

ABSTRACT

Feminism and Hostile Sexism Among the Religiously Affiliated

Amanda Dawn Hernandez, M.A.

Mentor: Jerry Z. Park, Ph.D.

This research examines the relationship between religious identification and feminist identification. Additionally, it investigates the extent of hostile sexist attitudes among those who identify as religious feminists. Utilizing 2016 American National Election Survey data, I find that religious women are no more or less likely to identify as feminist than the religiously unaffiliated, while Evangelical and Black Protestant men are less likely to identify as feminist. Further, both Black and Protestant women and Catholic men who identify as feminist express hostile sexist sentiment to a higher degree than their feminist unaffiliated counterparts, along with Latinas and Asian-identified men. This study offers quantitative insights into the relationship between feminist identification, religious affiliation, and hostile sexist attitudes. Additional implications for this study include conceptualizations of feminism and sexism more broadly in society.

Feminism and Hostile Sexism Among the Religiously Affiliated

by

Amanda Dawn Hernandez, B.A.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of Sociology

F. Carson Mencken, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts

Approved by the Thesis Committee

Jerry Z Park, Ph.D., Chairperson

Chris Pieper, Ph.D.

Ann Ward, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2019

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2019 by Amanda Dawn Hernandez

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER TWO.....	3
Literature Review.....	3
<i>Identifying and Measuring Feminism</i>	3
<i>Associations with Feminist Identity</i>	4
<i>Religion, Feminism, and Gender Traditionalism</i>	5
<i>Sexism</i>	6
<i>Religion and Sexism</i>	7
<i>Intersections of Gender, Gender Ideology, Race, and Religion</i>	9
CHAPTER THREE.....	10
Data and Analysis.....	10
<i>Data</i>	10
<i>Methodology</i>	10
CHAPTER FOUR.....	14
Results and Discussion.....	14
<i>Descriptive</i>	14
<i>Results</i>	16
<i>Discussion</i>	22
<i>Conclusion</i>	27
APPENDIX	29

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 <i>Descriptive Statistics</i>	15
Table 4.2 <i>Logistic Regression Coefficients for Associations with Feminist Identification among Women</i>	17
Table 4.3 <i>Logistic Regression Coefficients for Associations with Feminist Identification among Men</i>	18
Table 4.4 <i>OLS Regression Coefficients for Associations with Hostile Sexism among Women</i>	20
Table 4.4 <i>OLS Regression Coefficients for Associations with Hostile Sexism among Men</i>	21
Table A1 <i>Feminist Identification by Religious Tradition</i>	30
Table A2 <i>Comparison of General Social Science Survey and American National Election Survey Religious Tradition and Race/Ethnicity Variables</i>	30

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to Dr. Jerry Z. Park for his guidance throughout this thesis process. I am also grateful to Dr. Chris Pieper, Hannah Evans, and James Davidson for helping me think through some of the ideas in this project, and to Edwin Eschler and Rebecca Bonhag for their formatting assistance. Finally, thank you to Sharon Tate, Esmeralda Olvera, and Sandra Harman for their administrative support.

DEDICATION

For Sheila

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Who is a feminist? Do individuals who self-identify as feminist have similar ideologies and political agendas? The current political climate suggests that self-identified feminists come from varied race, class, political, and religious backgrounds. Further, intersectional scholars have long suggested that there are “different paths to different feminisms,” and that the challenge of quantitative sociology is to capture the contested nature of feminism among different groups along varying intersections (Bright, Malinsky, & Thompson 2016; Crenshaw 1989; Harnois 2005). Additionally, while the connection between hostile sexism and religiosity is well established (Christopher and Mull 2006; Northrop Orme et al. 2017; Peek, Lowe, and Williams 1991), gaps exist in our collective knowledge on how religion, sexism, and feminist identification intersect. Sexism and feminism are conceptually distinct, however the nature of sexism suggests that feminists and non-feminists alike hold sexist attitudes (Glick and Fiske 1996). This research investigates the relationship between religious identification and feminist identification. It also examines the extent of hostile sexist attitudes among those who identify as religious feminists.

Within the sociology of religion, research that examines issues of gender are overwhelmingly qualitative (Davidman 1991; Gallagher 2003; Gallagher and Smith 1999; Griffith 2000). While qualitative research is descriptively and theoretically rich in demonstrating the ways in which individuals make sense of their experiences, this project builds on the qualitative foundation of scholarship and utilizes quantitative techniques to

explore the connections between religious identification, feminism, and hostile sexism. Additionally, quantitative gender scholarship within the sociology of religion typically utilizes gender, gender ideology, or notions of “gender traditionalism” as the primary unit of analysis in quantitative research. This project uses a direct feminist identification variable and a hostile sexism scale to examine their relationship to one another and religious identification. By examining feminist identification and hostile sexist attitudes among individuals from varied race and religious traditions, frames from both sociology of religion and women and gender studies inform one another in ways that expand each discipline’s understanding of the other (Avishai and Irby 2017; Neitz 2014). Moreover, it expands on Wilde’s concept of complex religion by adding feminist identification to ways in which religion intersects with class, race, ethnicity, gender, and other social location characteristics (Wilde 2018).

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Feminism and sexism are closely related concepts; however, they are distinct. Both are attitudes or sets of beliefs, and there is some ambiguity about what exactly feminism and sexism is and is not (Ahmed 2015; Mallett, Ford, and Woodzicka 2016; Ogletree, Diaz, and Padilla 2017; Zinn and Dill 1996). Here I will expand how this study conceptualizes each and briefly examine documented social factors associated with each, along with their unique intersections with religiosity.

Identifying and Measuring Feminism

While bell hooks convincingly argues that “feminism is for everybody,” it remains a contentious “f” word (hooks 2016). The word feminist conjures up images ranging from butch lesbians (Taylor and Whittier 1992) to women protesting in pink pussy hats and American flag hijab (Gökarıksel and Smith 2017). According to 1996 GSS data, 29% of women in the United States self-identified as feminist, along with 12% of men (McCabe 2005). Because feminism has no universally accepted central movement or doctrine, survey reports of feminist identity cannot infer specific meanings that individuals associate with that term. McCabe (2005) notes, most quantitative studies of feminism measure liberal feminism, or what Sandoval (2000) refers to as “the equal rights” form of feminism (56). Equal rights or liberal feminism, focuses its efforts on anti-discrimination and equal rights policy, ignoring intersections of class, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and ability. Because of these difficulties, measuring feminism quantitatively remains difficult.

Associations with Feminist Identity

There are a range of characteristics associated with identifying as feminist including gender, political party, voting behaviors, race, and religious behavior and belief. Most feminists are overwhelmingly women (Liss et al. 2001; McCabe 2005). Additionally, those who have positive opinions about or exposure to feminism or feminist ideologies are likely to self-identify as feminist (Myaskovsky and Wittig 1997; Reid and Purcell 2004). Interestingly, most of these studies also cite activism as a central to feminist identity (Yoder, Tobias, and Snell 2011). Overall, one is not likely to self-identify as a feminist if they do not view “the personal as political” (Crow 2000). In other words, scholarship reveals that feminism is both something you are and something you do.

Regarding the latter, identifying as feminist is strongly associated with voting patterns and candidate choice. Specifically, those who identify as feminist are more likely to vote for a Democratic candidate than a Republican or Independent, especially if the candidate is perceived as feminist themselves (Plutzer and Zipp 1996; Sharrow et al. 2016). These findings are tempered by the reality that feminists, similar to women as a whole, do not vote as a monolith and that women from different class, race, and ethnic backgrounds each have different priorities that shape their voting patterns (Frasure-Yokley 2018; Harnois 2015; Strolovitch, Wong, and Proctor 2017). For Latinas and Black women, feminism can be conceptualized differently than White women. This is attributable to differing standards of acceptable femininity, family obligations, and historical exclusion from liberal feminist movements (Belgrave et al. 2016; Bermúdez,

Sharp, and Taniguchi 2015). While these associations with feminist identification have been documented, no studies link feminism and religion or faith beliefs together.

Religion, Feminism, and Gender Traditionalism

Within the sociology of religion, a significant void exists regarding Christianity's relationship to feminism directly. However, there is an existing body of work that discusses navigating both Islam and Judaism as feminist. This literature is theological, theoretical, and sociological in nature, establishing a history of feminist consideration within these faith traditions (Bourne 1987; Fishman 1998; Gonzlez 2016; Hashim 1999; Heschel 1990, 1995; Manning 1999; Martin Cohen 1980; Saadallah 2004; Seedat 2013).

In the United States, the majority religion is Christianity, although there is significant variation by religious tradition and denomination (Cooperman, Smith, and Ritchey 2015). Unlike studies that examine the relationship between Judaism, Islam, and feminism, there remains a dearth of sociological studies on Christian denominations and feminism. A notable exception is Ecklund's research note on how Catholic feminist women reconcile their feminism and Catholicism (2003). Another study explores women within Catholic, Jewish, and Evangelical groups, finding that the home and religious commitments and work/society and feminism are viewed as at odds with one another in each tradition in slightly different ways (Manning 1999). Broadly however, these studies utilize the concept of "gender egalitarianism" as a proxy for examining feminist beliefs. Here, notions of gender traditionalism and gender egalitarianism are placed at opposite ends of a spectrum. Gender traditionalism is interpreted as sexist, while gender egalitarianism is interpreted as feminist. While no studies directly examine feminism or

feminist identification and religion, gender traditionalism offers us some insights into who may embrace or reject the feminist label.

General findings associate gender traditionalism with biblical literalism, conservative Protestantism, conservative religious traditions, and holding negative attitudes towards same-sex relationships (Bang et al. 2005; Bartkowski 2001; Davidman 1991; Denton 2004; Gallagher 2003; Gallagher and Smith 1999; Ghazal Read and Bartkowski 2000; Hoffmann and Bartkowski 2008; Whitehead 2012). Again, while these studies do not directly link concepts of gender traditionalism to feminism, implications of those findings suggest that those who hold gender traditionalist attitudes would not identify as feminist.

Hypothesis 1a: Christian women will be less likely to identify as feminist compared to their non-Christian counterparts.

Hypothesis 1b: Christian men will be less likely to identify as feminist compared to their non-Christian counterparts.

Sexism

Much like feminism, it is not always clear what is meant by sexism. While feminism is an ideology based within a broader political and cultural movement, sexism is primarily based in prejudice, often operating unconsciously. Building off stereotype and prejudice literature (Allport 1954; Beere et al. 1984; Eagly and Mladinic 1989), Glick and Fiske created the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) (1996). The ASI taps into two different types of sexism: benevolent and hostile sexism. Benevolent sexism consists of ideas of paternalism, including gender complementarianism and heteronormative intimacy. Hostile sexism, the form of sexism measured in this paper, taps into ideas of dominant paternalism, competitiveness with women, and (hetero)sexual

hostility. Dominant paternalism, compared to benevolent paternalism, is more overt in its assertion that women need men. Additionally, hostile sexism encapsulates ideas of competition with women, both in economic and sexual venues. Where men traditionally held power in these spheres of influence, women who assert their own autonomy are seen as a threat (Sibley, Wilson, and Duckitt 2007). Some examples of questions used to measure hostile sexism include, “Women exaggerate problems they have at work,” and “Women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances” (Glick and Fiske 1996).

Among both men and women, benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes can exist simultaneously, creating an “ambivalence” about women and their roles. Women who do not deviate from socially acceptable gender scripts benefit from benevolent sexist attitudes; they are performing womanhood correctly and are therefore not subject to the scrutiny of hostile sexism. Hostile sexist attitudes are reserved for women who put themselves in direct competition with men by deviating from acceptable performances of femininity. Again, these attitudes can be held by both men and women alike. For this study, I utilize a portion the (ASI) that exclusively measures hostile sexism. In the next section I will elaborate on associations between religion and sexism.

Religion and Sexism

Sexism in religious communities is a well-documented site of study. Generally, these studies show an association between religious involvement or scriptural literalism and benevolent sexism (Burn and Busso 2005; Haggard et al. 2018; Mikoajczak and Pietrzak 2014; Peek et al. 1991). Another element of this benevolent sexism in religious groups are ideas of protective paternalism. Teaching about appropriate gender roles in

Christian denominations often dictates men as benevolent protectors of home and family and as a leader of the family, while women are passive recipients of this protection and caretakers of home and children (Bartkowski 2001; Bartkowski and Shah 2014; Hoffmann and Bartkowski 2008; Mikoajczak and Pietrzak 2014). In “Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands,” W. Bradford Wilcox argues that conservative Protestant men generally hold traditional gender ideologies while being more involved emotionally with their families (2004). Wilcox interprets this as the behavior of a doting patriarch who makes himself emotionally available to his family because of his beliefs about traditional gender roles and a man’s role in the family. I argue that this is more likely attributable to a paternalistic sense of responsibility, and like other forms of benevolent sexism, serves to further perpetuate gender inequality.

Hostile sexism is found in these communities as well and is associated with authoritarian and dominating ideologies found in some conservative religious traditions (Christopher and Mull 2006). Maltby et. al consider if the relationship between hostile sexism among religious groups is related to feelings directed at out-groups, such as feminists (2010). They argue that feminists are seen through a political lens that threatens religious group members’ own in-group solidarity (Maltby et al. 2010; Northrop Orme et al. 2017).

Hypothesis 2a: Christian women will not be statistically different on the hostile sexism scale compared to their non-Christian counterparts.

Hypothesis 2b: Christian men will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than their non-Christian counterparts.

Hypothesis 3a: Christian feminist women will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than non-Christian feminist women.

Hypothesis 3b: Christian feminist men will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than non-Christian feminist men.

Intersections of Gender, Gender Ideology, Race, and Religion

The unique intersection of gender, race, ethnicity, and religious affiliation create differing circumstances in which a feminist identification is forged. Likewise, at these intersections understandings of mens' and womens' roles are shaped that fit each individuals' specific cultural and religious norm. In "Soul Mates: Religion, Sex, Love, and Marriage among African Americans and Latinos," Wilcox and Wolfinger examine similar family structures among minority groups (2015). Utilizing several data sets, they illustrate the often-conservative family views that Black and Latinx individuals have compared to Whites, while simultaneously embracing progressive stances on social issues, such as race and immigration.

Several studies support these findings that Blacks and Latinx generally report more conservative attitudes about gender and sexuality than their White counterparts (see Kane 2000). Latinx individuals often report maintaining traditional family roles and attitudes (Bartkowski et al. 2012; Montoya 1996). However, high egalitarianism regarding economic enterprises appears among Black men and women (Cazaenave 1983; French and Nock 1981; Fulenwider 1980; Hatchett and Quick 1983; Hunter and Sellers 1998; Welch and Sigelman 1989). Studies on the gender role expectations or attitudes among Asian-American respondents are few in number. What findings do exist suggest traditional gender attitudes among Asian-American respondents (Lottes and Kuriloff 1992; Tang and Dion 1999).

Hypothesis 4a: Non-white women will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than their white counterparts.

Hypothesis 4b: Non-white men will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than their white counterparts

CHAPTER THREE

Data and Analysis

Data

This research uses the 2016 American National Election Studies (ANES) Pre-Election survey data. This data was collected pre-election between September 7th and November 7th, 2016. Data was collected both in-person and on the Internet. Face-to-face interviews used computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) software on laptop computers. Pre-election response rates were 50 percent for face-to-face interviews and 44 percent for the Internet sample. For more information on sample design and respondent recruitment, see the user guide and codebook for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study (Hutchings and Brader 2017: 3-5). This dataset contains an explicit measure for feminist identification in addition to an abbreviated version of the Glick and Fiske hostile sexism scale. Additionally, the dataset also contains detailed information on respondents' religious tradition, making the ANES ideal for exploring the relationship between feminism, hostile sexism, and religious tradition or affiliation.

Methodology

For this research I conduct four nested regressions. The first two are logistic regressions predicting feminist identification among women and men respectively, while the third and fourth, OLS models, examines adherence to hostile sexist ideology, again among women and men respectively.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable in the first set of logistic regression models is feminist identification. Respondents were asked, “Do you consider yourself a strong feminist, a feminist, or are you not a feminist?” Feminist identification is coded dichotomously with 0 indicating not feminist. Those who reported that they considered themselves a “strong feminist” or “feminist” were coded as 1. Less than 2 percent of respondents refused the question.

The second set of models uses an abbreviated four-item Glick and Fiske hostile sexism scale (Glick and Fiske 1996). The four questions that compose this scale read: “Many women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist,” (coded 1 = agree strongly and 5 = disagree strongly) “Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them,” “Women seek to gain power by getting control over men,” and “Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she tries to put him on a tight leash.” For each question, respondent options were a Likert scale of 1-5 and were reverse coded from strongly disagree to strongly agree. These were created into a hostile sexism scale ($\alpha=0.79$) ranging from 4-20. Higher scores indicate higher hostile sexist attitudes.

Independent Variables

The main independent variables of analysis in this study include religious tradition and race/ethnicity. A religious tradition variable was created modeling Steensland et. al (2000) using the denomination respondents identified, frequency of church attendance, and race. Specific code for the creation of this variable is available upon request. The religious traditions analyzed in this project include Evangelical,

Mainline Protestant, Black Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Other. Those who are unaffiliated are used as the comparison group.

As race and ethnicity are central to the exploration of the relationship between feminism, hostile sexism, and religious tradition, they are key independent variables of my analysis. The ANES is set up to first ask respondents if they identify as Hispanic or Latino. The ANES utilizes the term Latino, however, I utilize Latinx as inclusive of all genders, or as specifically Latino or Latina in models. Respondents are then asked to identify one or more races they consider themselves to be including: White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. While individuals can identify as any mixture of race and Latinx, if they identify as Hispanic or Latinx I include them in that category rather than White, Black, or another racial category. For example, if a Black individual marked “Hispanic” as their ethnicity, they are included in the Latinx sample for this study. The final race variable in my study includes, White, Black, Latinx, Asian, and Other, which includes American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders. Table 1 shows the percentages and means for these key independent variables. White individuals are the reference group across models.

Control Variables

I control for several important variables across models including political party affiliation, presence of children in the respondents’ household, marital status, educational attainment, age, and household income. Political parties represented in this study are Democrat, Independent, and Republican. Democrats are the reference category for all tables and models. Respondents were asked how many children 17 and under reside in

their household. I recoded the range of options into a dichotomous variable. Those who did not have children present in the household were coded as 0, and those who did were coded at 1. For marital status, individuals who are currently married with a co-residing spouse are coded as 1, and those who have an absent spouse, are widowed, divorced, separated, or never married are coded at 0. Educational attainment is originally coded as: (1) less than first grade, (2) first, second, third, or fourth grade, (3) fifth or sixth grade, (4) seventh grade or eighth grade, (5) ninth grade, (6) tenth grade, (7) eleventh grade, (8) twelfth grade, no diploma, (9) high school graduate, (10) some college but no degree, (11) associate degree in college, occupational, (12) associate degree in college, academic, (13) bachelor's degree, (14) master's degree, (15) professional degree, (16) doctorate degree, (90), other, specify as given, and (95) other specify. I recoded these into four categories indicating an individual's highest level of education earned: (1) less than high school, (2) high school degree, (3) four-year college degree, and (4) advanced degree. Age ranges from eighteen to ninety. Income is comprised of five groups. The first group is comprised of individuals who report an income of less than \$24,999. Group two earn between \$25,000 to \$49,999. The next group reported \$50,000 to \$74,999 annually. Group four reported \$75,000 to \$99,999. And the final grouping here report incomes of \$100,000 or more a year.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

Descriptive

Table 4.1 describes the sample of this study. Of the total sample, 39.98 percent identify as feminist, while 60.02 percent do not identify as feminist. Nearly fifty-two percent of women identify as feminist, with 48.22 percent rejecting the label. Among men, 27.06 percent of men identify as feminist, while the vast majority, at 72.94 percent, do not identify as feminist. This is in contrast to McCabe's 1996 GGS data revealing that only 29 percent of women and 12 percent of men self-identify as feminist (1996). The Hostile Sexism Scale ranges from 5 to 20. The total sample mean is 10.72. The score mean among women is 10.05 and 11.46 for men. This indicates that hostile sexism is slightly lower for women compared to men, and that most respondents do hold some degree of hostile sexist attitudes but less than the expected mean.

Regarding religion, of the sample, 16.64 percent are Evangelical, 20.7 percent are Mainline Protestants, 6.14 identify as Black Protestant, 25.32 percent are Catholic, 2.17 percent are Jewish, 5.39 percent identify as another religion, and 23.64 are unaffiliated with any religious denomination. These proportions are reflected across religious traditions when disaggregated by gender. Black Protestants are the exception to this, with 7.27 percent of women and only 4.93 percent of men identifying as Black Protestant. For the percentages of feminist identification by religious tradition, see the appendix.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Women Mean/%	Men Mean/%	Total Sample Mean/%	Min	Max
Feminist	51.78%	27.06%	39.98%		
Not a Feminist	48.22%	72.94%	60.02%		
Hostile Sexism Scale	10.05	11.46	10.72	4	20
<i>Religious Tradition</i>					
Evangelical	17.14%	16.09%	16.64%		
Mainline Protestant	21.83%	19.47%	20.70%		
Black Protestant	7.27%	4.93%	6.14%		
Catholic	25.21%	25.44%	25.32%		
Jewish	2.14%	2.21%	2.17%		
Other	5.40%	5.39%	5.39%		
Unaffiliated	21.06%	26.48%	23.64%		
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>					
White	72.60%	78.62%	72.61%		
Black	10.50%	8.05%	9.33%		
Latina/o	9.61%	11.94%	10.72%		
Asian	3.14%	3.76%	3.44%		
Other	4.15%	3.63%	3.90%		
<i>Controls</i>					
Political Party					
Republican	26.69%	31.99%	28.76%		
Independent	30.78%	36.99%	33.75%		
Democrat	42.53%	31.02%	37.50%		
Child	35.17%	31.67%	33.50%		
Age	49.57	48.72	49.16	18	90
Married	44.25%	52.89%	48.37%		
Education	2.49	2.48	2.48	1	4
Income	2.83	3.16	2.99	1	5
	<i>n</i> = 1686	<i>n</i> =1541	<i>n</i> =3227		

Note: Results in this table are unweighted.

Results

Table 4.2 Model 1 reveals that among women, racial identification alone has no statistically significant relationship with feminist identification, controlling for political party, age, education, income, presence of children in the household, and marital status. Model 2 suggests that compared to religiously unaffiliated women, there is no statistical difference in the probability of identifying as feminist among other religious traditions. In the final model, we see that there is no significance among any religious tradition when race is included in the model. However, three control variables remain significantly associated with feminist identification. Both Independents ($\beta = -.445; p < .05$) and Republicans ($\beta = -1.352; p < .001$) are significantly less likely to identify as feminist as compared to Democrats. Educational attainment ($\beta = .451; p < .001$) is positively associated with feminist identification among women and the presence of children ($\beta = -.348; p < .01$) in the home is negatively associated with the dependent measure.

Table 4.3 model 1 reveals a significant and negative relationship with feminist identification among Black men ($\beta = -.770; p < .01$), net of demographic control variables. Model 2 indicates that Evangelical ($\beta = -.531; p < .05$) and Black Protestant ($\beta = -1.221; p < .01$) men are less likely to identify as feminist than their unaffiliated counterparts. Diverging from the pattern among women, the significance of the negative relationship among Evangelical and Black Protestant men persist in the full model. Across all three models, political party, age, and education remain associated with feminist identification for men in the expected directions.

Table 4.2

Logistic Regression Coefficients for Associations with Feminist Identification among Women

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Religious Tradition^a</i>			
Evangelical		-0.371	-0.388
Mainline Protestant		-0.171	-0.191
Black Protestant		-0.600	-0.711
Catholic		-0.243	-0.251
Jewish		0.126	0.104
Other		0.123	0.142
<i>Race/Ethnicity^b</i>			
Black	-0.195		0.133
Latina	-0.017		0.004
Asian	-0.117		-0.243
Other	0.183		0.222
<i>Demographic</i>			
Political Party ^c			
Independent	-0.451**	-0.453**	-0.445**
Republican	-1.352***	-1.300***	-1.278***
Age	-0.010**	-0.007	-0.007
Education	0.451***	0.430***	0.426***
Income	0.075	0.070	0.073
Child	-0.348**	-0.337*	-0.337**
Married	-0.282	-0.267	-0.259
Constant	0.023	0.184	0.159

Note: All reported results are weighted beta coefficients.

^aThe reference group for Religious Tradition is Unaffiliated.

^bThe reference group for Race/Ethnicity is White.

^cThe reference group for Political Party is Democrat.

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

n = 1,686

Table 4.3

Logistic Regression Coefficients for Associations with Feminist Identification among Men

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Religious Tradition^a</i>			
Evangelical		-0.531*	-0.563*
Mainline Protestant		0.034	-0.015
Black Protestant		-1.221**	-1.104*
Catholic		-0.313	-0.255
Jewish		-0.360	-0.414
Other		-0.662	-0.557
<i>Race/Ethnicity^b</i>			
Black	-0.770*		-0.252
Latino	-0.487		-0.456
Asian	-0.630		-0.597
Other	0.152		0.160
<i>Demographic</i>			
Political Party ^c			
Independent	-0.683***	-0.603**	-0.664**
Republican	-1.652***	-1.517***	-1.589***
Age	-0.014**	-0.012**	-0.013**
Education	0.575***	0.590***	0.588***
Income	0.074	0.077	0.070
Child	-0.139	-0.150	-0.121
Married	0.150	0.152	0.143
Constant	-1.267***	-1.380***	-1.194**

Note: All reported results are weighted beta coefficients.

^aThe reference group for Religious Tradition is Unaffiliated.

^bThe reference group for Race/Ethnicity is White.

^cThe reference group for Political Party is Democrat.

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

n = 1,547

Table 4.4 indicates a consistent significant negative association of feminist identification with hostile sexist attitudes across all four models. Diagnostic tests for

variance inflation factors for the table reveal that while there is some collinearity between hostile sexist attitudes and feminist identification, as the literature review suggests, they are two distinct concepts. Among the control variables, both Independents and Republicans score significantly higher on the hostile sexism scale compared to Democrats. Age is positively associated with a higher score on the hostile sexism scale, while education and income are more negatively associated with higher scores. Marital status is not significantly associated with hostile sexist attitudes in these models.

Model 1 indicates that net of other demographic factors in the model, Latinas are significantly more likely than their white counterparts to score higher on the hostile sexism scale ($\beta = 1.253$; $p < .01$) Model 2 illustrates a significant negative association between hostile sexist sentiment and Jewish women compared to unaffiliated women ($\beta = 1.828$; $p < .001$). This relationship remains significant throughout all four models, however it does not retain the same strength by model 4 ($\beta = -2.405$; $p < .05$). Model 3 illustrates the persistence of the association between Latinas and hostile sexist attitudes when religious tradition is included in the model ($\beta = 1.212$; $p < .05$). This association persists and strengthens in model 4 ($\beta = 1.150$; $p < .01$). Additionally, this last model reveals Black Protestant feminist women have a strong positive association with hostile sexist attitudes compared to unaffiliated feminists ($\beta = 3.954$; $p < .001$).

Table 4.5 displays the same variables and interactions among men. Similar to women, across models, feminist identification is significantly negatively associated with hostile sexist attitudes. Across all models, age and having children present in the home are all positively associated with hostile sexist attitudes, while educational attainment and household income are negatively associated with hostile sexist attitudes. Similarly, both

identifying as Independent or Republican is positively associated with hostile sexist attitudes across all models compared to identifying as Democrat.

Model 1 indicates a significant positive association among Latino ($\beta = .821$; $p < .05$) and Asian identified ($\beta = 1.487$; $p < .01$). men and hostile sexist attitudes. The association between Asian identity among male respondents and hostile sexism persists through model four. Model 2 indicates that compared to their unaffiliated counterparts, Evangelical ($\beta = .783$; $p < .05$), Mainline Protestant ($\beta = -.928$; $p < .01$), and Catholic ($\beta = 1.018$; $p < .01$) men are more likely to score higher on the hostile sexism scale. These relationships remain intact through model 3. Model 4 displays the interaction terms among feminist men and religious affiliation. Here we see that among religious men who identify as feminist, Catholic men ($\beta = 1.246$; $p < .05$). are likely to score higher on the hostile sexism scale than their unaffiliated feminist counterparts.

Table 4.4

OLS Regression Coefficients for Associations with Hostile Sexism among Women

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Feminist Identification	-1.096***	-1.057***	-1.052***	-1.957**
<i>Religious Tradition^a</i>				
Evangelical		0.467	0.500	-0.074
Mainline Protestant		0.290	0.380	0.121
Black Protestant		0.403	0.767	-1.250
Catholic		0.539	0.363	-0.298
Jewish		-1.828***	-1.743***	-2.405*
Other		0.047	-0.006	0.303
<i>Race/Ethnicity^b</i>				
Black	0.152		-0.178	-0.205
Latina	1.253**		1.212*	1.150**
Asian	0.513		0.602	0.584
Other	0.250		0.176	0.174

Demographic

(continued)

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Political Party ^c				
Independent	1.183***	1.030***	1.123***	1.018***
Republican	1.582***	1.321***	1.428***	1.347***
Age	0.020**	0.016*	0.018*	0.017**
Education	-0.725***	-0.730***	-0.668***	-0.644***
Income	-0.287**	-0.285**	-0.292**	-0.297**
Child	0.406	0.486	0.407	0.411
Married	-0.016	-0.082	-0.022	-0.048
<i>Feminist ID x Religious Tradition ^d</i>				
Feminist Evangelical				0.987
Feminist MP				0.324
Feminist BP				3.954***
Feminist Catholic				1.142
Feminist Jewish				0.993
Feminist Other				-0.373
Constant	11.229***	11.402***	11.005***	11.619***
R Squared	0.168	0.167	0.177	0.197

Note: All reported results are weighted OLS coefficients.

^a The reference group for Religious Tradition is Unaffiliated.

^b The reference group for Race/Ethnicity is White.

^c The reference group for Political Party is Democrat.

^d The reference group for Feminist ID x Religious Tradition are Unaffiliated Feminists

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

n = 1,686

Table 4.5

OLS Regression Coefficients for Associations with Hostile Sexism among Men

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Feminist Identification	-2.062***	-2.096***	-2.040***	-2.768***
<i>Religious Tradition</i>				
Evangelical		0.783*	0.829*	0.533
Mainline Protestant		0.928**	0.931**	0.662
Black Protestant		0.592	0.276	0.093
Catholic		1.018**	0.925**	0.561
Jewish		-0.643	-0.519	-0.916
Other		0.834	0.608	0.327
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>				
Black	0.480		0.572	0.515
Latino	0.821*		0.706	0.688
Asian	1.487**		1.491**	1.442**
Other	0.304		0.211	0.193
<i>Demographic</i>				
Political Party				

(continued)

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Independent	0.585*	0.455	0.543*	0.511*
Republican	1.024***	0.700*	0.843**	0.815**
Age	0.025***	0.022**	0.023***	0.023***
Education	-0.792***	-0.764***	-0.775***	-0.769***
Income	-0.190*	-0.207*	-0.190*	-0.191**
Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Child	0.505*	0.558*	0.503*	0.506*
Married	-0.629**	-0.697**	-0.670**	-0.664**
<i>Feminist ID x Religious Tradition</i>				
Feminist Evangelical				1.155
Feminist MP				0.845
Feminist BP				0.638
Feminist Catholic				1.246*
Feminist Jewish				1.142
Feminist Other				0.957
Constant	12.830***	12.730***	12.392***	12.653***
R Squared	0.186	0.191	0.199	0.203

Note: All reported results are weighted OLS coefficients.

^a The reference group for Religious Tradition is Unaffiliated.

^b The reference group for Race/Ethnicity is White.

^c The reference group for Political Party is Democrat.

^d The reference group for Feminist ID x Religious Tradition are Unaffiliated Feminists

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

n = 1,547

Discussion

The association between benevolent sexism and religious communities is well documented (Burn and Busso 2005; Christopher and Mull 2006; Christopher and Wojda 2008; Maltby et al. 2010; Mikoajczak and Pietrzak 2014). However, quantitative analysis of the relationships between feminism, hostile sexism, and religious affiliation has remained unexplored. Hypotheses 1a and 1b, Christian women (men) will be less likely to identify as feminist compared to their non-Christian counterparts, are partially confirmed in tables 2 and 3. Interestingly, religious women are no less likely to identify as feminist compared to their unaffiliated counterparts, while both Evangelical and Black Protestant men are significantly less likely to identify as feminist as compared to unaffiliated men. Previous studies within the sociology of religion that examine gender

complementarian beliefs suggest that religious people may not identify as feminist as frequently as the religiously unaffiliated (Bartkowski 2001; Denton 2004; Gallagher 2003; Gallagher and Smith 1999; Hoffmann and Bartkowski 2008; Whitehead 2012). However, this study demonstrates that with few exceptions, religious individuals are no more or less likely to identify as feminist than the unaffiliated.

A possible reason that this difference appears within Evangelical and Black Protestant groups and not among Mainline, Catholic, Jewish, or Other religious groups may be due to targeted gender messaging about appropriate gender roles and expectations within these faith traditions. Wilcox demonstrates the keeping of gender traditionalist attitudes among both Conservative Protestant and Black Christians, although there is no distinction made between Black Protestants and Black Mainliners (2004, 2016). If both groups, motivated differently perhaps, adhere to gender traditionalist attitudes compared to other religious traditions and the religiously unaffiliated, then male willingness to endorse feminism and identify as feminist would be slight. Additionally, educational trends may account for these differences. Evangelicals and Black Protestants have less education on average than Catholics and Mainline Protestants, along with Jewish and Secular individuals (Cooperman et al. 2015).

Hypothesis 2a posits that Christian women will score similarly on the hostile sexism scale to their non-Christian counterparts. This hypothesis is largely confirmed. Evangelical, Mainline, Black Protestant, Catholic, and religiously Other women do not statistically differ from unaffiliated women. Jewish women, however, score significantly lower on the hostile sexism scale than their unaffiliated counterparts. After Hindus and Unitarian Universalists, Jewish individuals have the highest percent of individuals who

complete a college degree at 59% (Cooperman et al. 2015). Across all models, greater educational attainment and being a woman is positively associated with feminist identification and negatively associated with hostile sexist attitudes. This combined with the concerted theological efforts of Jewish feminisms (Fishman 1998; Heschel 1995) may help us understand the strong negative association with hostile sexist attitudes among Jewish women.

Hypothesis 2b, Christian men will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than their non-Christian counterparts, is likewise confirmed. Among men, Evangelical, Mainline, and Catholic men score significantly higher on the hostile sexism scale than their unaffiliated counterparts. This reflects general findings that men score higher on hostile sexism scales, along with findings of sexism found in religious settings (Burn and Busso 2005; Christopher and Wojda 2008). By its very nature, hostile sexism seeks to keep women performing acceptable feminine traits to align with protective paternalism and heterosexual dominance (Glick and Fiske 1996, 2001). While these beliefs can and are held by both men and women, in this particular case Christian men, score significantly higher than unaffiliated men. Gendered and family messaging within churches, combined with a larger societal norm that engages frequently in both benevolent and hostile sexism messaging may amplify the effects of hostile sexism among Christian men.

Hypotheses 3a and 3b, Christian feminist women and men will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than non-Christian feminist women, is partially supported. Among both women and men, Evangelical, Mainline, Jewish, and Other religious feminists do not score any higher on the hostile sexism scale than unaffiliated feminists.

However, feminist Black Protestant women, along with Catholic feminist men have significant and positive relationships with the hostile sexism scale. Further, hypotheses 4a and 4b, non-white women and men will score higher on the hostile sexism scale than their white counterparts, is partially confirmed. Both Asian men and Latinas score consistently higher on the hostile sexism scale than White men and women throughout all models on Tables 4 and 5. These findings suggest that hostile sexist attitudes may be higher in some non-white communities, even when individuals identify as feminist.

One possible explanation for these findings may be rooted in gendered expectations among different racial and ethnic groups. For example, Black Protestant feminist women may score highest on the hostile sexism scale compared to unaffiliated feminist women due to the histories of marginalization of Black men. Because Black men have historically been denied hegemonic forms of masculinity (Cheng 1999), economic egalitarianism has been essential. However, if Black men cannot achieve white masculine ideals that assert that men must economically provide, then perhaps Black women internalize hostile sexist attitudes to a different degree than white women to bolster Black men in achieving an appropriate masculinity. Additionally, men in the Black community have been disproportionately incarcerated in the United States (Alexander and West 2012). Because of the imbalanced sex ratio (Western and Wildeman 2009), Black women are subject to gender messaging that problematizes Black women who exhibit or adopt traditionally “masculine” behaviors. These findings that suggest Black Protestant women are no less likely to identify as feminist than unaffiliated women, yet paradoxically maintain hostile sexist attitudes supports Glick and Fiske’s findings on the ambivalent nature of benevolent and hostile sexism (Glick and Fiske 1996). This larger

context may intersect with the historical Black church and Black Protestant denominations in such a way that it is not so much that Black Protestant feminist women are in reality more hostile sexist than other populations, but that feminism and what constitutes appropriate and socially sanctioned performances of womanhood are conceptualized differently than individuals from non-Black communities.

However, if this type of messaging plays a role, it does not seem to affect Black Protestant men in the same ways on Black Protestant women. Among non feminist-identified men, Evangelical, Mainline, and Catholic men score higher on the hostile sexism scale, while Catholic men who identify as feminist score significantly higher than unaffiliated feminist men. It is possible that these groups receive targeted gendered messaging that highlights gender complementarianism, or the idea that men and women each have distinct biological and social roles in ways that are not present in other denominations. Likewise, perhaps Catholic men who identify as feminist subscribe to a view of feminism that highlights gender complementarianism. Manning (1999) and Ecklund's (2003) work on feminism and conceptualizations of gender in Catholicism offer some insights that may support this finding. Additionally, the documented nature of benevolent sexism in conservative religious communities (Barreto and Ellemers 2005; Haggard et al. 2018; Sibley et al. 2007) paired with Glick and Fiske's assertion that both benevolent and hostile sexism are held simultaneously support this finding (1996, 2001).

Some limitations of this study include the contested nature of the meanings and interpretations of who feminists are and what they believe. It remains a difficult subject to study quantitatively as there is no central feminist movement or doctrine, and feminism is conceptualized differently by those of differing race, gender, class, and religious

backgrounds. Additional qualitative research should focus on parsing out these differences. Further, because these intersections are important to gaining deeper understandings of feminism and sexism, small cell sizes require additional sensitivity and robustness checks, and even replication if possible.

Additionally, the data used in this study utilizes an abbreviated hostile sexism scale. Because benevolent sexism may be interpreted as gender complementarian ideology or even as a way to honor partners (Wilcox 2004), and because the naturalization of benevolent sexism or paternalistic behaviors serves to sustain gender inequality, future quantitative studies should examine the extent to which religious feminists hold ambivalent sexist attitudes using the whole of the ambivalent sexism inventory. That is, do religious individuals and religious feminists subscribe to both benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes?

Conclusion

Feminism among religious individuals remains an understudied field of research within sociology. This project finds that Christian women are no more or less likely to identify as feminist than nonreligious women, while Evangelical and Black Protestant men are less likely to identify as feminist than nonreligious men. As stated throughout this project, feminists come from diverse backgrounds. People from an infinite number of intersecting identities find identity, promise, and hope in feminism. Coalition and community building remain difficult in the broader feminist movement because of these differences, including among those who are religious. My project also suggests that Christians and Christian feminists still can and do hold hostile sexist attitudes, and that the likelihood of this is dependent upon gender and denominational affiliation. Part of

this is certainly attributable to the broadness of feminist and religious identities. Social movements, like feminism, stand much to gain by the inclusion of voices from disparate backgrounds; however, these many voices present real challenges that have proven to be burdensome in building larger feminist coalitions.

This line of inquiry remains vitally important, as both feminism and sexism are explicitly linked with broader gender (in)equality. What is reproduced in faith communities is also reproduced in society at large. Gaining a deeper understanding of how feminism and sexism operates within religious communities can help researchers make sense of how feminism and sexism play out in larger communities and groups.

APPENDIX

Table A1

Feminist Identification by Religious Tradition

Variables	Feminist			Not Feminist		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total
Evangelical	37.7	13.3	26.4	62.3	86.7	73.6
Mainline Protestant	47.6	28	38.8	52.4	72	61.2
Black Protestant	52.5	19.7	39.9	47.5	80.3	60.1
Catholic	51.3	26.8	39.5	48.7	73.2	60.5
Jewish	66.7	44.1	55.7	33.3	55.9	44.3
Other	62.6	26.5	45.4	37.4	73.5	54.6
Unaffiliated	63.7	35	48.4	36.3	65	51.6

Note: Numbers shown are percentages.
n=3227

Table A2

*Comparison of General Social Science Survey and American National Election Survey
Religious Tradition and Race/Ethnicity Variables*

Variables	ANES	GSS
<i>Religious Tradition</i>		
Evangelical	16.64	25.3
Mainline	20.7	11.34
Black Protestant	6.14	7.67
Catholic	25.32	24.29
Jewish	2.17	1.91
Other	5.39	6.32
Nonaffiliated	23.64	23.17
	n=3227	n=2672
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>		
White	72.6	61.81
Black	10.5	13.95
Latinx	9.61	12.03
Asian	3.14	2.72
Other	4.15	1.4
Mixed Race; Not Hispanic	NR	7.22
	n=3227	n=2867

Note: 2016 Data

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Sara. 2015. "Introduction: Sexism - A Problem with a Name." *New Formations* (86):5–13.
- Alexander, Michelle and Cornel West. 2012. *The New Jim Crow*. The New Press.
- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*.
- Avishai, Orit and Courtney Ann Irby. 2017. "Bifurcated Conversations in Sociological Studies of Religion and Gender." *Gender & Society* 31(5):647–76.
- Bang, Esther, M. Elizabeth Lewis Hall, Tamara L. Anderson, and Michele M. Willingham. 2005. "Ethnicity, Acculturation, and Religiosity as Predictors of Female College Students' Role Expectations." *Sex Roles* 53(3–4):231–37.
- Barreto, Manuela and Naomi Ellemers. 2005. "The Burden of Benevolent Sexism: How It Contributes to the Maintenance of Gender Inequalities." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 35(5):633–42.
- Bartkowski, John P. 2001. *Remaking the Godly Marriage: Gender Negotiation in Evangelical Families*. Rutgers University Press.
- Bartkowski, John P., Aida I. Ramos-Wada, Chris G. Ellison, and Gabriel A. Acevedo. 2012. "Faith, Race-Ethnicity, and Public Policy Preferences: Religious Schemas and Abortion Attitudes Among U.S. Latinos." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 51(2):343–58.
- Bartkowski, John P. and Sarah Shah. 2014. "Religion and Gender Inequality: From Attitudes to Practices." Pp. 173–94 in *Religion and Inequality in America: Research and Theory on Religion's Role in Stratification*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beere, Carole A., Daniel W. King, Donald B. Beere, and Lynda A. King. 1984. "The Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale: A Measure of Attitudes Towards Equality Between the Sexes." *Sex Roles* 10(7):563–76.
- Belgrave, Faye Z., Jasmine A. Abrams, Kristina B. Hood, Melanie P. Moore, and Anh B. Nguyen. 2016. "Development and Validation of a Preliminary Measure of African American Women's Gender Role Beliefs." *Journal of Black Psychology* 42(4):320–42.

- Bermúdez, J. Maria, Elizabeth A. Sharp, and Narumi Taniguchi. 2015. "Tapping Into the Complexity: Ambivalent Sexism, Dating, and Familial Beliefs Among Young Hispanics." *Journal of Family Issues* 36(10):1274–95.
- Bourne, Jenny. 1987. "Homelands of the Mind: Jewish Feminism and Identity Politics." *Race & Class* 29(1):1–24.
- Bright, Liam Kofi, Daniel Malinsky, and Morgan Thompson. 2016. "Causally Interpreting Intersectionality Theory." *Philosophy of Science* 83(1):60–81.
- Burn, Shawn Meghan and Julia Busso. 2005. "Ambivalent Sexism, Scriptural Literalism, and Religiosity." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 29(4):412–18.
- Cheng, Cliff. 1999. "Marginalized Masculinities and Hegemonic Masculinity: An Introduction." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 7(3):295–315.
- Christopher, Andrew N. and Melinda S. Mull. 2006. "Conservative Ideology and Ambivalent Sexism." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 30(2):223–30.
- Christopher, Andrew N. and Mark R. Wojda. 2008. "Social Dominance Orientation, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Sexism, and Prejudice Toward Women in the Workforce." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 32(1):65–73.
- Cooperman, Alan, Gregory Smith, and Katherine Ritchey. 2015. *America's Changing Religious Landscape: Christians Decline Sharply as Share of Population; Unaffiliated and Other Faiths Continue to Grow*. Pew Research Center.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140:139–167.
- Crow, Barbara A., ed. 2000. *Radical Feminism: A Documentary Reader*. New York: NYU Press.
- Davidman, Lynn. 1991. *Tradition in a Rootless World: Women Turn to Orthodox Judaism*. University of California Press.
- Denton, Melinda Lundquist. 2004. "Gender and Marital Decision Making: Negotiating Religious Ideology and Practice." *Social Forces; Oxford* 82(3):1151–80.
- Eagly, Alice H. and Antonio Mladinic. 1989. "Gender Stereotypes and Attitudes Towards Women and Men." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 15(4):543–58.
- Ecklund, Elaine Howard. 2003. "Catholic Women Negotiate Feminism: A Research Note." *Sociology of Religion* 64(4):515–24.
- Fishman, Sylvia Barack. 1998. *A Breath of Life: Feminism in the American Jewish Community*. Hanover; London: Brandeis University Press.

- Frasure-Yokley, Lorrie. 2018. "Choosing the Velvet Glove: Women Voters, Ambivalent Sexism, and Vote Choice in 2016." *The Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics* 3(01):3–25.
- Gallagher, Sally K. 2003. *Evangelical Identity and Gendered Family Life*. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press.
- Gallagher, Sally K. and Christian Smith. 1999. "Symbolic Traditionalism and Pragmatic Egalitarianism: Contemporary Evangelicals, Families, and Gender." *Gender & Society* 13(2):211–33.
- Ghazal Read, Jen'nan and John P. Bartkowski. 2000. "To Veil or Not to Veil? A Case Study of Identity Negotiation among Muslim Women in Austin, Texas." *Gender & Society* 14(3):395–417.
- Glick, Peter and Susan T. Fiske. 1996. "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70(3):491–512.
- Glick, Peter and Susan T. Fiske. 2001. "Hostile and Benevolent Sexism as Complementary Justifications for Gender Inequality." *American Psychologist* 10.
- Gökarıksel, Banu and Sara Smith. 2017. "Intersectional Feminism beyond U.S. Flag Hijab and Pussy Hats in Trump's America." *Gender, Place & Culture* 24(5):628–44.
- Gonzlez, A. 2016. *Islamic Feminism in Kuwait: The Politics and Paradoxes*. Place of publication not identified: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Griffith, R. Marie. 2000. *God's Daughters: Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*. University of California Press.
- Haggard, Megan C., Rob Kaelen, Vassilis Saroglou, Olivier Klein, and Wade C. Rowatt. 2018. "Religion's Role in the Illusion of Gender Equality: Supraliminal and Subliminal Religious Priming Increases Benevolent Sexism." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*.
- Harnois, Catherine E. 2005. "Different Paths to Different Feminisms? Bridging Multiracial Feminist Theory and Quantitative Sociological Gender Research." *Gender and Society* 19(6):809–28.
- Harnois, Catherine E. 2015. "Race, Ethnicity, Sexuality, and Women's Political Consciousness of Gender." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 78(4):365–86.
- Hashim, Iman. 1999. "Reconciling Islam and Feminism." *Gender & Development* 7(1):7–14.

- Heschel, Susannah. 1990. "Jewish Feminism and Women's Identity." *Women & Therapy* 10(4):31–39.
- Heschel, Susannah. 1995. *On Being a Jewish Feminist*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Hoffmann, John P. and John P. Bartkowski. 2008. "Gender, Religious Tradition and Biblical Literalism." *Social Forces* 86(3):1245–72.
- hooks, bell. 2016. *Feminism Is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*.
- Hutchings, Vincent and Ted Brader. 2017. "User's Guide and Codebook for the ANES 2016 Time Series Study."
- Kane, Emily W. 2000. "Racial and Ethnic Variations in Gender-Related Attitudes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(1):419–39.
- Liss, Miriam, Christy O'Connor, Elena Morosky, and Mary Crawford. 2001. "What Makes a Feminist? Predictors and Correlates of Feminist Social Identity in College Women." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 25(2):124–33.
- Lottes, Ilsa L. and Peter J. Kuriloff. 1992. "The Effects of Gender, Race, Religion, and Political Orientation on the Sex Role Attitudes of College Freshman." *Adolescence* 27(107):675–88.
- Mallett, Robyn K., Thomas E. Ford, and Julie A. Woodzicka. 2016. "What Did He Mean by That? Humor Decreases Attributions of Sexism and Confrontation of Sexist Jokes." *Sex Roles* 75(5–6):272–84.
- Maltby, Lauren E., M. Elizabeth L. Hall, Tamara L. Anderson, and Keith Edwards. 2010. "Religion and Sexism: The Moderating Role of Participant Gender." *Sex Roles* 62(9–10):615–22.
- Manning, Christel. 1999. *God Gave Us the Right: Conservative Catholic, Evangelical Protestant, and Orthodox Jewish Women Grapple with Feminism*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press.
- Martin Cohen, Steven. 1980. "American Jewish Feminism: A Study in Conflicts and Compromises." *American Behavioral Scientist* 23(4):519–58.
- McCabe, Janice. 2005. "What's in a Label? The Relationship between Feminist Self-Identification and 'Feminist' Attitudes among U.S. Women and Men." *Gender & Society* 19(4):480–505.
- Mikoajczak, Magorzata and Janina Pietrzak. 2014. "Ambivalent Sexism and Religion: Connected Through Values." *Sex Roles; New York* 70(9–10):387–99.

- Montoya, Lisa J. 1996. "Latino Gender Differences in Public Opinion: Results From the Latino National Political Survey." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(2):255–76.
- Myaskovsky, Larissa and Michele Andrisin Wittig. 1997. "Predictors of Feminist Social Identity among College Women." *Sex Roles* 37(11–12):861–83.
- Neitz, Mary Jo. 2014. "Becoming Visible: Religion and Gender in Sociology." *Sociology of Religion* 75(4):511–23.
- Northrop Orme, Laura M., M. Elizabeth L. Hall, Tamara L. Anderson, and Jason McMartin. 2017. "Power, Sexism, and Gender: Factors in Biblical Interpretation." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 45(5):274–85.
- Ogletree, Shirley Matile, Paulette Diaz, and Vincent Padilla. 2017. "What Is Feminism? College Students' Definitions and Correlates." *Current Psychology*.
- Peek, Charles W., George D. Lowe, and L. Susan Williams. 1991. "Gender and God's Word: Another Look at Religious Fundamentalism and Sexism." *Social Forces; Chapel Hill, N.C.* 69(4):1205–1221.
- Plutzer, Eric and John F. Zipp. 1996. "Identity Politics, Partisanship, and Voting for Women Candidates." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60(1):30.
- Reid, Anne and Nuala Purcell. 2004. "Pathways to Feminist Identification." *Sex Roles* 50(11/12):759–69.
- Saadallah, Sherin. 2004. "Muslim Feminism in the Third Wave: A Reflective Inquiry." Pp. 216–26 in *Third Wave Feminism: A Critical Exploration*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seedat. 2013. "Islam, Feminism, and Islamic Feminism: Between Inadequacy and Inevitability." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 29(2):25.
- Sharrow, Elizabeth A., Dara Z. Strolovitch, Michael T. Heaney, Seth E. Masket, and Joanne M. Miller. 2016. "Gender Attitudes, Gendered Partisanship: Feminism and Support for Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton among Party Activists." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 37(4):394–416.
- Sibley, Chris G., Marc S. Wilson, and John Duckitt. 2007. "Antecedents of Men's Hostile and Benevolent Sexism: The Dual Roles of Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33(2):160–72.
- Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79(1):291–318.

- Strolovitch, Dara Z., Janelle S. Wong, and Andrew Proctor. 2017. "A Possessive Investment in White Heteropatriarchy? The 2016 Election and the Politics of Race, Gender, and Sexuality." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 5(2):353–63.
- Tang, Taryn N. and Kenneth L. Dion. 1999. "Gender and Acculturation in Relation to Traditionalism: Perceptions of Self and Parents Among Chinese Students." *Sex Roles* 41(1/2):17–29.
- Taylor, Verta and Nancy E. Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communitites: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." Pp. 104–29 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. Yale University Press.
- Western, Bruce and Christopher Wildeman. 2009. "The Black Family and Mass Incarceration." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 621(1):221–42.
- Whitehead, Andrew L. 2012. "Gender Ideology and Religion: Does a Masculine Image of God Matter?" *Review of Religious Research* 54(2):139–56.
- Wilcox, William Bradford. 2004. *Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilcox, William Bradford and Nicholas H. Wolfinger. 2015. *Soul Mates: Religion, Sex, Love, and Marriage among African Americans and Latinos*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilde, Melissa J. 2018. "Editorial: 'Complex Religion: Intersections of Religion and Inequality.'" *Social Inclusion* 6(2):83.
- Yoder, Janice D., Ann Tobias, and Andrea F. Snell. 2011. "When Declaring 'I Am a Feminist' Matters: Labeling Is Linked to Activism." *Sex Roles* 64(1–2):9–18.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1996. "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism." *Feminist Studies* 22(2):321.