Emphasizing these intersectional interests, this perspective predicts that men with subordinate racial/ethnic and sexuality statuses will be more likely than privileged men to hold a strong gendered political consciousness (Hypothesis 1).

In addition to intersecting social statuses, recent social psychological research centralizes the importance of intersectional ideologies. Men's awareness of racial/ethnic, class, and sexuality-based systems of inequality may inform their understanding of gender inequality, as well as their response to it. Broadening the concept of "exposure to [gender] egalitarianism" to include exposure to social (in)justice issues more generally, this perspective suggests that those who are aware of other inequalities will be more likely to hold a strong gendered political consciousness. In other words, men's perceptions of racial/ethnicity and sexuality-based inequalities will positively correlate with their political consciousness of gender (Hypothesis 2).

The present study tests these two hypotheses and extends existing research by analyzing data from a recent and relatively large-scale survey. Its focus on race/ethnicity and sexuality shed light on a previously unexamined issue: the extent to which men's location within these hierarchies, as well as their awareness of these inequalities, structure men's gendered political consciousness.

Method

Participants

The data I analyzed are from the 2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study (American National Election Study 2012), a survey conducted online, using a nationally representative probability sample. Respondents were members of the Knowledge Networks KnowledgePanel, an online panel of participants invited to complete surveys several times each month on a range of topics. Participants were recruited through telephone (Random Digit Dialing) and address-based sampling (ABS) methods. Those recruited via ABS were invited to participate by means of a series of mailings and, when possible, telephone follow-up. Those who agreed to participate, but who were not able to access the internet, were provided free internet access and equipment to enable their participation. All participants received an incentive worth approximately \$1 for each survey completed, and all were English-speaking U.S. citizens, aged 18 or older. Fully 598 men provided complete information for the questions examined here, four of whom identify as transgender. Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 92 ($M = 50.43$, $SD = 6.20$). The sample was predominantly non-Hispanic

White ($n = 468$, 78.26 %), with 7.19 % non-Hispanic Black respondents ($n = 43$), 9.20 % ($n = 55$) Hispanic/Latino respondents, and 5.35 % ($n = 32$) of respondents identifying with other racial/ethnic groups. Most respondents identified as heterosexual ($n = 566$, 94.6 %), with 5.3 % ($n = 32$) identifying as gay, bisexual or with another sexual minority group. Approximately two-thirds of men ($n = 395$) reported being married.

Procedure and Measures

Multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models are employed to assess the factors associated with men's perceptions of gender inequality, and ordered logistic regression models are used to examine the factors associated with men's support for women fighting for gender equality. Multivariate analyses use post-stratification weights for generalizing to the broader population and use linearized standard errors (DeBell et al. 2011). The use of weights reduces the effective sample size from 598 to 592.

Gendered Political Consciousness

The two aspects of gendered political consciousness analyzed are (a) perceptions of gender inequality and (b) perceptions of women who fight for greater gender equality, an indication of respondents' support for collective action to address gender inequality (Harnois 2015). Respondents were asked, "How much discrimination is there in the United States today against each of the following groups: women, men, Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, and gays and lesbians?" Both the order of the groups and the ordering of the extent of discrimination were randomized across the survey to minimize any potential biases, and answers range from 1 (*none at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*). Perceptions of gender inequality are measured by subtracting respondents' score for discrimination against men from their score for discrimination against women. The resulting variable ranges from -4 to 4, with higher values indicate more relative discrimination against women, and greater gender inequality.

Men's perceptions of women who fight for gender equality were assessed with two survey questions. A random subset of half the respondents was asked, "When women demand equality these days, how often are they actually seeking special favors?" Responses were coded into five categories, ranging from 5 (*never*) to 1 (*all the time*), where higher scores indicated more support for women's equality. The remaining respondents were asked a similar question: "Do you agree or disagree with each statement?... When women demand equality these days, they are actually seeking special favors." Responses using the same response scale were again coded into five categories, where high values indicate strong disagreement and thus support for women's equality.

Descriptive statistics reveal that the distribution of the variables concerning support for women who “demand equality” differ, and to account for these differences, multivariate analyses include a control variable (“DV Version”) corresponding to which version of the survey question respondents were asked. As an additional precaution, multivariate regression analyses examined separately the extent to which the sociodemographic characteristics predict responses to each version of the survey question. The results showed that the dummy variable for non-Hispanic Blacks differed across the two models. To account for this difference, an interaction term between the variable Black and the dummy variable for the version of the survey question is included in multivariate analyses.

Independent Variables

The main independent variables are respondents’ social statuses of race/ethnicity, class, and sexuality, and respondents’ beliefs about racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities. Sexual identity is assessed with a dummy variable based on the question, “Do you consider yourself to be heterosexual or straight, gay, lesbian, or bisexual?” For this variable, 0 indicates respondents who identify as heterosexual or straight, and 1 indicates respondents who identify as gay, bisexual, or with another sexual minority group. Respondents’ racial/ethnic statuses are measured as a series of dummy variables (non-Hispanic Black or African American; non-Hispanic White; Hispanic or Latino; other non-Hispanic racial/ethnic group).

Perceptions of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities are assessed by the same series of questions that are used to examine beliefs about the extent of gender inequality. Perceptions of inequalities facing Blacks are measured by subtracting the value of respondents’ perceptions of discrimination against Whites from the value of their response for discrimination against Blacks. Perceptions of inequalities facing Hispanics are measured by subtracting the value of respondents’ perceptions of discrimination against Whites from the value of their beliefs about discrimination against Hispanics. Both variables range from -4 to 4, with higher values indicating more relative discrimination against Blacks and Hispanics respectively.

The EGSS does not include a measure of discrimination against heterosexuals and, consequently, it is not possible to construct a measure of *relative* inequality experienced by sexual minorities. Instead, a variable assessing respondents’ perception of discrimination experienced by gays and lesbians is included. The survey asked, “How much discrimination is there against each of the following groups... gays and lesbians?” Responses range from 1 (*none at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*), with higher values indicating perceptions of greater discrimination. In multivariate models, interaction terms are also used to test whether the relationship between gendered

political consciousness and perceptions of these inequalities differ across different racial/ethnic and sexuality-based groups.

Respondents’ educational attainment is assessed with a four-category, ordinal-level variable: 1 (*less than high school*), 2 (*high school degree but no college*), 3 (*some college but less than a bachelor’s degree*), and 4 (*bachelor’s degree or more*). Age is measured in years, and family income is assessed with an eleven-category variable with increments of: less than \$10,000; \$10,000–\$19,999; \$20,000–\$29,999; \$30,000–\$39,999; \$40,000–\$49,999; \$50,000–\$59,999; \$60,000–\$74,999; \$75,000–\$84,999; \$85,000–\$99,999; \$100,000–\$124,999; \$125,000+. The variable values correspond to the midpoint of these categories, measured in thousands of dollars, with the highest category coded at 150. Multivariate models also include a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent is currently married or widowed (1 = yes) and a variable assessing respondents’ political ideology. This variable is assessed with the question, “When it comes to politics, would you describe yourself... as liberal, conservative or neither liberal nor conservative?” Responses range from 1 (*very conservative*) to 7 (*very liberal*), with a midpoint value of 4 for respondents who describe themselves as neither liberal nor conservative.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics (un-weighted) for all variables included in the analysis, with missing cases omitted list-wise. Planned contrasts were conducted to assess the extent to which variable means differed for men of different racial/ethnic groups, and the asterisks in the table correspond to the significance levels for these t-tests. As shown, there is considerable diversity across the racial/ethnic groups considered, in terms of both socio-demographic background and perceptions of social inequality. Compared to non-Hispanic Whites, Hispanic men in the sample are significantly younger and have lower educational attainment. Non-Hispanic Black men and Hispanic men report family incomes that are, on average, significantly lower than the incomes reported by non-Hispanic Whites. Non-Hispanic Black men and men who identify as non-Black/non-Hispanic racial/ethnic minorities have, on average, more liberal political ideologies than do men of other racial/ethnic groups.

Non-Hispanic Black men and Hispanic men, on average, perceive significantly higher levels of gender inequality than do non-Hispanic White men. Further analyses reveals that whereas Black and Hispanic men are similar to non-Hispanic men in their perceptions of discrimination against men, Black and Hispanic men see significantly more

Table 1 Un-weighted descriptive statistics: evaluation of Government and Society Study 2012

Variable	Total (<i>N</i> = 598) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Non-Hispanic White (<i>n</i> = 468) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Non-Hispanic Black (<i>n</i> = 43) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Hispanic / Latino (<i>n</i> = 55) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Other Racial/ethnic Minority (<i>n</i> = 32) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Min	Max
Perceived gender inequality	.53 (1.18)	.44 (1.15)	1.19*** (1.31)	.85* (1.27)	.34 (1.00)	-4	4
Support for women seeking equality	3.48 (1.04)	3.45 (1.05)	3.88** (.90)	3.53 (1.07)	3.34 (.86)	1	5
Age	50.43 (16.20)	51.44 (16.21)	49.37 (15.21)	43.89** (15.81)	48.25 (15.91)	18	92
Sexual minority	.5 (.22)	.5 (.22)	.02 (.15)	.9 (.29)	.6 (.25)	0	1
Education	2.94 (.99)	3.00 (.97)	2.63* (.90)	2.54** (1.03)	3.09 (1.06)	1	4
Family Income	74.63 (45.04)	77.18 (44.27)	61.45* (42.98)	64.04* (44.35)	73.20 (55.42)	5	150
Married/Widowed	.67 (.47)	.68 (.47)	.60 (.49)	.60 (.49)	.59 (.450)	0	1
Political Ideology	3.65 (1.69)	3.50 (1.69)	4.56*** (1.58)	3.91 (1.62)	4.12* (1.58)	1	7
Discrimination against gays and lesbians	3.41 (1.07)	3.36 (1.05)	3.95*** (1.02)	3.53 (1.17)	3.12 (1.16)	1	5
Perceived racial inequality	.89 (1.39)	.76 (1.31)	1.84*** (1.45)	1.22* (1.56)	.97 (1.60)	-4	4
Perceived ethnic inequality	.88 (1.31)	.80 (1.27)	1.58*** (1.33)	1.02 (1.43)	.87 (1.50)	-4	4
DV Version	.52 (.50)	.53 (.50)	.39 (.49)	.56 (.50)	.50 (.51)	0	1

Note. Reported contrasts are from non-Hispanic Whites

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed tests

discrimination against women than do non-Hispanic White men ($p < .001$ and $p = .008$ respectively). Compared to non-Hispanic White men, non-Hispanic Black men report higher levels of support for women seeking equality and perceive higher levels of discrimination against gays and lesbians. Hispanic and non-Hispanic Black men also report seeing higher levels of racial inequality, and Black men see higher levels of ethnic inequality than any other group, including more than Hispanics ($p = .012$). With the exception of political ideology, men who identify with other racial/ethnic groups are not significantly different from non-Hispanic Whites on any of the items considered, although the non-significance may be due, in part, to the small sample of men in this group.

Table 2 presents the bivariate correlations for all variables in the analysis. The strength of the relationships varies, but men's perceptions of racial and ethnic inequality, as well as perceptions of discrimination against sexual minorities, are all significantly and positively correlated with perceptions of gender inequality and with support for women fighting for gender equality.

Hypothesis Testing

The remaining tables present the results from multivariate analyses that further clarify the relationship among men's social statuses, perceptions of inequality, and gendered political consciousness. Although little known existing research has examined the factors associated with men's gendered political consciousness, intersectionality and theories of masculinities suggest that men with subordinate racial/ethnic and sexuality statuses—who have less to

gain from the patriarchal dividend—will be more likely than more privileged men are to hold a strong gendered political consciousness (Hypothesis 1). See Table 3 for tests of this hypothesis. Models 1 and 2 present the results from OLS regressions, showing that, controlling for other factors, non-Hispanic Black men on average perceive higher levels of gender inequality than do non-Hispanic White men. Men who identify as Hispanic or Latino, as well as those who identify with other non-Black racial/ethnic minorities, are similar to non-Hispanic Whites in terms of their perceptions of gender inequality. Marital status is also a significant predictor: Compared to men in other family forms, men who are currently married or widowed saw significantly more gender inequality. Model 2 adds political ideology, and it reveals that liberal-leaning men perceive greater gender inequality.

Models 3 and 4 show the results from ordered logistic regressions examining the factors associated with support for women fighting for gender equality. As in Models 1 and 2, Model 3 shows that non-Hispanic Black men hold higher levels of gendered political consciousness than do non-Hispanic White men, controlling for other socio-demographic characteristics. Age and family income have a significant negative relationship with support for women fighting for gender inequality, although all of these factors become non-significant when political ideology is included (Model 4).

Hypothesis 2 predicted that men's perceptions of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities would be positively associated with men's gendered political consciousness. Men who are aware of racial/ethnic, class, and sexuality-

Table 2 Un-weighted correlations: 2012 evaluation of government and society study (*N* = 598)

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
(1) Perceived gender inequality	–													
(2) Support for women seeking gender equality	.361***	–												
(3) Age	–.39	–.005	–											
(4) No-Hispanic Black	.155***	.108**	–.018	–										
(5) Hispanic/Latino	.88*	.015	–.129**	–.089*	–									
(6) Other racial/ethnic minority group	–.37	–.31	–.32	–.66	–.76	–								
(7) Sexual Minority	.38	.62	–.17	–.37	.53	.10	–							
(8) Education	–.32	–.25	.115**	–.88*	–.127**	.38	–.23	–						
(9) Family Income	–.34	–.3	.47	–.82*	–.75	–.08	–.53	.483***	–					
(10) Married / Widowed	.32	.31	.395***	–.36	–.44	–.36	–.194***	.178***	.315***	–				
(11) Political Ideology	.293***	.265***	–.122**	.149***	.49	.67	.207***	.12	–.74	–.167***	–			
(12) Racial inequality	.499***	.207***	–.05	.189***	.75	.13	.29	.4	–.47	–.22	.344***	–		
(13) Ethnic inequality	.436***	.173***	–.34	.149***	.34	–.01	.39	–.03	–.27	–.36	.304***	.837***	–	
(14) Discrimination against gays and lesbians	.303***	.82*	–.15	.141***	.35	–.63	.131**	–.60	–.56	–.43	.266***	.373***	.371***	–
(15) DV Version	–.35	.138***	.000	–.71	.26	–.11	–.11	–.46	.56	–.09	–.47	–.79	–.84*	–.107**

Table 3 OLS and ordered logistic standardized estimates of men's gendered political consciousness ($N = 592$)

	Perceived gender inequality		Support for women who seek equality	
	Model 1 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 2 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 3 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 4 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)
Age	-.004 (.003)	-.003 (.004)	-.0141* (.007)	-.012 (.006)
Black (Non-Hispanic)	.907*** (.246)	.767** (.244)	1.258* (.545)	1.009 (.543)
Hispanic / Latino	.457 (.248)	.423 (.265)	.132 (.409)	.026 (.417)
Other racial/ethnic minority	-.271 (.209)	-.335 (.215)	-.303 (.348)	-.429 (.303)
Sexual Minority	.231 (.342)	.36 (.322)	.683 (.611)	.283 (.579)
Education	.107 (.068)	.79 (.068)	.37 (.101)	-.25 (.103)
Family Income	-.003 (.002)	-.002 (.002)	-.005* (.002)	-.004 (.002)
Married / Widowed	.400** (.151)	.460** (.150)	.281 (.246)	.424 (.235)
Political Ideology		.140** (.042)		.315*** (.075)
DV Version			.516* (.223)	.526* (.213)
Black* DV Version			-1.094 (.704)	-1.239 (.771)
Constant	.308 (.233)	-.232 (.298)		
R^2	.094	.127		

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

based inequalities, or who have been “exposed to” issues of inequality and social justice, may be more likely hold a strong gendered political consciousness. See the last two tables for tests of this hypothesis. Model 1, in Table 4, focuses on perceptions of inequality experienced by Blacks, and it shows that there is a significant positive relationship between men's perceptions of racial inequality and their perceptions of gender inequality. Marital status remains a significant predictor, and non-Hispanic Black men perceive significantly more gender inequality than do non-Hispanic White men. Model 2 includes an interaction term for Black*Perceived Racial Inequality, the non-significance of which suggests that, for Black respondents and others, perceptions of racial inequality are positively associated with perceived gender inequality. With the inclusion of perceived racial inequality, political ideology is no longer a significant predictor of men's perception of gender inequality. Including perceived racial inequality also dramatically increases the R^2 from .127 (Table 3, Model 2) to .322 (Table 4, Model 1).

Models 3 and 4 focus on perceptions of inequality experienced by Hispanics and show that for both Hispanics and non-Hispanics, men who perceive higher levels of ethnic inequality tend to perceive higher levels of gender inequality (see Table 4). Model 5 shows that, controlling for other factors, for every one-unit increase in perceptions of discrimination against sexual minorities, the expected value of perceived gender inequality increases by .254. Across all models, married and widowed men see higher levels of gender inequality than their non-married counterparts do, and non-Hispanic Black men perceive more gender inequality than non-Hispanic Whites do,

other things being equal. Perceptions of racial/ethnic inequalities are stronger predictors of men's perceived gender inequality than is political ideology. This relationship is shown by the non-significance of political ideology in Models 1–4 and by the relatively high R^2 throughout the table.

Table 5 shows similar analyses but uses ordered logistic regression models to examine men's support for women who fight for gender equality. Across all models, political ideology is a significant predictor, with politically conservative men less likely to be strong supporters of women fighting for gender inequality. Models 5 and 6 show that, when controlling for perceptions of discrimination against gays and lesbians, Non-Hispanic Black men show significantly more support for women fighting for gender inequality than do non-Hispanic White men. In Table 4, perceptions of inequality experienced by Blacks and Hispanics, and discrimination experienced by sexual minorities, were all statistically significant and positively correlated with perceived gender inequality, even when controlling for political ideology. Table 5 shows that, when political ideology is taken into consideration, these factors are not significant predictors of men's support for women fighting for gender equality. Subsequent analyses show that when political ideology is removed from the model, perceptions of racial and ethnic inequality are significant and positive predictors of support for women fighting for gender equality ($p < .05$). In addition, when political ideology is omitted, age is consistently a significant negative predictor, and the coefficient for non-Hispanic Black is a significant and positive predictor.

Table 4 OLS standardized estimates of men's perceptions of gender inequality (N=592)

	Model 1 <i>b</i> (SE)	Model 2 <i>b</i> (SE)	Model 3 <i>b</i> (SE)	Model 4 <i>b</i> (SE)	Model 5 <i>b</i> (SE)	Model 6 <i>b</i> (SE)
Age	-.005 (.003)	-.005 (.003)	-.003 (.003)	-.003 (.003)	-.004 (.003)	-.004 (.003)
Black (Non-Hispanic)	.476* (.205)	.385 (.357)	.539* (.224)	.533* (.225)	.610** (.234)	.599* (.233)
Hispanic / Latino	.341 (.232)	.343 (.232)	.391 (.242)	.451* (.225)	.392 (.263)	.367 (.264)
Other racial/ethnic minority	-.357 (.197)	-.355 (.196)	-.287 (.230)	-.287 (.231)	-.203 (.209)	-.208 (.209)
Sexual Minority	.80 (.270)	.81 (.271)	.22 (.275)	.5 (.276)	-.153 (.333)	1.554 (1.195)
Education	.35 (.060)	.36 (.060)	.58 (.063)	.60 (.063)	.76 (.066)	.78 (.066)
Family Income	-.002 (.02)	-.002 (.02)	-.002 (.002)	-.002 (.002)	-.002 (.002)	-.002 (.002)
Married / Widowed	.342** (.128)	.336** (.127)	.355** (.134)	.357** (.134)	.431** (.141)	.435** (.142)
Political Ideology	.045 (.037)	.044 (.037)	.063 (.038)	.062 (.038)	.106* (.041)	.107** (.041)
Racial Inequality	.408*** (.053)	.400*** (.054)				
Black* Racial Inequality		.058 (.178)				
Ethnic Inequality			.369*** (.061)	.377*** (.065)		
Hispanic* Ethnic Inequality				-.066 (.163)		
Discrimination against gays and lesbians					.254*** (.047)	.265*** (.047)
Sexual Minority * Discrimination against Gays and Lesbians						-.399 (.308)
Constant	.49 (.282)	.56 (.281)	-.91 (.286)	-.99 (.289)	-.905** (.327)	-.937** (.330)
R-squared	.322	.323	.266	.267	.174	.177

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Discussion

The present study combined a social psychological framework with research on intersectionality and masculinities to assess the predictors of men's political consciousness of gender. An intersectional approach to conceptualizing men's "interests" emphasizes that the rewards men gain from the gender hierarchy are structured by multiple axes of inequality, including race/ethnicity, class, and sexuality. This perspective hypothesized that men with subordinate racial/ethnic, class, and sexuality statuses would be less invested in the gender hierarchy and thus more likely than privileged men are to hold a strong gendered political consciousness (Hypothesis 1). An intersectional perspective on exposure to egalitarianism argues that, beyond exposure to gender egalitarian ideals and situations, men's awareness of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based injustices may also inform their perception of gender inequality, as well as their response to it. This perspective hypothesized that men's perceptions of racial/ethnicity and sexuality-based inequalities would positively correlate with men's political consciousness of gender (Hypothesis 2).

The findings from the present study show mixed results, and underscore the complex relationship between intersecting inequalities and men's gendered political consciousness. In terms of Hypothesis 1, the results revealed that non-Hispanic Black men reported an awareness of gender inequality and greater support for women fighting for gender equality than did non-Hispanic White men.

Despite the small number of non-Hispanic Black men in the survey ($n = 43$), this finding is extremely robust and consistent across almost all analyses including bivariate analyses and multivariate analyses. This finding supports the "intersectional interests" perspective (Hypothesis 1). Compared to non-Hispanic White men, Black men gain fewer advantages of patriarchy, and their greater level of gendered political consciousness suggests that they have significantly less interest in its maintenance.

Less support is found when other disadvantaged statuses are considered. Bivariate analyses (see Table 1) showed that men who identify as Hispanic or Latino perceived higher rates of gender inequality than non-Hispanic White men did, but this difference was no longer significant in multivariate analyses (see Tables 3 and 4). Hispanic/Latino men were not significantly different from Non-Hispanic Whites in their support for women fighting for gender equality (see Tables 1, 3, and 5). Men who identified as non-Black/non-Hispanic racial/ethnic minorities perceived levels of gender inequality similar to non-Hispanic Whites, and they were also similar in their support for women fighting for gender equality. Men who identified as gay, bisexual, or with other sexual minority groups perceived levels of gender inequality similar to heterosexual-identified men (see Table 3), although the small sample of sexual-minority men in the sample ($n = 32$) urges caution with this particular finding. Controlling for other characteristics, educational attainment and family income were generally not significant predictors of men's gendered

Table 5 Ordered logistic standardized estimates of men's support for women who seek equality ($N = 592$)

	Model 1 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 2 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 3 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 4 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 5 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 6 <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)
Age	-.12 (.006)	-.12 (.006)	-.12 (.006)	-.12 (.006)	-.11 (.006)	-.11 (.006)
Black (Non-Hispanic)	.906 (.513)	.667 (.662)	.939 (.524)	.916 (.524)	1.124* (.546)	1.134* (.547)
Hispanic / Latino	.21 (.419)	.22 (.419)	.27 (.419)	.137 (.516)	.57 (.413)	.76 (.414)
Other racial/ethnic minority	-.437 (.312)	-.435 (.312)	-.417 (.312)	-.416 (.313)	-.496 (.282)	-.493 (.281)
Sexual Minority	.323 (.566)	.320 (.571)	.289 (.572)	.250 (.591)	.390 (.582)	-.903 (2.053)
Education	-.42 (.105)	-.38 (.106)	-.32 (.104)	-.28 (.104)	-.20 (.103)	-.21 (.103)
Family Income	-.004 (.002)	-.004 (.002)	-.004 (.002)	-.004 (.002)	-.004 (.002)	-.004 (.002)
Married / Widowed	.409 (.238)	.394 (.239)	.417 (.236)	.417 (.235)	.429 (.230)	.426 (.230)
Political Ideology	.286*** (.080)	.286*** (.079)	.296*** (.080)	.295*** (.080)	.335*** (.073)	.334*** (.073)
Racial Inequality	.123 (.087)	.105 (.093)				
Black* Racial Inequality		.133 (.236)				
Ethnic Inequality			.85 (.101)	.101 (.110)		
Hispanic* Ethnic Inequality				-.120 (.259)		
Discrimination against gays and lesbians					-.156 (.102)	-.164 (.103)
Sexual Minority * Discrimination against Gays and Lesbians						.304 (.533)
DV Version	.550* (.218)	.548* (.218)	.545* (.218)	.539* (.220)	.504* (.213)	.501* (.213)
Black * DV Version	-1.142 (.768)	-1.041 (.799)	-1.165 (.777)	-1.139 (.781)	-1.258 (.768)	-1.266 (.771)

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

political consciousness, a finding unanticipated by most existing research.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that men's exposure to a broad range of social justice issues, measured in terms of perceptions of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities, would positively correlate with men's political consciousness of gender. Findings show that men's perceptions of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities were significant predictors of men's perception of gender inequality (see Table 4), both for minority groups and for more privileged groups. The high R^2 of Model 1 of Table 4 (.322) more than doubles the R^2 reported in Table 3, Model 2 (.127), and the former shows that men's perceptions of race-based inequalities are particularly powerful predictors of perceived gender inequality. Perceptions of racial/ethnic and sexuality-based inequalities, although positively correlated with men's support for women fighting for greater gender equality, were not significant predictors of this dimension of gendered political consciousness after controlling for political ideology.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

My analyses clearly demonstrate the importance of race/ethnicity and sexuality for theorizing men's political consciousness of gender, but there also are limitations. First, although attention to multiple inequalities is a strength of the present study, the small sample of racial/ethnic and sexual minorities included may be suppressing the statistical significance of effects for these groups. The analyses also group

together men who identify with non-Hispanic/non-Black racial/ethnic minority groups and, in so doing, mask important variations within this group. An additional limitation concerns the cross-sectional nature of the present data and their inability to capture the sequence through which gendered political consciousness develops. Some intersectionality research theorizes a consciousness of multiple inequalities which develops simultaneously (King 1988) whereas other research suggests that, among men, awareness of one form of inequality often facilitates an awareness of other forms of inequality (Messner et al., 2015). Both explanations may be at play, and longitudinal studies—particularly those focusing on minority groups currently under-represented in gendered political consciousness research—are vital for future research.

A further limitation concerns the lack of information about social class: the EGSS does not include neither questions concerning respondents' class-based identities nor questions about respondents' perceptions of class-based discrimination. Intersectionality and masculinities research both emphasize social class as an important dimension of inequality, and the present analyses are limited in this regard. In addition, although previous research has found that men's educational attainment and income are associated with more liberal gender ideologies, these factors are consistently non-significant in the present study. This discrepancy may be due to the focus on "gender roles," rather than gendered political consciousness, in much existing research, or it may be due to the significant changes in gender arrangements and ideology over the past several decades (Bolzendahl and Myers 2004; Gerson 2010;

Pampel 2011). Future research focusing specifically on the intersection of class with other inequalities is needed for this line of research to move forward.

It must also be noted that although many respondents indicate that they see high levels of discrimination against women and express support for women fighting for gender equality, these survey responses do not always carry over into “real world” situations. Although previous research demonstrates a significant link between gender-related attitudes and behavior (Clayton and Crosby 1992; Drury and Kaiser 2014; Miller and Borgida 2016), it is likely far easier for men to support women’s fight for gender equality when they are by themselves, completing an on-line survey, than when they are in other contexts where the social sanctions for challenging masculinity are more severe (Kimmel 2008; Pascoe 2007). For people of all genders, beliefs about gender justice do not always translate into action.

Practice Implications

Although the analyses presented here stop short of assessing men’s behavior, an accurate assessment of men’s gendered political consciousness remains crucial for addressing gender inequality. Most known existing research on men’s gendered political consciousness focuses on men *qua* men, centralizing gendered interests, gendered experiences, and familial relationships. The high correlations among perceptions of gender, racial/ethnic, and sexuality-based inequalities suggest that men’s experiences with race/ethnicity and sexuality may be just as important for cultivating a gendered political consciousness as is gender. Programs seeking to build men’s awareness of gender inequality might benefit from explicit attention to other forms of inequality.

Two further implications for feminist activism are of note. First, my results make clear that non-Hispanic Black men and married men are among the most likely to see high levels of gender inequality. These two (overlapping) groups are seldom represented as “feminist” in academic research, activist writing, or broader culture discourse. The results presented here suggest that these groups may be more “feminist” than previously suggested. A second implication concerns the need to address the multiple dimensions of gendered political consciousness as related but distinct. As noted previously, increasing men’s awareness of gender inequality does not automatically translate into support for challenging gender inequality. Attention to the multiple dimensions of gendered political consciousness is likely necessary for meaningful social change to occur.

Conclusion

Taken as a whole, the present results find relatively strong links among men’s intersectional interests, exposure to a

broad range of inequalities, and perceived gender inequality, but less clear connections among intersectional interests, exposure to inequalities, and support for women fighting for gender equality. What is unambiguous from the present study is that socially disadvantaged men vary significantly in terms of their gendered political consciousness. Some men with disadvantaged social statuses (i.e., non-Hispanic Black men) tend to see high levels of gender inequality and show high levels of support for women fighting for gender equality, but others less so. Connell (2002, p. 142) describes the patriarchal dividend as that which “makes patriarchy worth defending.” And whereas working class men, sexual minority men, Black men, Hispanic men, and men identified with other subordinated racial/ethnic groups are all positioned to reap fewer rewards from patriarchy than more privileged men are, there nonetheless exists significant variation in how these disadvantaged statuses correlate with men’s political consciousness of gender.

My study identified a correlation among men’s intersectional interests, their exposure to social justice issues, and their political consciousness of gender. But important questions remain: How and to what extent does a political consciousness of gender shape men’s enactment of masculinity? How do men of diverse social groups view the connections between multiple systems of inequality? Beyond predicting men’s political consciousness of gender, do intersectional interests and exposure to social justice issues help to predict men’s participation within feminist and other social justice movements? Compared to other racial/ethnic groups, non-Hispanic Black men consistently perceive high levels of gender inequality and show the highest level of support for women’s fight for gender equality. Greater attention to Black men’s gendered political consciousness—not only in comparison to Whites’, but as it intersects with multiple identities and ideologies—may reveal new possibilities for advancing gender justice.

Compliance with Ethical Standards All procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of Wake Forest University.

Conflict of Interest The author has no potential conflicts of interest.

References

- American National Election Study. (2012). *Preliminary Release Documentation for ANES 2010-2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study*. Retrieved from http://www.electionstudies.org/studypages/2010_2012EGSS/ANES_EGSS4_Preliminary_Release_Documentation.pdf.
- Baca Zinn, M., & Thornton Dill, B. (1996). Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. *Feminist Studies*, 22, 321–331. doi:10.2307/3178416.

- Banaszak, L., & Plutzer, E. (1993). The social bases of feminism in the European community. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57, 29–53. doi:10.1086/269353.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen attention to daily encounters with sexism as way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35, 227–242. doi:10.1177/0361684310397509.
- Bennett, J. (2006). *History matters. Patriarchy and the challenge of feminism*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.
- Bettie, J. (2003). *Women without class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blee, K. M., & Tickamyer, A. R. (1995). Racial differences in men's attitudes about women's gender roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 21–30. doi:10.2307/353813.
- Bolzendahl, C., & Myers, D. (2004). Feminist attitudes and support for gender equality: Opinion change in women and men, 1974–1998. *Social Forces*, 83, 759–90. doi:10.1353/sof.2005.0005.
- Bridges, T. S. (2010). Men just weren't made to do this: Performances of drag at 'Walk a Mile in Her Shoes' marches. *Gender & Society*, 24, 5–30. doi:10.1177/0891243209356924.
- Brooks, C., & Bolzendahl, C. (2003). The transformation of US gender role attitudes: Cohort replacement, social-structural change, and ideological learning. *Social Science Research*, 33, 106–133.
- Burn, S. M., Aboud, R., & Moyles, C. (2000). The relationship between gender social identity and support for feminism. *Sex Roles*, 42, 1081–1089. doi:10.1023/A:1007044802798.
- Ciabattari, T. (2001). Changes in men's conservative gender ideologies: Cohort and period influences. *Gender & Society*, 15, 574–591. doi:10.1177/089124301015004005.
- Clayton, S. D., & Crosby, F. J. (1992). *Justice, gender, and affirmative action*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 64, 170–180. doi:10.1037/a0014564.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2004). *Black sexual politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemmas. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 1–20. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112142.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2002). *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19, 829–859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639.
- Conover, P. J., & Sapiro, V. (1993). Gender, feminist consciousness, and war. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37, 1079–1099. doi:10.2307/2111544.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–99. doi:10.2307/1229039.
- Curtin, N., Stewart, A. J., & Cole, E. R. (2015). Challenging the status quo: The role of intersectional awareness in activism for social change and pro-social intergroup attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 39, 512–529. doi:10.1177/0361684315580439.
- Davis, S. N., & Greenstein, T. N. (2009). Gender ideology: Components, predictors, and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 87–105. doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-070308-115920.
- Davis, N. J., & Robinson, R. V. (1991). Men's and women's consciousness of gender inequality: Austria, West Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 72–84.
- DeBell, M., Wilson, C., Segura, G., Jackman, S., & Hutchings, V. (2011). *Methodology report and user's guide for the ANES 2010–2012 Evaluations of Government and Society Study*. Palo Alto, CA, and Ann Arbor, MI: Stanford University and the University of Michigan.
- Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against sexism: The role of men in confronting sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70, 637–652. doi:10.1111/josi.12083.
- Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Antiracism discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 101–116.
- Ferree, M. M., & Hess, B. B. (2000). *Controversy and coalition: The new feminist movement across four decades of change*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Gerson, K. (2010). *The unfinished revolution: Coming of age in a new era of gender, work and family*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491–512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491.
- Gurin, P. (1985). Women's gender consciousness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 49, 143–163. doi:10.1086/268911.
- Gurin, P., & Townsend, A. (1986). Properties of gender identity and their implications for gender consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 139–148. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.1986.tb00712.x.
- Gurin, P., Miller, A. H., & Gurin, G. (1980). Stratum identification and consciousness. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 43, 30–47.
- Hamilton, L., Geist, C., & Powell, B. (2011). Marital name change as a window into gender attitudes. *Gender & Society*, 25, 145–175. doi:10.1177/0891243211398653.
- Harnois, C. E. (2010). Race, gender, and the Black women's standpoint. *Sociological Forum*, 25, 68–85. doi:10.1111/j.1573-7861.2009.01157.x.
- Harnois, C. E. (2013). *Feminist measures in survey research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Harnois, C. E. (2015). Race, ethnicity, sexuality, and women's political consciousness of gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 78, 365–386. doi:10.1177/0190272515607844.
- Henderson-King, D. H., & Stewart, A. J. (1994). Women or feminists? Assessing women's group consciousness. *Sex Roles*, 31, 505–516. doi:10.1007/BF01544276.
- Hershey, M. R. (1978). Racial differences in sex-role identities and sex stereotyping: Evidence against a common assumption. *Social Science Quarterly*, 58, 583–596.
- Holter, Ø. G. (2014). 'What's in it for men?': Old question, new data. *Men and Masculinities*, 17, 515–548. doi:10.1177/1097184X14558237.
- Huddy, L., Neely, F. K., & Lafay, M. R. (2000). Trends: Support for the women's movement. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64, 309–350. doi:10.1086/317991.
- Hunter, A. G., & Sellers, S. (1998). Feminist attitudes among African American women and men. *Gender & Society*, 12, 81–99. doi:10.1177/089124398012001005.
- Iyer, A., & Ryan, M. K. (2009). Why do men and women challenge gender discrimination in the workplace? The role of group status and in-group identification in predicting pathways to collective action. *Journal of Social Issues*, 65, 791–814. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01625.x.
- Kane, E. W. (2000). Racial and ethnic variations in gender-related attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 419–439.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men*. New York: HarperCollins.
- King, D. K. (1988). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of a Black feminist ideology. *Signs*, 14, 42–72.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. A. (1997). *Discrimination against women: Prevalence, consequences, remedies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Mansbridge, J., & Morris, A. D. (2001). *Oppositional consciousness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Messner, M. A. (1997). *Politics of masculinities: Men in movements*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Messner, M. A., & Greenberg, M. A. (2015). *Some men: Feminist allies and the movement to end violence against women*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, A. L., & Borgida, E. (2016). The separate spheres model of gendered inequality. *PLoS One*, *11*, e0147315. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0147315](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0147315).
- Pampel, F. (2011). Cohort changes in the socio-demographic determinants of gender egalitarianism. *Social Forces*, *89*, 961–982. doi:[10.1353/sof.2011.0011](https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2011.0011).
- Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Plummer, K. (Ed.). (1981). *The making of the modern homosexual*. London: Macmillan.
- Powell, B., Bolzendahl, C., Geist, C., & Steelman, L. C. (2010). *Counted out: Same-sex relations and Americans' definitions of family*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Ransford, H. E., & Miller, J. (1983). Race, sex and feminist outlooks. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 46–59.
- Reingold, B., & Foust, H. (1998). Exploring the determinants of feminist consciousness in the United States. *Women & Politics*, *19*, 19–48. doi:[10.1300/J014v19n03_02](https://doi.org/10.1300/J014v19n03_02).
- Ricciardelli, R., Maier, K., & Hannah-Moffat, K. (2015). Strategic masculinities: Vulnerabilities, risk and the production of prison masculinities. *Theoretical Criminology*, *19*, 491–513. doi:[10.1177/1362480614565849](https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480614565849).
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & Society*, *18*, 510–531. doi:[10.1177/0891243204265269](https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243204265269).
- Roscigno, V. J. (2007). *The face of discrimination*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schnittker, J., Freese, J., & Powell, B. (2003). Who are feminists and what do they believe?: The role of generations. *American Sociological Review*, *68*, 607–22.
- Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 301–311. doi:[10.1007/s11199-008-9501-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9501-8).
- Simien, E. (2006). *Black feminist voices in politics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *2*, 219–220. doi:[10.3758/BF03329252](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03329252).
- White, A. M., Potgieter, C. A., Stube, M. J., Fisher, S., & Umana, E. (1997). An African-centered, Black feminist approach to understanding attitudes that counter social dominance. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *23*, 398–420. doi:[10.1177/00957984970234007](https://doi.org/10.1177/00957984970234007).

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner.
Further reproduction prohibited without permission.