



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Department of Psychology

“Get Away From Me!”: Implicit and Explicit Transphobia in Swedish-speaking Men

George E. Juge

Master thesis fall 2013

Supervisors: Una Tellhed

Emma Bäck

Abstract

This study aimed to measure implicit and explicit prejudice towards transpeople among Swedish-speaking men. A new picture IAT (Implicit Association Test) was created in a pilot study to measure implicit attitudes towards gender transgressing males. In the main study, 66 male participants were divided into control and experimental groups. The manipulation consisted of two different gender presentations on the part of the (male) researcher: gender normative presentation in the control condition and gender transgressing presentation in the experimental condition. Participants completed the picture IAT, along with explicit measures of transphobia and male role norm endorsement. Two measures of implicit prejudice (disgust and avoidance) were surreptitiously taken. It was hypothesized that group means would differ on measures of implicit and explicit transphobia, and that participants in the experimental group would show greater disgust and avoidance. Mean score differences between groups reached significance on the measure of explicit attitudes and approached significance on implicit attitudes. After accounting for male role norm endorsement, between-group differences no longer reached statistical significance for either measure. Significant effects of the manipulation were found on the disgust measure but not on the avoidance measure. Findings are discussed in light of relevant theory and future directions recommended.

Key words: attitudes, prejudice, transphobia, implicit, gender, masculinity

I wish to thank all of my friends and loved ones for their help and support throughout the process of writing this thesis. Thanks also to my supervisors for their patience, enthusiasm and belief in me and in this project.

Introduction

In the early stages of data collection for this thesis, a wrench was thrown into my plans. I was put on a brief sick leave after being harassed while working as an educator on LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) issues. Two of my colleagues and I had been asked to do outreach at a youth club in connection with the club screening a film about a transgender woman. When we arrived, the film was almost over, and several of the youth, who were almost exclusively male, were sitting in the back of the room, laughing and making fun of the main character. When the film was over and the lights came on, I noticed that many of the young men were staring at me and making comments to one another, possibly provoked by the small amount of eye shadow I had on. Later in the evening, when my colleagues and I were leading an exercise, one of the young people asked me whether I was a he or a she. I responded that it didn't make much difference to me. After asking incredulously whether I was serious and being assured that I was, he told me in no uncertain terms, "Get away from me!" There were no other adults close enough to us to hear this. He whispered something to the boy next to him, and the whispering continued around the circle in which they were sitting, sometimes punctuated by a glance in my direction, laughter, and comments such as, "You're gay right? Do you think he's cute?" (referring to one of the youths in the group).

Had this been a one-time occurrence, I doubt that it would have affected me as much as it did. However, this experience was only a drop in the ocean that is the harassment, abuse and violence faced daily by people who break gender norms, myself included. It is to shed light upon this situation that I have conducted this experiment and written this thesis.

On Sex and Gender

Gender is a broad and incredibly complex subject. Indeed, it is a field of study in its own right. In order better to understand the issues upon which this thesis touches, it is necessary first to have an understanding of what gender can mean in the context of attitudes towards transpeople. Transpeople refers to persons who break gender norms in various ways. Included are transsexuals, who do not identify with the sex assigned them at birth and people who do not identify as either men or women (sometimes called intergender, bigender or genderqueer). Transgender, like most social categories, is a fluid rather than discrete category ("Begreppslista," no date given).

Gender can be defined in many ways, but it is perhaps easiest to break down the

concept into four types: biological, legal, social and mental. Biological gender, which is sometimes referred to as sex, refers to the physical body ("Begyppslista," n.d.). In western cultures, at least, humans are assigned a sex as soon as possible after birth. In most cases, sex assignment is based on the appearance of external genitalia. In a few cases, the external genitalia do not fit the norm of there being only males and females. People whose external genitalia are not clearly within the range of what is considered normal for males or females can be called intersex, although intersex can also refer to a number of other "conditions" – bodies which do not fit the binary gender norm. While there is clearly a sexual dichotomy amongst humans, with a tendency towards being either male or female, there are many more than two sexes. Sex has to do not only with external genitalia, but also with internal reproductive organs, chromosomes, hormone levels, and secondary sex characteristics, such as facial hair and breast development. Considering all of these aspects and their possible combinations, it is estimated that there are at least 17 different biological sexes, and that nearly 2% of live births worldwide have bodies which do not fit the standard of being male or female (Fausto-Sterling, 2000).

Dr. Milton Diamond, a sexologist who has been active for many years in debates about the medical rights of intersex people, has been famously quoted as saying, "Nature loves variety but society hates it" ("Said on Campus", 2008). Indeed, despite there being vast diversity in biological sex expression, society – and thereby the law – is built around a binary gender system which recognizes only males and females. In Sweden, as well as in most industrialized nations, every person is required to have a legal gender. With very few exceptions (Sweden not being one of them), these genders are limited to two: male and female. While the binary legal gender system may seem unproblematic to most people, it poses a number of difficulties for both intersex and transgender people. Legal requirements that a newborn be given one of two genders add formidably to the considerable social pressure to make infants bodies conform to the binary gender norms. In many cases, irreversible surgeries are performed on infants who cannot consent, sometimes without the consent or even knowledge of their parents, in the name of allowing the intersex person to lead a "normal life". Many people who have been operated on as infants live the rest of their lives with genital pain, scarring, shame and the inability to function sexually ("What's Wrong With the Way," 2008). Since the 1970s, Sweden has forced transsexuals to be sterilized in order to legally change their sex until the law was declared unconstitutional and overturned in December, 2012 ("Transgender People in Sweden," 2013). Similar laws remain in effect today in more than a dozen EU countries ("Sweden Ends Forced Sterilization," 2013). The

requirement for one's legal gender to appear on documents such as identification cards and passports can also pose difficulties and even safety risks for those who do not fit the norm of what a woman or man "should" look like.

The legal system is only one of many aspects affected by societal gender norms. Whether a person is a man or a woman, a girl or a boy, is one of the very first things people notice as social beings. As soon as a baby is born, and often times even before birth, people inquire as to its gender. This is because people are generally socialized to interact with males and females and there are subtle but important differences in the ways people interact depending upon the gender of everyone involved. Social gender, then, refers to the gender role or roles enacted by, or sometimes forced upon, any given person. A person may be biologically and legally female, for example, but if that person presents as male and is treated as a male by those around them, that person is socially male. For many people, social gender is fairly stable, but due to the intricate natures of both social relations and gender, some people may be socially male in one setting and socially female in another ("Begræpslista," n.d.).

Besides the biological, legal and social aspects of gender, one can also speak of mental gender. Mental gender refers to a person's own gender identity, and is sometimes referred to as such. A person who has a gender identity or mental gender different from that of their biological, legal or social gender is often referred to as transgender or transsexual ("Begræpslista," n.d.). However, for the purposes of this thesis, the term transgender will be used in its wider meaning as an umbrella term (unless otherwise specified), which includes many different types of gender identity and expression. These may include, but are not limited to: transsexuals, who may or may not have undergone transition in order to effect bodily changes; crossdressers, who are often heterosexual men who occasionally wear clothing traditionally associated with women; drag kings and queens, who use stereotypes of gender roles for entertainment purposes and sometimes for political purposes; effeminate men who wear makeup, and very masculine women ("Begræpslista," n.d.).

The word transgender has its etymological origin in Latin. The prefix "trans" means "across" or "on the other side". Transgender, then, can be thought of as referring to someone for whom the above mentioned four genders do not "match". In the spirit of norm critique, the prefix "cis" and the word "cisgendered" have recently come into use in order to draw attention to the social norms which necessitate the category transgender. "Cis" is also Latin in origin and means "on the same side". Thus, instead of speaking of transgender people vs. "normal" people (a practice regularly used in everyday speech, which makes social

norms invisible and those who break them hypervisible), one can speak of a cis norm and of cispeople. For example, a ciswoman is someone who was assigned a female sex at birth, is biologically and legally female, and who interacts with others, and identifies as, a woman. The cis norm is the social norm that assumes that all people are, and should be, cispeople ("Begreppslista," n.d.).

It is important to note the relationship between gender and sexual orientation. The understanding predominant in the western world today that people have a sexual orientation which can be stable and serve as a basis for personal identity is a relatively new concept. Terms such as homosexual have only come into being in the last 150 years or so ("HBT-historia," n.d.). Similarly, the modern, western understanding of sex and gender is also rooted in time and space. In the 1950s, drag queens, gay men and transwomen may have been more likely to see each other as belonging to the same group. In the past several decades, however, many gays, lesbians and bisexuals – particularly white, well-off gay men – have made a concerted effort to convince the wider (heterosexual) public and legislators that homosexuals are normal men and women who just happen to love other normal men and women. This attempt to normalize homosexuality exacted a high price: in order to be accepted by heterosexuals, many gay men and lesbians distanced themselves from all things gender bending. In turn, a number of laws have been passed protecting people on the basis of sexual orientation while gender identity has been ignored ("HBT-historia," n.d.).

Sexual orientation and gender identity are not the same thing, but they are intimately related. Norms surrounding both gender and sexuality rest on similar principles: there are two sexes, male and female; there are two genders, man and woman, which follow suit from those two sexes; and men and women are attracted to one another. These are the assumptions upon which cis norms and hetero norms rest. To be homosexual, therefore, is a violation of gender norms. Normative men and women are heterosexual. However, being homosexual does not automatically make one transgender, which is a common misconception. Similarly, transgender people do not fit nicely into the hetero norm. Take, for example, a transsexual man – a person born female who has undergone transition and looks male. If he is a heterosexual man, he may have a history as a lesbian. If he was attracted to men before transition, he will likely be viewed as a gay man after transition. Even if he were attracted to men before transition and to women after, some would still argue that his relationships with women are not fully heterosexual. In addition, many people who are not heterosexual (as well as some who are) do not fit traditional gender norms ("Begreppslista," n.d.). Indeed, most stereotypes of gay men and lesbians are based on some form of non-normative gender

performance. Research and experience have shown that gay men and lesbians who are effeminate and masculine, respectively, receive far more harassment, are more often the targets of homophobia and have worse mental health than their gender normative counterparts (Rosario, Schrimshaw & Hunter, 2008; Sanford, Melendez & Diaz, 2007). In turn, transgender people are the victims of violence and harassment at a level many times that of gay men, lesbians and bisexuals (Grant, Mottet, Tanis, Harrison, Herman & Keisling, 2011). It becomes apparent that the line between homophobia and transphobia is blurry to say the least.

Sexual orientation and gender identity are related not only to one another but also to any number of other social categories, including ethnicity, religious affiliation, age, class and ability. This work is approached from an intersectional standpoint, requiring an awareness of how various social structures and systems of oppression interact and reinforce one another.

Discrimination vs. Oppression: a Question of Power

Prejudice refers to a preconceived, biased attitude, usually towards a social group to which the prejudiced person does not belong. Prejudice and discrimination can go in any direction. People belonging to high status groups can be prejudiced, and discriminate, against those in low status groups, and vice versa. Oppression, on the other hand, can be seen as the kind of discrimination that results from a combination of prejudice and power. In this sense, people occupying a position of low social power or status lack the social capital to oppress those who occupy positions of higher status with regard to any given social category, such as ethnicity, gender or class. This is why it is possible for people of color to be prejudiced against white people, but it is not possible for a person of color to be a so-called reverse racist (McKenzie, 2013). People of color, of course, occupy many social positions – just as white people do – in addition to being racialized. This makes it possible for a specific person of color to oppress a specific white person on the basis of another social category, such as gender, class or functionality. However, being privileged with regard to one social category does not erase the oppression that comes with another social category. Therefore it continues to make no sense to speak of reverse racism, reverse sexism, heterophobia, etc. (McKenzie, 2013).

Violence Against Transpeople

Transpeople are harassed, abused and murdered at staggering rates. This is especially true of transwomen of color, who are caught in a proverbial crossfire of sexism, racism, homophobia and transphobia (Grant, Mottet, Tanis, Harrison, Herman & Keisling, 2011). Lesbians, gays and bisexuals who are perceived to be gender nonconforming are at higher risk of being harassed than their gender conforming counterparts (Rosario, Schrimshaw & Hunter, 2008; Sanford, Melendez & Diaz, 2007). This systematic oppression and violence takes a physical and emotional toll on transgender people, especially transgender youth (Grant, Mottet, Tanis, Harrison, Herman & Keisling, 2011; Ignatavicius, 2013).

Issues of gender are not reserved for intersex and transpeople. Much of the bullying faced by young people in schools revolves around failures to live up to exacting gender norms. One recent book reports that the vast majority of school shootings, which have resulted in multiple deaths and injuries, have been perpetrated by teenage boys in response to gender bullying or masculinity threats (Klein, 2012). Since all members of society have to relate to the gender binary, gender issues affect everyone on a daily basis and are important factors in social problems ranging from domestic violence to workplace discrimination.

Theoretical Framework and Previous Research

Attitudes

Attitudes can be described as value-laden feelings directed towards something or someone (or a group of people). In psychological literature, individuals' attitudes towards social groups and their members are often discussed in connection with stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination. These three aspects of intergroup relations interact and are often so closely intertwined that they can be difficult to tease apart. Stereotypes are cognitive in nature and refer to generalized beliefs about a given group of people which is seen to be essentially homogenous. Prejudice arises from and interacts with stereotypes. Prejudice is affective in nature and, although it correlates with relevant stereotypes, is a better predictor of behavior than stereotypes in and of themselves are (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a). Discrimination refers to behavior, which can be seen as the result of cognitive and affective processes (Fiske & Taylor, 2008).

Although attitudes tend to correlate to both cognition and behavior, these correlations are moderated by a number of factors, including cognitive load (van Knippenberg, Dijksterhuis, & Vermeulen, 1999), motivation to avoid stereotyping (Blair &

Banaji, 1996), and personal contact with members of relevant social groups (Lowery, Hardin, & Sinclair, 2001). The Stereotype Content Model put forth by Fiske, Cuddy, Glick and Xu in 2002 posits that specific stereotypes give rise to specific feelings (attitudes) and behaviors (some of which can be classified as discrimination) directed towards members of relevant social groups.

Both subliminal (preconscious) and postconscious priming – that is to say, exposure to a relevant stimulus – has been found to affect attitudes (Kawakami, Dovidio, & Dijksterhuis, 2003) and behavior (see Ferguson & Clark, 2004, for a review). This study builds in part on these previous works, aiming to test the hypothesis that exposure to a transgender experimenter will affect unconscious discriminating behavior and attitudes towards transpeople.

Stereotypes

The Stereotype Content Model (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) describes two structural variables, namely status and competition, which are correlated with stereotypes of competence and warmth, respectively. Groups of people stereotyped to be low in competence evoke qualitatively different kinds of prejudice and discrimination depending on the group's perceived warmth. Those stereotyped to be incompetent but warm, for example those with mental or physical disabilities and the elderly, evoke pity in others, theoretically because their misfortune in life is perceived as not being "their fault". However, those groups perceived to be low in both competence and warmth, including the poor, homeless and drug addicted, illicit disgust in others and are often dehumanized. Given that reactions to transpeople often include disgust and dehumanization, and the fact that transwomen, especially those of color, are murdered more than any other group exposed to hate crimes (Grant, Mottet, Tanis, Harrison, Herman, & Keisling, 2011), it would follow that the stereotype of transpeople is one of low competence and little warmth. The specific qualitative nature of stereotypes regarding transpeople has not yet been explored within social psychology. The current study is primarily an investigation of unifactoral attitudes towards transpeople (feeling either positively or negatively towards them). It will provide important information about the nature of the implicit and explicit attitudes regarding transpeople in Sweden. The addition of measures of emotional and behavioral reactions, including a disgust measure, may provide insight into discrimination against, and possibly stereotypes linked to, transpeople.

Disgust and dehumanization. Disgust is a unique emotion in that it is felt for both inanimate objects and for certain groups of people, namely those social groups which are stereotyped as low in both competence and warmth. These groups are sometimes referred to as inhabiting the "low – low" position on the stereotype matrix (Harris & Fiske, 2006). Disgust is associated with the cognitive process known as dehumanization (Harris & Fiske, 2006). Dehumanization entails thinking of an individual as less than fully human. Dehumanized individuals are sometimes thought of as nonhuman animals or, alternatively, as emotionless automatons, similar to robots (Haslam, 2006). In either case, dehumanization appears to act as a barrier to empathy. Therefore the process of dehumanization facilitates both active and passive harm being done to the dehumanized individual, since it is generally more socially acceptable for humans to harm or kill nonhuman animals or damage inanimate objects than it is to harm other human beings (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006).

Disgust and dehumanization have been used throughout history as a means to motivate and facilitate violence against certain social groups. People kidnapped from Africa were widely thought of as subhuman animals and as property by white North Americans, allowing them to be sold as slaves and regularly exposed to miserable living conditions, forced, unpaid labor, violence, rape and murder. This is a legacy which lives on. People with African heritage are still referred to as apes and are systematically mistreated, subject to violence, and incarcerated at alarming and disproportionate rates (NAACP, 2014). People from both the Jewish and Romany cultures have been referred to as vermin throughout their histories, an everyday act of dehumanization which is part and parcel of the structural discrimination faced by both of these groups. One of the most salient examples of the consequences of dehumanization is the atrocities committed by Hitler and his NAZI party in Germany in the 1930s and '40s. Propaganda directed towards white, Anglo-Saxon, Christian Germans encouraged already present stereotypes of Jews, Romany, homosexuals, the disabled and others. This propaganda played a key role in persuading ordinary people to actively partake in mass murder (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953).

Different stereotypes give rise to specific forms of prejudice. While stereotypes have been theorized as two dimensional, attitudes are generally classified as either positive or negative. However, both the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) and Intergroup Emotions Theory (E. Smith, 1993) paint a more nuanced picture of specific prejudices and forms of discrimination which may arise from specific kinds of stereotypes. Relevant to this particular study, the stereotype content model posits that a social

group low in status will be perceived as incompetent and, depending upon perceived warmth, will be treated with either pity or disgust (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Transpeople undoubtedly have low status: they are virtually unrepresented in positions of economic and political power. Likewise, the stereotype of incompetence fits well with personal experience. Two professional transgender friends of mine recount constantly meeting the assumption that they occupy a position much lower than they do; one of them is repeatedly met with disbelief or surprise when he tells people he is a medical doctor. Whether transpeople are generally stereotyped as warm or not is more difficult to determine and has not been investigated within social psychology. However, that transpeople are met with disgust is indubitable (Morgan, 2013; Turner, 2012). An alternative explanation of the disgust reaction can be found in Intergroup Emotions Theory (E. Smith, 1993). This model posits that when a high status perceiver appraises someone from a low status group to have motives inconsistent with the perceiver's ingroup, is certain of the appraisal, and perceives a norm violation, the perceiver will feel disgust and avoid the other person. It is certainly clear that transpeople violate gender norms. The measures of disgust and avoidance in this study aim to explore how well this model fits for transpeople.

Belief in a Just World and Intergroup Emotions Theory

The belief in a just world is a common theme in both Social Dominance Theory (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) and Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1981). While both of these ideologies are based on perceived threats to a powerful ingroup, the oppressive prejudice which accompanies it expresses itself differently with regards to different social groups. Neither women nor African Americans are generally seen to have chosen their sex or ethnicity, respectively. The belief in a just world excludes the possibility of unjust social power structures and necessitates the logical conclusion that women and African Americans are inherently, i.e. biologically, inferior to men and whites, respectively. On the other hand, transpeople, as well as other members of LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) communities, are often seen as having chosen their sexual orientation or gender identity. This enters transgender people into another category of social group, namely norm breakers. According to Intergroup Emotions Theory (E. Smith, 1993), the perception of norm violation gives rise to disgust and avoidance in people with high status towards those with low status. Also relevant to transpeople's situation, this theory posits that when any one perceives anyone else as intentionally taking action inconsistent with the goals of the first person's group, the perceiver is likely to feel either contempt or anger (depending on whether

the perceiver is relatively weak or strong to the perceived person) (E. Smith, 1993). In either case, the tendency is for the perceiver to move against the perceived person, in this case a transperson. If transpeople are seen as intentionally breaking gender norms, this could easily be perceived as acting inconsistently with the goals of cispeople. Both cismen and ciswomen benefit from maintaining and adhering to gender norms, and transpeople can be seen as the embodiment of calling those norms into question.

Explicit and Implicit Attitudes

Attitudes exist on both explicit and implicit levels. Implicit attitudes are thought to encompass visceral reactions that occur prior to cognitive processing (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). Explicit attitudes are those actually expressed. The attitudes people express, however, are subject to a number of factors which may reduce their relationship to implicit attitudes, such as social desirability (not wanting to seem politically incorrect or prejudiced) or having goals which contradict ones implicit attitudes (as in the case of aversive racism, Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986).

The Implicit Association Test or IAT (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) measures the strength of implicit associations by forcing participants to sort two sets of stimuli, either words or pictures, into categories. One set of stimuli must be sorted into categories such as flowers vs. insects. The other set of stimuli consist of value-laden words (such as wonderful or terrible), which must be sorted into good vs. bad. While some critics question whether the IAT measures implicit attitudes or merely association strengths, IAT scores have consistently been found to correlate very well with both relevant behavior (Uhlmann, Poehlman, & Nosek, 2012) and explicit attitudes on subjects which are not particularly subject to social desirability (such as which political candidate one supports) (Greenwald, Smith, Sriram, Bar-Anan, & Nosek, 2009). Whether one chooses to call the IAT measure implicit attitude testing or association strength testing, it can provide useful and important information on intergroup relations.

Implicit Association Tests have been developed and used to study implicit associations on a range of topics, but implicit attitudes towards transpeople have not yet been explored using this particular measure. In order to measure implicit transphobia for the purpose of this study, the author created a new implicit association test (see details under "Overview of Present Studies: Pilot Study").

Distancing Behavior

Within Intergroup Emotions Theory, avoidance is a discriminating behavior linked to feelings of disgust (E. Smith, 1993). One of the most concrete ways to avoid another person is to maintain physical distance. Studies evaluating implicit prejudice have found approach and avoidance behaviors to correlate to implicit attitudes. This correlation seems to work in both directions – implicit attitudes affect approach/avoidance behavior and being instructed to approach or avoid an object or person affects implicit attitudes (Kawakami, Phillips, Steele, & Dovidio, 2007).

Male Role Norms, Masculinity Threat and Swedish Culture

The endorsement of male role norms has been linked in several studies to sexual prejudice, specifically negativity towards gay men and adversity to femininity in men (Parrott, 2009; Davies, 2004). It was therefore important to measure how much participants supported traditional masculinity norms in order to be able to explore the extent to which male role norm endorsement correlated with implicit and explicit transphobia.

The endorsement of male role norms can also affect self-esteem in men. Masculinity has been theorized as a precarious social status, which must be defended against the threat of feminization (Stotzer & Shih, 2012). Masculinity threat can arise from a variety of social interactions and causes anxiety in many men whose identity is strongly defined by their gender. This anxiety leads to changes in biochemistry, including cortisol and testosterone levels. There is a tendency for men to act aggressively directly following a perceived masculinity threat, in order to reduce anxiety and reinstate their male social status (Falomir-Pichastor & Mugny, 2009). The overwhelming amount of violence faced by transpeople (mostly at the hands of cisgendered men) may be motivated in part by this sequence of threat, anxiety and aggression.

The extent to which men and women endorse male role norms varies from culture to culture. In a study by the United Nations Development Programme conducted in 2007-2008, women in cultures with a long history of feminist influence in politics, including the United States, tended to endorse male role norms less than men do. In other countries, such as China, Russia, and Pakistan, which were ranked much lower than the United States on the same Gender Empowerment Measure, subscriptions to male role norms were similar between men and women (Levant, Hall, & Rankin, 2013). Political climates are, of course, always in flux, and gender equality is no exception to this rule. In the latest publication of the

United Nations' Gender Inequality Index, a list ranking over 185 countries, territories and regions on a number of criteria related to the empowerment of women, the United States had fallen to a ranking of number 42. This represents a significant drop from their rank at number 12 in the above mentioned report from 2007-2008. The cultural context of this study, namely its participants being men living in Sweden, is of particular interest, as Sweden has a strong reputation as a trailblazer of gender equality. Indeed, Sweden is second only to the Netherlands in gender equality according to the United Nations' 2012-2013 Gender Inequality Index (United Nations Development Programme, 2013). Although Sweden has made great strides towards gender equality, sexism, homophobia and transphobia are far from eradicated in Swedish society. Hate crime legislation specifically protects homo- and bisexuals, but not transpeople, and statistics on transphobic hate crimes in Sweden are sorely lacking (see for example Aspling & Djärv, 2013).

Overview of Present Studies

One of the primary aims of this study was to measure implicit attitudes towards transpeople among Swedish-speaking men. While there are a number of methods commonly used to measure implicit attitudes in social psychology, no one has yet developed a test of implicit attitudes towards transpeople specifically. The Implicit Association Test (IAT) (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) has been used to measure implicit attitudes or associations towards a wide range of social groups, including gay men (Jellison, McConnell, & Gabriel, 2004). The IAT can easily be adapted to target associations with any given group. The author therefore chose to create a new Implicit Association Test for the purposes of this study.

Because gender normativity is generally invisible until it is broken, it was very difficult to come up with descriptive words which could easily be associated with gender normativity as a category. Photographs were therefore used as stimuli to be sorted into the categories gender normative vs. transgender in the Implicit Association Test (IAT) used in the main study. Twenty photographs of people who are biologically and legally male, and/or who identify and live as male, were collected. Focus was placed on people perceived as men because, while people perceived as gender nonconforming women are also the victims of gender bashing and transphobia, it is arguably even more threatening for people perceived as men to break with masculinity norms (a contributing factor to transwomen of color being the number one target of identity-based murder). This specific type of gender nonconformity actively and deliberately refuses masculinity in favor of femininity. This threatens not only

individual men, the social group who perpetrates virtually all gender bashing, but also the patriarchal society which prizes masculinity over femininity.

Pilot Study

Method. In order to determine which of the 20 photos best represented the two categories of gender normativity and gender nonconformity to be used in the IAT, a pilot study was conducted. Thirty-one people (16 female, 11 male, 4 other, according to self-identification) were recruited through the researcher's contacts and through the Internet. These participants completed a survey evaluating each of the 20 pictures on the following four points:

1. How masculine the person in the picture seemed, according to social norms;
2. How feminine the person in the picture seemed, according to social norms;
3. Whether the person in the picture was a man or a woman; and
4. To what extent the person in the picture crossed typical gender boundaries.

Questions one, two and four were answered using a Likert - type scale ranging from 1 to 7, with the number one representing "not at all" and the number seven representing "extremely."

Results. Descriptive analysis performed on the survey answers revealed six of the photos to have received a mean rating on gender nonconformity (question four) below 1.68. The same analysis showed five of the photographs to have a mean rating on the same question above 4.30. However, one of these photos was excluded because roughly one third of pilot study participants perceived the subject of the photo as female. An additional two photographs received a mean rating of 4.13 on question four ("To what extent does the person in this photograph cross typical gender norms?"). This provided me with six photographs in each category, which is consistent with other established picture IAT's, such as the black/white IAT (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). A paired samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the difference in perceptions between the two groups of photos. There was a statistically significant difference in mean ratings on question 4 for the photograph in the low group with the highest score ($M = 1.67, SD = 1.24$) and the photograph in the high group with the lowest score ($M = 4.13, SD = 1.63$), $t(30) = 6.32, p < 0.001$ (two-tailed). In order to ensure that the ratings represented the perceptions of self-identified men, who were to be the target group of the primary study, a separate analysis was performed based only on the male participants of the pilot study. The results were consistent with the initial analysis.

Main Study

Purpose. The main study aims to investigate the attitudes – both implicit and explicit – and emotional and behavioral reactions of Swedish-speaking men towards transpeople.

Hypotheses. It was hypothesized that men in an experimental group who interacted with a male researcher with a feminine gender presentation (wearing clothing typical for women and makeup) would differ on a number of measures from men in a control group who interacted with a male researcher with a masculine gender presentation (wearing clothing typical for men and no makeup). These measures include the Implicit Association Test developed in the pilot study, a test of explicit attitudes towards transpeople, and surveys inquiring as to how much participants agree with masculinity norms and how important being male is to their identity. It was difficult to predict in which direction this difference would manifest. According to some theories, stereotypes are automatically activated when primed with a member of the relevant social group, leading to increased prejudice (Fiske & Taylor, 2008). However, Intergroup Contact Theory (Allport, 1954) along with the work of Lowery, Hardin, & Sinclair (2001) suggest that personal contact with a member of a social group can increase implicit liking for other members of the same group. In addition, the effect of social desirability could impact at least explicit measures of attitudes towards transpeople to a greater extent in the experimental group than in the control group. Finally, participants in the experimental and control groups were predicted to differ on two measures designed to surreptitiously measure reactions of disgust and avoidance. To summarize, the hypotheses are as follows:

1. Experimental and control groups will differ in implicit attitudes towards transpeople as measured by the Implicit Association Test created for the purposes of this study.
2. Experimental and control groups will differ in explicit attitudes towards transpeople as measured by the Genderism and Transphobia Scale.
3. Participants in the experimental group will experience a disgust reaction, resulting in lower ratings (compared to participants in control group) of how well they like a cake given to them in the course of the experiment.

4. Participants in the experimental group will engage in subtle avoidance behavior by sitting farther away from the researcher than participants in the control group do.

Design. The design of the study was a basic randomized experiment. For practical purposes, it was not possible to randomize individual trials, as this could create a situation in which the researcher was forced to change clothes and put on/remove makeup between participants. Instead, testing days were randomized.

The manipulation which separated the study's control group from the experimental group was the researcher's gender presentation. In the control group, the researcher was dressed in typical male clothing – jeans and either a T-shirt or a button down shirt – and wore no makeup. When participants in the experimental group were tested, the researcher dressed in typically female clothing – either a dress or a top and skirt – and wore clearly visible makeup. For illustrations of gender presentation in each of the two groups, see Appendix A.

Participants. Due to the intricate nature of this experiment, time restraints and the fact that males make up the overwhelming majority of gender bashers (Willoughby, Hill, Gonzalez, Lacorazza, Macapagal, Barton, & Doty, 2010) the study focused on the attitudes and discriminating behavior of males to the exclusion of females. For ethical and practical purposes, all participants were 18 years of age or older ($n = 66$, mean age = 28.34, $SD = 8.67$). Because the aim of the study was to investigate the attitudes of men living in Sweden towards transpeople, the materials were in Swedish and participants were all Swedish-speaking.

Procedure. Participants were recruited in one of three ways: some were approached on a university campus by the researcher; some responded to an online invitation to participate; the rest were recruited at a university library by a third party. Requirements were that participants be male identified, 18 years of age or older, understand written Swedish, and not have had prior face-to-face contact with the experimenter. Participants entered a room individually, either at a previously arranged time or after being recruited by a third party. In the room were a table and two chairs, one of which was occupied by the researcher. Each participant was asked to take the remaining chair and have a seat wherever he liked. The participant was given a small sheet of paper introducing the experiment and defining the terms "transgender" and "gender normative" as they were used in the study. After confirming with the participant that he understood the terms, he was given a laptop and

allowed to begin the Implicit Association Test (IAT). While the participant was taking the test, the researcher prepared his cake and coffee. When the IAT was complete, the participant received the cake, a cup of coffee and the remaining surveys to be taken with pen and paper. The participant was told that the bakery which provided the cakes did so at a discounted rate in exchange for receiving feedback about how good the cakes tasted, so a survey from the bakery was also mixed in with the other surveys. In actuality, the supposed bakery survey was part of the experiment. See more details below under "Measures". After completing the written surveys, the participant was allowed to finish his coffee and cake, if he had not already done so, and was thanked for his participation. After the participant had left, the distance between the front legs of the chairs in which the participant and the researcher had been sitting was measured.

Measures. *Manipulation/check:* In a study conducted by Parrott and Zeichner (2008), viewing homoerotic material served as a masculinity threat in heterosexual men. In a similar vein, the manipulation for the current study consisted of the researcher having two different gender presentations: in the control group, the researcher wore typically male clothing and no makeup while in the experimental group, the researcher wore typically female clothing and noticeable makeup (see photographs in Appendix A for examples). In order to ensure that the manipulation was successfully carried out, participants answered two questions – what the researcher's gender was (woman, man or other) and whether the researcher crossed typical gender boundaries. The second question was answered on a Likert-type scale from 1 ("no, not at all") to 7 ("yes, definitely").

Demographic questions and Male Identification Scale. Participants were asked to provide demographic information, including age, major (for students), number of university credits, and gender (with the option to mark woman, man or other). In order to gauge how much being male contributed to participants' self image, a subset of Eriksson and Lindholm's (2007) Swedish translation of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), which consists of four items, was adapted to fit male-only participants. Two of the four questions on this scale were negatively worded which led to very low correlation with the other two items. The negatively worded items were therefore eliminated from analysis and answers from the positively worded items used. The Swedish translation of this scale reports a Cronbach's α of 0.66; in the current study, internal consistency was very good, with a Cronbach's α of 0.91 for the two items used. Amongst the participants of the current study,

male identification scores were highly correlated with Male Role Norms Inventory scores ($r = 0.564, n = 66, p < 0.001$). Therefore, this scale was not used in further analyses.

Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form (MRNI – SF). The Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form (Levant, Hall & Rankin, 2013) is a reduced item version of the Male Role Norms Inventory – Revised (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010) which retains reliable measures of each of the original scale's seven subscales. The MRNI – SF consists of 21 statements to which participants agree or disagree with along a Likert-type scale from one ("completely disagree") to seven ("agree completely"). The seven factors measured by the subscales are: Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Self-Reliance through Mechanical Skills (SR), Negativity towards Sexual Minorities (NT), Avoidance of Femininity (AF), Importance of Sex (IS), Dominance (Do), and Toughness (T). See Appendix B for example statements.

The short form of the MRNI as a whole has a very good internal consistency, Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.92$ for male participants (Levant, Hall & Rankin, 2013). Internal consistency for the current study was also good, Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.95$.

Status survey. The status survey consisted of four questions aimed at determining three things: the social status of transpeople in Swedish society, since perceived social status of a group is a contributing factor to others' attitudes towards the given group (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick & Xu, 2002); how taboo it is in Sweden to express dislike for transpeople, which could provide a baseline from which to estimate the likelihood of social desirability affecting explicit answers; and lastly, two questions addressing the individual participants' ideas about possible "causes" of being transgender. The last two questions were posed because ideas about nature vs. nurture have been found to affect attitudes toward several oppressed social groups (Bastian & Haslam, 2006). Attitudes towards both women and African Americans are affected positively by a belief that inequality between groups is primarily caused by social factors rather than biological ones. Interestingly, the opposite seems to be true in the case of attitudes towards transpeople, at least according to a survey conducted among Swedish adults (Landén & Innala, 2000), in which the belief that being transgender is caused by biological rather than social factors correlated to more positive attitudes towards transgender people. All of these findings are consistent with the theory that a belief in a just world leads people with social privilege to believe that their status, as well as the misfortunes of others, is deserved (Levin, Federico, Sidanius, & Rabinowitz, 2002). This

sort of logic, unsurprisingly, leads to increased prejudice and discrimination towards low status groups, who are believed to be inherently inferior to high status groups. This system of logic can be classified as oppressive, and not merely prejudiced (McKenzie, 2013).

Implicit Association Test (IAT): For the purposes of this experiment, a picture IAT was devised (see details under Pilot Study) to measure implicit attitudes towards men perceived to be gender conforming vs. men perceived to be breaking gender norms. Participants were instructed to sort visual stimuli consisting of pictures and words into one of two available categories using the E and I keys on the keyboard of a laptop. In certain rounds of sorting, participants had to correctly categorize the 12 pictures selected from the pilot study as either "Gender normative" or "Transgender". In others, value-loaded words, such as wonderful and terrible, had to be categorized as either "Good" or "Bad". A third type of sorting round combined the same pictures and value-loaded words and required participants to sort stimuli into either "Gender normative or Good" or "Transgender or Bad". Finally, the fourth round was identical to the third except that the categories were "Transgender or Good" and "Gender normative or Bad". All sorting rounds were preceded by practice rounds and were alternated and counterbalanced, so that half of participants sorted stimuli into "Transgender or Bad" and "Gender Normative or Good" first, while the other half sorted "Transgender or Good" and "Gender Normative or Bad" first. Scores are calculated from mean differences between response times in associating transgender with good/ gender normative with bad and response times in associating transgender with bad/gender normative with good for each participant. This Implicit Association Test was created using the picture IAT template included in Millisecond's software program Inquisit 4.

Explicit attitude measure: Genderism and Transphobia Scale. The Genderism and Transphobia Scale (GTS) is a bifactorial measure of explicit transphobia. The scale consists of 32 statements, which participants were instructed to evaluate according to how true each statement was for them personally. Answers were given using a Likert-type scale from one ("completely disagree") to seven ("agree completely"). The first factor measured by the GTS is transphobia/genderism, which is evaluated by a subscale including statements such as "Feminine men make me uncomfortable," and "Men who shave their legs are weird"; another subscale measures the second factor, gender bashing, and includes such statements as "I have behaved violently towards a man because he was too feminine." Higher scores indicate higher explicit negativity towards transpeople.

Hill and Willoughby (2005) report good internal consistency with a Cronbach's

α of 0.95 for the Genderism and Transphobia Scale as a whole. Internal consistency was good in the current study as well, Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.95$.

Disgust measurement. In order to determine whether being exposed to a man breaking gender norms would elicit disgust in the experimental group, participants rated a cake given to them as part of the experiment. Participants were told that the cake was a thank you for their participation, and that the bakery from which the cakes were bought offered a discount in exchange for receiving the participants' opinions as to how good the cake was. In actual fact, the cake and participants' evaluation of it served as a measure of a disgust reaction. The evaluation was in the form of a Likert-type scale from 1 to 7, with one representing "disgusting" and seven representing "delicious". Below the scale was an invitation to comment. This scale was printed on a separate piece of paper in a different font from the rest of the scales, to make the cover story more believable. Only one participant expressed suspicion about the cake survey. During the experiment, he was assured that it was not a part of the study. However, he was debriefed after participation was complete.

Food and General Neophobia Scales (FNS and GNS) – Swedish form. In order to be able to control for individuals being more or less skeptical in regards to new foods, a potential confound to the disgust measure, participants filled out the unidimensional version of Pliner and Hobden's (1992) Food Neophobia Scale (Ritchey, Frank, Hursti and Tuorila, 2003). The General Neophobia Scale (Pliner and Hobden, 1992) provides a control for individuals' comfort level in new situations overall, a potential confound to the distance measurement. Participants were given the Swedish version of this survey as translated from the original English by Björklund and Hursti (2002). Each scale consists of eight items and answers were given using a Likert-type scale ranging from one ("completely disagree") to seven ("agree completely"). The Food Neophobia Scale includes statements such as, "I am afraid to eat things I have never had before." The General Neophobia Scale includes statements such as, "I feel uneasy in unfamiliar surroundings."

The Food Neophobia Scale has been tested repeatedly in diverse populations, with reported Cronbach's α generally lying in the 0.8 to 0.9 range (Frank et al., 1997, Hursti and Sjöden, 1997, Pliner and Hobden, 1992 and Tuorila et al., 1994). In the current study, internal consistency was also acceptable, with a Cronbach's α of 0.75. Pliner and Hobden (1992) reported Cronbach's α from two participant groups for the General Neophobia Scale ,

one reaching 0.78 and the other reaching 0.88. The current study showed a good internal consistency for the General Neophobia with a Cronbach's α of 0.87.

Distance measurement. Previous research within social psychology has found that one behavioral correlate to racial prejudice is physical distancing. Amodio and Devine (2006) told study participants that they would be partnered with another person with whom they would have to cooperate in the experiment. Participants were told the name of the person with whom they would be partnered. In the control group, participants received a partner name that was typically Anglo-American. Those in the experimental group received a partner name that was typically African American. The study found that white participants who were higher in racial prejudice tended to choose seats farther away from the belongings of the presumed African American partner in the experimental group.

In an attempt to measure implicit discriminating behavior among the current study's participants, the distance between where the researchers sat and where each participant placed himself was measured. Whenever it was feasible, which was the case for most participants, the only chair available to the participant was hanging by its arms on the table or desk in the room. The participant was told to sit wherever he liked. Prior to the participant having entered the room, the experimenter had placed a small amount of oil paint on the bottoms of the two back legs of the chair. This resulted in two marks being left on the floor where the participant had originally placed his chair. Distance was measured in centimeters and represents how far the midpoint between the two front legs of each chair were from one another. No participants expressed suspicion regarding this measure.

Results. *Preliminary analysis.* Before conducting the primary analyses, summed scales were transformed into indices representing original scoring from 1 to 7. Raw scores from the IAT were transformed into D scores in keeping with the improved algorithm recommended by Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003). The data then underwent assumption testing. While none of the main measurements were normally distributed, there were only extreme outliers present on two measures, the Genderism and Transphobia Scale and the Implicit Attitude Test. Six of the GTS scores and four IAT scores representing extreme outliers were adjusted to be closer to the rest of the scores, eliminating extreme outliers in these two measures, as recommended by Pallant (2010). Data from one participant was removed from the data set because he answered all of the surveys haphazardly without reading the questions. Mahalanobis distances indicated that there were no multivariate outliers. Seven participants declined the cake offered them. Two of them cited dietary

reasons (one was vegan and the other lactose intolerant) and the other five said that they did not want it. Since this did not seem to be a random pattern (four out of five of those who declined were in the experimental group), the five remaining missing values were replaced with the midpoint of the scale (3.5).

Manipulation check. In order to ensure that the manipulation had had the desired effect, participants were asked whether the person who presented the experiment (the author) was a woman, man or other, as well as whether the experimenter crossed typical gender boundaries. An independent t-test performed on the first of these two questions confirmed a significant difference between the control group ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 0.27$) and experimental group ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 0.50$, $t(49) = -4.25$, $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed). There was also a significant difference on the second of these two questions between the control group ($M = 2.09$, $SD = 1.63$) and the experimental group ($M = 5.94$, $SD = 1.46$, $t(63) = -10.03$, $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed). It is therefore safe to assume that the manipulation worked as planned.

Implicit Association Test. In order to test the first hypothesis, that implicit attitudes towards transpeople would differ between groups, an independent t-test on mean IAT scores was performed. IAT scores are calculated such that positive scores indicate implicit negativity towards transgender vs. gender normative men, with higher positive scores indicating more implicit negativity. Negative scores indicate implicit positivity towards transgender vs. gender normative men. There was a difference in means between the control group ($M = 0.62$, $SD = 0.81$) and experimental group ($M = 0.21$, $SD = 0.84$) which approached statistical significance, $t(64) = 1.98$, $p = 0.053$ (two-tailed). These results suggested that the manipulation may have had an effect on implicit attitudes, lowering negativity/increasing positivity towards transgender vs. gender normative men in the experimental group. Hierarchical regression analysis was then conducted in order to account for variability in the Male Role Norms Inventory (which was positively correlated with implicit attitude scores, $r = 0.389$, $n = 66$, $p = 0.001$). Male role norm endorsement has also been found to correlate with homophobia and adversity to femininity in men (Parrott, 2009; Davies, 2004), providing theoretical grounds for the regression analysis. In the final model, only Male Role Norms Inventory scores were statistically significant, recording a higher beta value ($beta = 0.34$, $p = 0.017$) than either group number ($beta = -0.17$, $p = 0.527$) or the interaction between MRNI scores and group ($beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.879$). See Table 1 for remaining results of the hierarchical regression analysis.

Table 1.
Results of hierarchical regression analysis on IAT scores

Variable	<i>beta</i>	<i>p</i>	Adjusted R^2	F	<i>p</i>	R^2_{change}
Block 1:						
Group number	-.240	.053	.043	3.902	.053	.057
Block 2:						
MRNI scores	.348**	.005	.141	6.341**	.003	.110
Block 3:						
Interaction of MRNI and group number	.039	.879	.128	4.170**	.009	.000

Note. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

The results of this analysis suggests that the manipulation did not, in fact, affect implicit attitudes towards transpeople as predicted by hypothesis one. Rather, the difference in group was accounted for by variability in Male Role Norm Inventory scores, and there appears to be no significant interaction between these scores and group number.

Explicit attitude measure: Genderism and Transphobia Scale (GTS). In order to test the second hypothesis, that explicit attitudes towards transpeople as measured by the Genderism and Transphobia Scale (GTS) would be impacted by the manipulation, an independent t-test was conducted. Mean scores on the GTS differed significantly between the control group ($M = 2.10$, $SD = 1.02$) and the experimental group ($M = 1.45$, $SD = 0.48$; $t(40) = 3.10$, $p = 0.004$, two-tailed). In order to evaluate whether MRNI scores might be a mediating factor, as they appeared to be in implicit attitude scores, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. In the final model, only Male Role Norms Inventory scores were statistically significant, recording a higher beta value ($beta = 0.83$, $p < 0.001$) than both group number ($beta = 0.27$, $p = 0.872$) and the interaction between MRNI scores and group ($beta = -0.19$, $p = 0.255$). See Table 2 for the remaining results of this regression analysis. The results of this analysis suggest that endorsement of male role norms has a significant impact on explicit attitudes towards transgender people as measured by the Genderism and Transphobia Scale. The effect of condition on GTS scores was accounted for by MRNI scores, and there was no significant interaction effect between male role norms endorsement and group on GTS scores, suggesting a rejection of hypothesis two.

Table 2.
Results of hierarchical regression analysis on GTS scores

Variable	<i>beta</i>	<i>p</i>	Adjusted R ²	F	<i>p</i>	R ² _{change}
Block 1:						
Group number	-.383	.003	.132	9.786**	.003	.057
Block 2:						
MRNI scores	.783***	<.001	.693	66.322***	<.001	.110
Block 3:						
Interaction of MRNI and group number	-.185	.255	.694	44.912***	<.001	.000

Note. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$

Status survey. None of the four items in the status survey had significantly different means scores between groups ($p > 0.05$). Three of four items (status, sensitive, and environment) were significantly and positively correlated with Genderism and Transphobia Scale scores. Scores for the item status were also significantly and positively correlated to Implicit Association Test scores. See Table 3 for specific statistics.

Table 3.
Pearson's Correlation, number of participants and statistical significance of status survey items with implicit and explicit transphobia scores (IAT and GTS)

	<u>IAT</u>			<u>GTS</u>		
	<i>r</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>p</i>
Status	.306**	58	.010	.277*	58	.035
Sensitive	.084	59	.263	.305*	59	.019
Biology	.001	58	.498	-.132	58	.324
Environment	.146	59	.134	.369**	59	.004

Note. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Disgust measure. In order to evaluate whether the manipulation produced a disgust reaction in the experimental group participants as measured by cake scores, an independent t-test was performed. Mean scores on the cake differed significantly between the control ($M = 5.90, SD = 1.19$) and experimental groups ($M = 5.21, SD = 1.43; t(62) = 2.09, p = 0.041$, two-tailed). In order to evaluate food neophobia as a potential confound to the

disgust effect and to explore the possibility of male role norms endorsement being a mediating factor of the manipulation effect (as it was in explicit and implicit attitudes), a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. In the final model, only the interaction between male role norms inventory scores and group number was statistically significant, $\beta = -0.57, p = 0.036$ although the main effect of MRNI scores on cake scores approached significance, $\beta = 0.27, p = 0.069$. In this model, there was no significant main effect of condition ($\beta = 0.30, p = 0.294$) or of food neophobia scores ($\beta = -0.101, p = 0.419$) on disgust as measured by cake scores. See Table 4 for remaining regression statistics.

Table 4.
Results of hierarchical regression analysis on disgust scores

Variable	β	p	Adjusted R^2	F	p	R^2_{change}
Block 1:						
Food neophobia scores	.060	.640	-.013	.221	.640	.004
Block 2:						
Group number	.276*	.033	.046	2.511	.090	.074
Block 3:						
MRNI scores	-.125	.347	.045	1.970	.128	.014
Block 4:						
Interaction of MRNI and group number	.573*	.036	.100	2.715*	.038	.067

Note. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

These results support the hypothesis that the manipulation produced a disgust effect in the experimental group (hypothesis three), specifically via an interaction effect with male role norm endorsement.

Avoidance measure. In order to test the hypothesis that people in the experimental group would sit farther away from the researcher than those in the control group did, an independent t-test was performed on chair distance. There was no significant difference in mean distance, as measured in centimeters, between the control ($M = 133.68, SD = 52.49$) and experimental groups ($M = 137.60, SD = 45.33; t(61) = -0.316, p = 0.753$, two-tailed). In order to explore potential effects of neophobia on chair distance, a hierarchical

regression analysis was performed. Food neophobia and general neophobia scores were entered in step one, explaining 6.1% of the variance in avoidance as measured by chair distance, $F(2, 59) = 1.91, p = 0.157$. Group number was entered in step two, providing a model which, as a whole, explained 6.3% of the variability, $F(3, 58) = 1.29, p = 0.286$. There was no main effect of the manipulation on avoidance as measured by chair distance, suggesting a rejection of hypothesis four.

Discussion

Overview

The current study aimed to explore attitudes and behavioral and emotional reactions of Swedish-speaking men towards transpeople. In the control group, the researcher wore typically masculine clothing and wore no makeup; in the experimental group, he wore typically feminine clothes and noticeable makeup. An Implicit Association Test (picture IAT) was developed for this study in order to measure implicit positive and negative associations with transpeople. In addition, participants answered demographic questions, the Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010) as well as the gender identity subscale of the Collective Self-esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Participants' explicit attitudes towards transpeople were also evaluated using the Genderism and Transphobia Scale. Participants were given cake and coffee during the experiment, and were asked to evaluate how well they liked the cake, supposedly in order to provide feedback to the bakery from which it came. However, this evaluation was actually a measure of the disgust reaction predicted as an effect of the experimental manipulation (the researcher's gender presentation). After each participant had left, the distance between the chairs in which the researcher and the participant had been sitting was measured, in order to test the hypothesis that participants in the experimental condition would sit farther away from the researcher than those in the control group.

Interpreting the Results

Implicit Association Test. The first hypothesis of this study was that the manipulation, the researcher's gender presentation, would have a significant impact on implicit attitude measures. The difference in mean scores between the two groups was very close to statistical significance. Regression analyses compensating for MRNI scores indicate that differences between groups were mediated by male role norm endorsement. In addition,

higher implicit negativity was significantly correlated with a stronger belief that transpeople have high status in Sweden and that the nature of transgenderism is more environmental than biological.

One of the most surprising findings regarding the IAT is the fact that 23 of 66 participants showed an implicit preference for transgender rather than gender normative men. Of those 23, only three identified themselves as transgender in any way. This means that 20 cisgender men showed implicit preference for people in their outgroup over people in their ingroup. Transpeople are largely invisible in society and have very low status, making the extent of the participants' positivity especially unexpected.

It makes good sense that men who subscribe more strongly to masculinity norms are more implicitly biased against transpeople, particularly the kind of transperson featured in the IAT: males with a feminine gender expression. The finding that a theory of biological rather than environmental origin of transgenderism correlates with more implicit positivity towards transpeople is consistent with previous findings in Swedish populations. However, it makes less intuitive sense that believing that transpeople have higher status should correlate positively with implicit transphobia, as it did in this study. The Stereotype Content Model (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) proposes that social groups who are stereotyped to have high status tend to be respected as competent. However, this finding could alternatively be interpreted to be more in line with cognitions encompassed in modern racism, particularly that people of color have "gone too far" in their quest for civil rights (Henry & Sears, 2002). Clearly, since people of color still suffer greatly from racism both on individual and structural levels, this attitude reflects not reality but the desire on the part of white people to keep people of color "in their place" and retain social power for themselves and their ingroup. One participant in the current study, who was particularly vocal about his opinions, perhaps best summed it up with this comment regarding the status of transpeople: "Well, it's a bit of both [high and low status], isn't it? Sometimes they boast, 'I am this and I am that and I'm so oppressed' and the rest of the time they're ashamed. They really ought to make up their minds." The same participant remarked that "Nowadays...everything is allowed" and noted that gender was a hot topic, "It's gender this and gender that...it gets to be so forced." I interpret this statement as reflecting a belief that transpeople are relatively free to live openly without fear of transphobia or gender bashing, a belief which is not rooted in reality. This mindset represents a great disconnect with the everyday discrimination faced by many transpeople, rather than the kind of respect afforded, for example, the rich (a social group with high status, stereotyped as competent). This participant seems to believe that

transpeople who speak up about injustice are "boasting" or possibly trying to get (undeserved) attention. If indeed the question about status included in this study is reflective of a kind of modern heteronormativity, then it is no surprise that it significantly correlates to higher implicit bias against transpeople.

Explicit attitude measure - Genderism and Transphobia Scale. Participants in the experimental group had significantly lower scores on explicit attitudes towards transpeople as measured by the Genderism and Transphobia Scale than participants in the control group; however, after accounting for male role norm endorsement, the manipulation had neither a main effect nor an interaction effect on GTS scores. This could be interpreted as indication of a rejection of hypothesis 2. Alternatively, GTS scores could be interpreted as having been affected by the manipulation via the mediating effect of male role norm endorsement. In other words, men in the control group may have felt less pressure to assert their masculinity in the presence of a gender normative man (the researcher), resulting in greater endorsement of masculinity norms and higher implicit and explicit negativity towards gender nonconforming men. Because male role norm endorsement was not measured prior to manipulation, it is impossible to know for certain whether MRNI scores function more as a dependent or independent variable in these analyses, a crucial element for a proper interpretation of the data.

Disgust measure. Despite participants in the experimental group scoring lower on both the implicit and explicit measures of negativity towards transpeople, the same participants liked the cake less than participants in the control group did, even after controlling for the effect of food neophobia. This finding supports the hypothesis that interacting with a transperson would elicit a disgust reaction (hypothesis 3). This effect is also in keeping with many of the transphobic remarks I have heard and have had directed at me. It may be that those men for whom masculinity is most important experience more contentment than men for whom masculinity is relatively unimportant – but only under certain circumstances. In circumstances which allow such a man to feel affirmed in their masculinity, their gender identity may act as a buffer to stress (Caswell, Bosson, Vandello, & Sellers, 2013). Under masculinity threat in the experimental group, however, it seems that strong male identification may have combined with post suppression rebound (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Jetten, 1994; Monteith, Spicer, and Tooman, 1998), in this case manifesting itself as disgust.

This finding lends support to the idea that transpeople may indeed occupy the

position of low warmth and low competence on the Stereotype Content Model (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) and/or be seen as norm violators with motives inconsistent with the dominant group (in this case, cismen) in keeping with Intergroup Emotions Theory (E. Smith, 1993).

Avoidance measure. In contrast to the study from which the author adapted this measure, in which participants seated themselves relative to the belongings of another (absent) participant, the author was both present in the room and had some degree of social clout in the role of researcher in this situation. These factors may have combined to make it less likely for participants to actively distance themselves from the researcher, although they may have done so under other circumstances, resulting in nonsignificant between-group differences in mean distance scores.

Limitations

Selection bias. One of the most significant limitations of this study is selection bias. Because the experiment was most often carried out in a university setting, students are overrepresented. Moreover, it seems unlikely that the men who participated are representative even of male students in general, for three reasons. First of all, I (the author) find approaching masculine men extraordinarily difficult in general, and it became even more difficult to do so in order to recruit them for this study, so men who were asked to participate were likely disproportionately less masculine than the average Swedish man. Secondly, because the people the author associates with tend to be extremely liberal compared to the average Swede, men who were recruited through acquaintances likely tended to share the same liberal values. Finally, it seemed that masculine presenting men who were approached were disproportionately unwilling to participate. These three factors, combined with the overrepresentation of students, make selection bias a serious threat to external validity; quite simply, participants in this study are likely far less transphobic than most Swedish men. This aspect of the participant population may help to explain the surprising amount of implicit positivity towards transpeople, as well as the fact that roughly half of participants reported personally knowing a transperson.

The method of randomization may also be a limitation to this study. Randomizing days instead of individual participants may have led to participants with similar characteristics being recruited into the same condition on a given experiment day. If this were the case, it may have limited within-group variability and inflated between-group variability.

Language. Language barriers may also have had some effect on the data.

While all participants were Swedish-speaking, not all were native speakers of Swedish. There were occasions on which the author was asked to explain certain terms to participants.

Variability in fluency may have especially impacted implicit attitude scores, in that IAT scores are based on reaction times and the sorting task is semantic in nature.

Intersectionality. In keeping with an intersectional perspective, it must also be noted that the various social positions which the researcher occupies, apart from gender presentation, also play a role in the participants' reactions during the experiment. The factors at play are nearly endless, and impossible to enumerate. Occupying the role of researcher in relation to an experiment participant is to occupy a power position, the significance of which must not be forgotten. Participants' perceptions of the author as warm or cold, smart or unintelligent, white or of color, may all have played a part in how the experimenter - participant interaction affected the data. Likewise, the author's nation of origin may have interacted with participants' attitudes towards foreigners or specifically towards Americans.

Environmental validity. The current study also has limited environmental validity. In the experimental situation, a transperson occupied a position of power in the role of experimenter relative to a participant who was (almost always) cis-gendered. The (almost always) cis-gendered man was alone in the room with the transgender researcher, but never in an isolated place. The particulars of this situation do not generalize to very many real life situations, especially those in which a transperson is most vulnerable. This study is not representative of situations that may occur, for example, on the street, where cispeople may be in groups; in situations where transgender people are met with transphobia and are isolated from others who might be able to help them; or in domestic settings where transpeople may be victimized by partners or family members.

Future Directions and Conclusion

This study is the first of its kind in several ways. Implicit attitudes towards transpeople have not been measured previously with the IAT. Neither has the Genderism and Transphobia Scale been used to assess explicit attitudes towards transpeople among males living in Sweden. Lastly, the methodologies used to measure disgust and avoidance are novel in connection with measures of transphobia. Now that a test measuring implicit attitudes towards transpeople has been created, and the hypothesis that contact with a transperson can elicit disgust and avoidance in men has been supported, many possibilities for future research

are opened.

One of the most interesting prospects for future research is an experiment designed to measure how male role norm endorsement interacts with contact with a transperson when men are in the presence of other gender-conforming men. Much of the anxiety produced by masculinity threat is contingent on the fear of losing social status as a man. Based on both theory and personal observations, men may experience more discomfort and anxiety when faced with a transperson in the company of other men, relative to when they are alone or with women.

While people perceived as gender-bending men are the target of much transphobia and gender bashing, people perceived as gender nonconforming women are certainly also targets of discrimination. It would be most enlightening to adapt the Implicit Association Test created for this study to measure women's attitudes towards masculine presenting females. Yet another variant might test how both men and women react to people whose physical sex cannot readily be identified. Personal experience says that this is perhaps one of the most dangerous positions to occupy as a gender bending person. While people may feel antipathy for masculine women and feminine man, they are still able to classify them. When people come into contact with someone whom they cannot identify as a man or a woman, strong feelings and reactions arise, including staring, laughter, rude comments, harassment and even violence. These extreme negative reactions to people with ambiguous sex have a drastic negative impact on the health and well-being of many intersex and transgender people. Given that transgender people are more at risk for harassment and violence than gays, lesbians and bisexuals, combined with the lack of research and statistics collected on transgender people relative to gays, lesbians and bisexuals, the need for further research on this topic is great.

In order to circumvent a confounding effect on attitudes of the transperson being in a position of power as the researcher, future experiments may do well to make use of a design which includes a transperson as a confederate. Evaluating potential participants' endorsement of male role norms prior to experiment would also be essential to similar studies in the future in order to control for the influence of manipulations. This would provide a clearer picture of the relationship between masculinity norms, exposure to transpeople and implicit and explicit transphobia.

Several of the constructs measured in this study have been correlated in previous research with physical phenomena. For example, the masculinity threat assumed to have occurred when participants high in sexual prejudice came into contact with the transgender

researcher produces changes in cortisol and testosterone levels in the body (Caswell, Bosson, Vandello, & Sellers, 2013). Disgust has been found to be processed differentially relative to other emotions in the prefrontal cortex (Harris & Fiske, 2007). Future studies including measures of neural activity and/or hormone levels could provide valuable additional information about the mechanisms at work in transphobia.

In conclusion, this study has contributed to the very limited social scientific knowledge about how men living in Sweden think, feel and act in relation to gender variant males. Transpeople are clearly vulnerable to prejudice and discrimination, even in Sweden where gender issues are at the forefront. This fact, combined with a severe lack of knowledge about the specifics of the kinds of adversity transpeople face in everyday life, makes the current study an excellent base upon which to build a better understanding of attitudes towards transpeople in Sweden.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba press.
- Amodio, D. & Devine, P. (2006). Stereotyping and evaluation in implicit race bias: Evidence for independent constructs and unique effects on behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(4), 652-661. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.4.652
- Aspling, F. & Djärv, C. (2013). *Hate crime 2012*. Retrieved December 19, 2013, from <http://www.bra.se/bra/bra-in-english/home/publications/archive/publications/2013-09-25-hate-crime-2012.html>
- Bastian, B. B. & Haslam, N. N. (2006). Psychological essentialism and stereotype endorsement. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *42*(2), 228-235. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.03.003
- Begreppslista [List of terms]. (n. d.). Retrieved January 5, 2014, from <http://www.rfsl.se/?p=410>
- Björklund, F. & Hursti, T. J. (2002). *A Swedish translation and validation of the disgust scale: an individual difference measure of disgust sensitivity / Fredrik Björklund, Timo J. Hursti*. Lund : Department of Psychology, Lund University [Psykologiska institutionen, Lunds universitet], 2002.
- Blackless, M., Charuvastra, A., Derryck, A., Fausto-Sterling, A., Lauzanne, K., & Lee, E. (2000). How sexually dimorphic are we? Review and synthesis. *American Journal of Human Biology*, *12*(2), 151-166.

- Blair, I. V. & Banaji, M. R. (1996). Automatic and Controlled Processes in Stereotype Priming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(6), 1142-1163
- Castano, E. & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2006). Not quite human: Infrahumanization in response to collective responsibility for intergroup killing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 804-818. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.804
- Caswell, T., Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., & Sellers, J. (2013). Testosterone and Men's Stress Responses to Gender Threats. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, doi:10.1037/a0031394
- Cohn, A. M., Seibert, L., & Zeichner, A. (2009). The role of restrictive emotionality, trait anger, and masculinity threat in men's perpetration of physical aggression. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 10(3), 218-224. doi:10.1037/a0015151
- Davies, M. (2004). Correlates of negative attitudes toward gay men: sexism, male role norms, and male sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 41(3), 259-266.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 62– 68
- Eriksson, K., & Lindholm, T. (2007). Making gender matter: The role of gender-based expectancies and gender identification on women's and men's math performance in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 329-338. doi: 10.1111/j. 1467-9459.2007.00588.x
- Falomir-Pichastor, J. & Mugny, G. (2009). "I'm not gay I'm a real man!": Heterosexual men's gender self-esteem and sexual prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(9), 1233-1243.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000). *Sexing the body : Gender politics and the construction of sexuality* / Anne Fausto-Sterling. New York : Basic Books, cop. 2000.

Ferguson, M. & Bargh, J. (2004). How social perception can automatically influence behavior. *Trends In Cognitive Sciences*, 8(1), 33-39.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878-902.
Doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878

Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (2008). *Social cognition: From brains to culture*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Frank, R.A., Reilley, S.P., Schroth, F.E., Werk, C.D., Wehner, B. (1997). Food neophobia reflects novelty seeking, not sensation seeking, or anxiety. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Ingestive Behavior, Baltimore, MD.

Gaertner, S. L. & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61 – 90). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles*, 57(1/2), 55-59. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9195-3

Grant, J. M., Mottet, L. A., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J.L., & Keisling, M. (2011). *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. Washington: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 74, 1464-1480.
- Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 197-216.
- Greenwald, A. G., Smith, C. T., Sriram, N., Bar-Anan, Y. and Nosek, B. A. (2009). Implicit race attitudes predicted vote in the 2008 U.S. presidential election. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 9: 241–253. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-2415.2009.01195.x
- Harris, L. T. & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Dehumanizing the lowest of the low: Neuroimaging responses to extreme out-groups. *Psychological Science (Wiley-Blackwell)*, 17(10), 847-853. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01793.x
- Harris, L. T. & Fiske, S. T. (2007). Social groups that elicit disgust are differentially processed in mPFC. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 2(1), 45-51. doi:10.1093/scan/nsl037
- Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrated review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)*, 10(3), 252-264. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4
- HBT-historia [LGBT history]. (n. d.). Retrieved January 8, 2014, from <http://www.rfsl.se/?p=413>
- Henry, P. & Sears, D. (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political Psychology*, 23(2), 253-283.

Hill, D. B. & Willoughby, B. L. B. (2005). The development and validation of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale. *Sex roles, 53*, 531 – 544.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven: CT: Yale University Press.

How common is intersex? (2008). Retrieved November 12, 2013, from <http://www.isna.org/faq/frequency>

Hursti, U. K. & Sjöden, P. O. (1997). Food and general neophobia and their relationship with self-reported food choice: Familial resemblance in Swedish families with children of ages 7-17 years. *Appetite, 29*(1), 89-103. doi:10.1006/appe.1997.0108

Höra hemma [Belonging]. (2006). Retrieved December 16, 2013, from http://www.rfsl.se/public/rfsl_horahemma_digital_lagre.pdf

Höra hemma: om transpersoner [Belonging: on transpeople]. (2005). Retrieved November 8, 2013, from http://www.rfsl.se/public/Horahemma_trans_2.pdf

Ignatavicius, S. (2013). Stress in female-identified transgender youth: A review of the literature on effects and interventions. *Journal of LGBT Youth, 10*(4), 267-286. doi:10.1080/19361653.2013.825196

Jellison, W.A., McConnell A.R., & Gabriel, S. (2004). Implicit and explicit measures of sexual orientation attitudes: Ingroup preferences and related behaviors and beliefs among gay and straight men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30* (5), pp. 629-642.

- Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2003). Effect of social category priming on personal attitudes. *Psychological Science (Wiley-Blackwell)*, *14*(4), 315-319.
doi:10.1111/1467-9280.14451
- Kawakami, K., Phillips, C. E., Steele, J. R., & Dovidio, J. F. (2007). (Close) distance makes the heart grow fonder: Improving implicit racial attitudes and interracial interactions through approach behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *92*(6), 957-971. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.957
- Klein, J. (2012). Gender is key to the bullying culture. Retrieved October 16, 2013, from <http://www.womensmediacenter.com/feature/entry/gender-is-key-to-the-bullying-culture>
- Landén, M., & Innala, S. (2000). Attitudes toward transsexualism in a Swedish national survey. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *29*(4), 375-388. doi:10.1023/A:1001970521182
- Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., & Rankin, T. J. (2013). Male Role Norms Inventory--Short Form (MRNI-SF): Development, confirmatory factor analytic investigation of structure, and measurement invariance across gender. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *60*(2), 228-238.
- Levant, R. F., Rankin, T. J., Williams, C. M., Hasan, N. T., & Smalley, K. (2010). Evaluation of the factor structure and construct validity of scores on the Male Role Norms Inventory—Revised (MRNI-R). *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, *11*(1), 25-37.
Doi:10.1037/a0017637
- Levin, S., Federico, C., Sidanius, J., & Rabinowitz, J. (2002). Social dominance orientation and intergroup bias: The legitimization of favoritism for high-status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*(2), 144-157.

- Lowery, B. S., Hardin, C. D., & Sinclair, S. (2001). Social influence effects on automatic racial prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(5), 842-855.
doi:10.1037//0022-3514.81.5.842
- Luhtanen, R. & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*(3), 302-318.
- Macrae, C., Milne, A., Bodenhausen, G., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(5), 808-817.
- McKenzie, M. (2013). 'Reverse-Racism.' Retrieved September 14, 2013, from <http://www.blackgirldangerous.org/2013/06/2013611qtpoc-chat-episode-1-reverse-racism/>
- Monteith, M. J., Spicer, C.V., & Tooman, G. D. (1998). Consequences of stereotype oppression: stereotypes on and not on the rebound. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*, 355 - 377.
- Morgan, J. (2013). GOP politician calls trans people 'disgusting freaks', should be put in 'camps'. Retrieved January 4, 2014, from <http://www.gaystarnews.com/article/gop-politician-calls-trans-people-disgusting-freaks-should-be-put-camps171013#sthash.Zp67WNR6.dpuf>
- NAACP. (2014). Criminal justice fact sheet. Retrieved December 8, 2013, from <http://www.naacp.org/pages/criminal-justice-fact-sheet>
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual : A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. New York: Maidenhead : Open University Press/McGrawHill

- Parrott, D. J. (2009). Aggression toward gay men as gender role enforcement: Effects of male role norms, sexual prejudice, and masculine gender roles stress. *Journal of Personality, 77*(4), 1137-1166. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00577.x
- Parrott, D. & Zeichner, A. (2008). Determinants of anger and physical aggression based on sexual orientation: An experimental examination of hypermasculinity and exposure to male gender role violations. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 37*(6), 891-901. doi:10.1007/s10508-007-9194-z
- Pliner, P. P. & Hobden, K. K. (1992). Development of a scale to measure the trait of food neophobia in humans. *Appetite, 19*(2), 105-120.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.
- Ritchey, P., Frank, R., Hursti, U., & Tuorila, H. (2003). Validation and cross-national comparison of the food neophobia scale (FNS) using confirmatory factor analysis. *Appetite, 40*(2), 163-173. doi:10.1016/S0195-6663(02)00134-4
- Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., & Hunter, J. (2008). Butch/femme differences in substance use and abuse among young lesbian and bisexual women: Examination and potential explanations. *Substance Use and Misuse, 43*(8/9), 1002-1015. doi:10.1080/10826080801914402
- Said on campus. (2008). Retrieved January 5, 2014, from <http://www.smcm.edu/rivergazette/archives/june08/saidoncampus.html>

- Sandfort, T. M., Melendez, R. M., & Diaz, R. M. (2007). Gender nonconformity, homophobia, and mental distress in Latino gay and bisexual men. *Journal of Sex Research, 44*(2), 181-189.
- Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 297-315). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Stotzer, R. & Shih, M. (2012). The relationship between masculinity and sexual prejudice in factors associated with violence against gay men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 13*(2), 136-142. doi:10.1037/a0023991
- Sweden ends forced sterilization of transgender people. (2013). Retrieved January 12, 2014, from <http://thinkprogress.org/lgbt/2013/01/11/1434121/sweden-ends-forced-sterilization-of-transgender-people/?mobile=nc>
- Transgender people in Sweden no longer face forced sterilization. (2013). Retrieved January 12, 2014, from <http://newsfeed.time.com/2013/01/14/transgender-people-in-sweden-no-longer-face-forced-sterilization/>
- Tropp, L. R. & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005a). Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1145 - 1158.
- Tuorila, H., Meiselman, H., Bell, R., Cardello, A. V., & Johnson, W. (1994). Role of sensory and cognitive information in the enhancement of certainty and liking for novel and familiar foods. *Appetite, 23*, 231-246

Turner, M. (2012). Transphobia (in Movies that you probably like!). Retrieved January 4, 2014, from <http://maddietampa.tumblr.com/post/32004797962/transphobia-in-movies-that-you-probably-like>

Uhlmann, E., Poehlman, T., & Nosek, B. A. (2012). *Automatic Associations: Personal Attitudes or Cultural Knowledge?* Oxford University Press.
doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199737512.003.0009

United Nations Development Programme (2013). *Summary, Human Development Report 2013: The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World*. Retrieved March 3, 2013, from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2013_en_summary.pdf

van Knippenberg, A., Dijksterhuis, A., & Vermeulen, D. (1999). Judgement and memory of a criminal act: The effects of stereotypes and cognitive load. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(2/3), 191-201.

Vorauer, J. (2012). Completing the implicit association test reduces positive intergroup interaction behavior. *Psychological Science*, 23(10), 1168-1175.

What's wrong with the way intersex has traditionally been treated? (2008). Retrieved January 5, 2014, from <http://www.isna.org/faq/concealment>

Willoughby, B. B., Hill, D. B., Gonzalez, C. A., Lacorazza, A., Macapagal, R. A., Barton, M. E., & Doty, N. D. (2010). Who hates gender outlaws? A multisite and multinational evaluation of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 12(4), 254-271. doi:10.1080/15532739.2010.550821

Appendix A

Illustration of researcher's gender presentations in control and experimental groups.



Illustration of researcher's gender presentation in control group.



Illustration of researcher's gender presentation in experimental group.

Appendix B

Example items from each of the seven subscales of the Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form:

Factor

Example item

Restrictive emotionality (RE): Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations.

Self-reliance through mechanical skills (SR): Men should have home improvement skills.

Negativity towards sexual minorities (NT): Homosexuals should never marry.

Avoidance of femininity (AF): Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls.

Importance of sex (IS): A man should not turn down sex.

Dominance (Do): A man should always be the boss.

Toughness (T): It is important for a man to take risks, even if he might get hurt.