



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

**Gender Differences in Attitudes Towards Feminism: A Study Using the Social Roles
Questionnaire**

Anonymous Submission

University of Wales Trinity Saint David

IUPS5006: Social Psychology: Global Perspectives

Dr Judith Marshall

11 September, 2026

AI Acknowledgement

I acknowledge the use of ChatGPT [<https://chatgpt.com/>] on 11/9/2026 to Structure. I used the prompt(s):

1. im writing a 2k APA psychology research report on different genders attitudes towards feminism. don't write any sentences or paragraphs for me. i need to write it myself. give me:

- section headings
- bullet point list of what content/points i need to cover based on study design attached
- ~word count target per section
- which of my results/statistics belong in which section

don't draft any actual prose. just skeleton and the list of points i need to write about

I confirm that I have not presented any AI generated text as my own work. I confirm I have copies of my drafts, notes, and other resources I used before, and after the use of AI tools which I may be asked to provide in evidence.

1.0 Introduction

Feminism means different things to different people. Attitudes towards it split fairly predictably with location and culture in mind along the demographic lines. Gender being one of the most commonly cited (Rotaecche et al., 2022). Attitudes towards feminism shape things like how people vote on policy, how they behave in public and how they raise their children. Hence, understanding who holds which views and why has practical value.

A few studies point in a similar direction. Rotaecche et al. (2022) found that feminism is understood differently depending on group membership, using education and occupation as a case study. Leon and Aizpurua (2023) linked stronger gender role stereotyping in young people to weaker support for feminism and to greater tolerance of gender based violence. Russell et al. (2024) went further and identified gender itself as one of the strongest predictors of liberal feminist ideology. It was observed that women would consistently score higher than men. Taken together, these studies suggested a reasonably confident prediction going into this project: women should score higher than men on a validated measure of attitudes towards gender roles.

That prediction is not universal in the literature though and effect sizes vary a lot depending on the population and the measure used. That inconsistency is part of why this study used a validated, published instrument which is the 13 item Social Roles Questionnaire from Baber and Tucker (2006). So, rather than a set of researcher written questions that wouldn't be standardized, our research team picked this as the method instead. With this in mind, the comparison would be measuring something with an established evidence base rather than something invented for this project alone.

The research question is “How much do men and women differ in their attitudes towards feminism?” Based on the literature above and current climate attitudes toward gender equality, the team's working hypothesis (H1) was that women would score significantly higher than men on the SRQ. The null hypothesis on the other hand is that no difference would exist. This was tested using a two-tailed independent samples t-test.

2.0 Method

2.1 Design

This study used a between-groups, correlational-comparative design suited for an anonymous, one-off online survey. The independent variable was participant gender (male or female), and the dependent variable was attitude towards social roles and feminism, operationalised as a total score on the SRQ. A between-groups design was selected over repeated-measures because it allowed data to be collected anonymously in a single setting. This removed the need to track individual participants over time and so reduced participant burden.

2.2 Participants

Participants were recruited through convenience sampling. This was done primarily via online distribution of the Qualtrics survey link. After removing incomplete responses, preview/test entries, and one response with an invalid gender entry, the final sample consisted of 36 adults aged 18-30 (21 men, 21 women originally targeted at 15 each. The achieved sample was 21 men and 15 women). Participants were grouped into three age bands (18-22, 23-26, 27-30) reflecting Generation Z as defined by McCrindle (2021). This was chosen to reduce the confounding influence of generational or cohort-related attitude differences. All participants were required to be over 18 years of age and to provide informed consent before taking part in the survey.

2.3 Materials

Attitudes were measured using the 13-item Social Roles Questionnaire (SRQ) by Baber and Tucker (2006). This questionnaire is a validated instrument designed to assess beliefs about gender-appropriate roles and behaviour. Each item (e.g. “People should be treated the same regardless of their sex”) was rated on a 11-point sliding scale from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree). Five items were worded in an unbiased, egalitarian direction and scored directly. 8 items were worded in a traditional direction and were reverse scored (10 minus off the raw response) prior to the analysis. This is so that higher total scores consistently reflected more egalitarian, feminist consistent attitudes. Total scores could then range from 0 to 130. The survey also collected participants’ age band and gender for descriptive and grouping purposes.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

As this was the research team's first experience of conducting inferential statistical analysis, the decision to run a single independent samples t-test on participants total SRQ score, rather than analysing individual items separately or adopting a multivariate approach, was reached partly through direct consultation with the module lecturer and partly by examining how comparable published studies using validated attitude scales typically structure and report this kind of group comparison. The consultation confirmed two points that shaped the first analysis. First, the comparison of interest was total SRQ score by gender, calculated by summing all 13 reverse scored and directly scored items, rather than a separate comparison for each individual item. Second, all collected responses were required to be retained in the analysis, Scores of 0 and 10, although usually extreme, were confirmed to reflect genuine participant responses rather than data entry errors. Therefore, they weren't treated as outliers or removed prior to analysis.

2.5 Procedure

The study was hosted entirely online using Qualtrics. Participants first read an information sheet and were asked to confirm informed consent, including confirmation that they were 18 or over in age, understood their right to withdraw, and agreed that anonymised data could be used in aggregated form in future reports. Participants then provided basic demographic information (age band, gender) before completing the 13 item SRQ. Upon completion, participants were presented with a debrief sheet explaining the purpose of the study and thanking them for their participation. No deception was used and no other measures beyond those described were administered.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

The compiled ethics form was sent to academic supervisor Dr Judith Marshall and approved prior to data collection. Participation was voluntary and participants could withdraw at any point during the survey without penalty by closing their browser. Data was anonymised automatically upon submission, withdrawal wasn't possible after this point. Participants were informed of this in the consent information page. No identifying information was collected.

3.0 Results

3.1 Data cleaning summary

Data was cleaned prior to analysis by removing incomplete responses, survey preview/test entries generated during questionnaire development and one response containing an invalid gender code. This left a final analytic sample of $N = 36$ (21 men, 15 women). SRQ item scores were reverse coded where appropriate and summed to produce a total SRQ score for each participant. Higher scores indicated more egalitarian attitudes towards gender and social roles.

Descriptive statistics for each group are presented in Table 1. Women ($M = 88.60$, $SD = 12.79$) scored marginally higher on average than men ($M = 85.43$, $SD = 21.59$). This indicates slightly more egalitarian attitudes. Although the standard deviation for men was noticeably larger, reflecting more variable responses within that group.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for SRQ total score by gender

Group	n	M	SD	Min	Max
Female	15	88.60	12.79	69	112
Male	21	85.43	21.59	33	120

Before conducting the main analysis, the assumptions of the independent samples t-test were checked. A Shapiro-Wilk test on the model residuals indicated no significant deviation from normality ($W = 0.9811$, $p = .783$). A Brown-Forsythe test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met $F(1, 34) = 1.854$, $p = .182$. As both assumptions were satisfied, a standard independent samples t-test with equal variances assumed was used.

Table 2. Assumption checks*Test of Normality (Shapiro-Wilk)*

Residuals	W	p
SRQ total	0.9811	.783

Note. Significant results suggest a deviation from normality.

Test of Equality of Variances (Brown-Forsythe)

	F	df ₁	df ₂	p
SRQ total	1.854	1	34	.182

The independent samples t-test revealed no statistically significant difference between women's and men's SRQ scores, $t(34) = 0.508$, $p = .615$. The effect size was small, Cohen's $d = 0.172$, $SE = 0.340$, indicating that gender accounted for very little of the variance in attitudes towards feminism in this sample. The null hypothesis was therefore retained. There was no evidence of a statistically significant difference in attitudes towards feminism between men and women in this sample (Humphrey et al., 2021).

Table 3. Independent-samples t-test result*Independent Samples T-Test*

	t	df	p	Cohen's d	SE Cohen's d
SRQ total	0.5076	34	.615	0.1716	0.3395

Note. Student's t-test.

4.0 Discussion

Going into this study, we expected women's SRQ scores to be meaningfully higher than men's. That was the whole basis for the hypothesis and it is the most of the literature we read pointed towards. What we got instead was two almost identical group means and a non-significant result which wasn't what we predicted and took some working through to make sense of.

One question we had while looking at the data was whether the SRQ items were capturing what we wanted them to. Some items are worded indirectly where it is disagreeing

with a traditional sounding statement and doesn't necessarily mean someone actively holds a feminist position, only that they don't endorse that particular framing. A participant could score in the egalitarian direction on several items simply because the statement felt outdated without having consciously thought about gender equality at all. If that is happening across both groups, it would compress the gap between men and women regardless of any underlying difference.

We also noticed a large number of responses clustered at the extremes of the scale with a lot of 0s and 10s rather than scores spread across the middle. Initially, we wondered whether this meant the test simply wasn't picking up a real difference but despite that, we believe these were genuine responses and the normality and variance checks both came back fine. So the results stand as a genuine non-significant finding rather than an error in scoring, though it is worth noting that our lecturer also found it strange and the extreme response pattern is still worth flagging.

Beyond this, we also considered whether the results reflect something about the sample's cultural context. Participants were recruited primarily from Malaysia where Islamic (Sharia) law governs family and personal matters for the Muslim population, and where prevailing religious and societal expectations continue to position women primarily within familial roles emphasising motherhood, domestic responsibility and deference to the male head of the household (Vandello, 2016). Within that context, agreeing with an egalitarian sounding statement may not reflect a real rejection of traditional gender roles so much as a lack of exposure to any alternative framing. Daughters raised watching mothers occupy loyal, subordinate positions within the family may simply see this as normal rather than as something unequal. If this dynamic was present in our sample (which it very arguably is as our sample primarily consists of UMWales faculty which is made up majorly of Muslim students), it could compress differences between men's and women's scores without reflecting any real closing of the attitudinal gap. It is also worth naming directly that the literature our hypothesis was based on, Rotaecche et al. (2022) and Leon & Aizpurua (2023), were both conducted in Spain and Russell et al. (2024) in the United States. Both come entirely from WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialised, Rich, and Democratic) populations. Henrich et al. (2010) showed that findings from WEIRD samples dominate psychology's evidence base and often don't generalise to the rest of the world. Gender role

attitudes are exactly the kind of construct likely to be shaped by culture rather than reflecting on a psychological universal. Our hypothesis that women would score higher than men was therefore built on research drawn from a fairly narrow slice of the world's population. Applying it directly to a Malaysian sample may have been optimistic from the outset itself and independent of anything about how we ran the study. Framed this way, the non-significant result may be closer to the evidence that the pattern itself doesn't travel well outside the WEIRD contexts it was originally observed in.

This lines up with research on collectivistic societies where group harmony and family loyalty are prioritized over individual self-expression and where general social awareness doesn't reliably translate into support for gender equality. In some cases, it entrenches patriarchal attitudes further rather than eroding them (Dutta et al., 2021). Malaysia often is described as collectivistic in this sense which could mean both men and women in our sample were socialised towards broadly similar endorsement of traditional roles.

A further limitation is the SRQ's binary framing of gender. One response in our raw dataset identified outside the male/female binary and couldn't be included in the group comparison as design, so it was excluded from the final analysis. I want to be upfront that this was a group decision I didn't fully agree with at the time as I would have preferred to find a way to retain that response even if only descriptively rather than drop it for the sake of a cleaner two-group comparison. My groupmates were right that including a single non-binary response wouldn't have been statistically meaningful on its own and keeping the design simple was a reasonable call. But it sits uncomfortably alongside a study about attitudes towards feminism specifically given that gender equality as a concept has increasingly moved beyond strict male/female binary. Excluding genders outside that binary risks reproducing the same narrow framing that feminist theory has spent decades trying to move past. A larger scale version of this study should treat non-binary and other gender identities as a genuine group of interest rather than a case to be excluded. Both to reflect the population more accurately and because leaving them out feels like it works against the spirit of what the research is about.

5.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study did not find a significant difference between men's and women's attitudes towards feminism as measured by the SRQ, contrary to what we expected going in and to the broader pattern in the literature. We think this is worth taking seriously rather than dismissing as a data quirk. It is genuinely unclear from this study alone whether it reflects a real cultural pattern. Whether it is collectivistic, religiously influenced social contexts narrowing measured attitude gaps without narrowing actual inequality or simply a small, imperfect sample. Future research with a larger sample and direct measures of religiosity and collectivism could help tell these explanations apart.

References

- Baber, K. M., & Tucker, C. J. (2006). The social roles questionnaire: A new approach to measuring attitudes toward gender. *Sex Roles*, 54(7–8), 459–467.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9018-y>
- Dutta, N., Giddings, L., & Sobel, R. S. (2021). Does trust always help gender role attitudes? The role of individualism and collectivism. *Social Indicators Research*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-021-02755-y>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x0999152x>
- Humphrey, K. L., Walker, R., & Prince, E. N. (2021). *Running and interpreting an independent samples t test in JASP*. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. Exploring Diversity with Statistics Using JASP: Step-by-Step Guides.
<https://utc.pressbooks.pub/step-by-step-JASP-guides/chapter/chapter-1/>
- Leon, C. M., & Aizpurua, E. (2023). Do youth dream of gender stereotypes? The relationship among gender stereotyping, support for feminism, and acceptance of gender-based violence. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 2439. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20032439>
- McCrindle, M. (2021, October 15). *The generations defined*. Mccrindle.
<https://mccrindle.com.au/article/topic/demographics/the-generations-defined/>
- Rotaeche, P. F., Mondragon, N. I., & Albóniga-Mayor, J. J. (2022). Comparing social representations of feminism among education and engineering majors: Insights for

developing feminist pedagogies. *Feminism & Psychology*, 095935352211261.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/09593535221126101>

Russell, B., Oswald, D., & Cotter, M. (2024). What makes a liberal feminist? Identifying predictors of heterosexual women and men's liberal feminist ideology. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12383>

Vandello, J. (2016). Do we need a psychology of women in the Islamic world? *Sex Roles*, 75(11–12), 623–629. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0691-1>