

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

Gendered Perceptions of Reproductive Justice Advocacy:
A Gen Z Perspective

CORRINNE CHASE
SPRING 2025

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Psychology and Statistics
with honors in Psychology

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Jes Matsick
Associate Professor of Psychology & Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
Thesis Supervisor

Sean Laurent
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Thesis Honors Adviser

* Electronic approvals are on file.

ABSTRACT

Reproductive Justice (RJ) is an intersectional framework and social movement created by women of color (SisterSong, 1997) to address social issues that impact reproductive freedom, even when protective legislation for abortion is in place. For example, factors like socioeconomic injustice, the prison industrial complex, and food insecurity disproportionately affect communities of color. RJ advocacy is imperative to providing all people with reproductive freedom, not just those whose biggest obstacle is legal abortion access. The current study aims to determine ways to combat stigma surrounding RJ by investigating perceptions of RJ advocates as a function of advocate gender. Using a mixed-methods survey, we asked Gen-Z participants ($N=156$) to rate the perceived femininity, masculinity, likeability, and confrontationality of an advocate from one of our four experimental conditions (2(Gender: Man/Woman) $\times$ 2(Advocacy Viewpoint: Pro/Anti RJ) between-subjects factorial design), in addition to rating the perceived masculinity and femininity of RJ advocacy actions (e.g., posting on TikTok, attending demonstrations). Results suggest that RJ advocates were seen as more likeable and more feminine across genders than their anti-rights counterparts. They also suggest that some advocacy actions were perceived as highly feminine by participants, while others were perceived as highly masculine. Future research will examine how gender may interact with specific advocacy action types and how metastereotypes, that advocates may develop based on these gendered action assumptions, might alter their advocacy behaviors. This research is essential to creating a more inclusive, diverse, and productive RJ.

Keywords: reproductive justice, advocacy, stigma, gender

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Reproductive Justice	1
Who is Advocating for Reproductive Justice?	3
Generation Z	4
Perceptions of Advocacy	4
Abortion Stigma.....	7
Reproductive Justice in Psychology	9
The Current Research	11
Chapter 2 Methods.....	12
Participants	12
Design and Procedure	13
Measures	14
Chapter 3 Results	17
Effects of Advocate’s Gender and Advocate Viewpoint on Ratings of the Advocate.....	17
Rating of Advocacy Behaviors	19
Qualitative Insights	22
Chapter 4 General Discussion.....	24
Limitations and Future Directions	26
Chapter 5 Conclusion.....	28
Appendix Vignettes	29
Bibliography	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. <i>Means (standard deviations) of rating social advocacy actions as masculine, feminine, and confrontational.</i>	21
--	----

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking Dr. Jes Matsick for her unwavering support and mentorship throughout my undergraduate career at Penn State. When I enrolled in her WMST 100 class freshman year, I was completely unaware that the ideas she was about to teach me would change my career aspirations entirely. I have cherished the three years I have gotten to work in her lab, building an invaluable foundation of knowledge that I will take with me in my future research endeavors. I am extremely grateful for all that she has taught me, and that despite balancing a new baby and a sabbatical, she dedicated her time to be the advisor for this thesis. I also want to thank Emerson Todd, who has also served as a vital mentor for this project. Not only was Emerson always there to support me with survey design, data analysis, and writing, they also always provided necessary comradery and comedic relief throughout the tough process of completing this project. I look forward to working with them as a colleague in the future. Finally, I would like to thank everyone else (my professors, my advisors, my family, and my friends) for their academic and personal support in the first chapter of hopefully a long career of research ahead of me. This truly would not have been possible without you

Chapter 1

Introduction

Reproductive Justice

After the overturning of Roe vs Wade, abortion access has become a hot topic. Scholars noted that this change will disproportionately affect black and poor women (Coen-Sanchez, 2022). Choice activists, those whose efforts focus on legalizing abortion to provide women with the right to choose to reproduce or not, have done little to address this imbalance, which created a necessity for reproductive justice (RJ) activists to focus specifically on the historical racialization of reproduction. Media has also used the term reproductive justice interchangeably with pro-choice activism. It does not tend to credit women of color in coining the term and tends to eliminate the important historical contexts of white supremacy in its development. A singular focus on white women does not represent the RJ movement, and thus for the purposes of discussing RJ accurately, it must be defined.

Although the pro-choice and pro-life movements have opposing viewpoints, research has shown that they share an ideology rooted in using stereotypes to control the reproduction of women of color. The pro-choice movement, although based on free will ideology, was built on eugenics. It advocates for access to abortion and other forms of birth control but has historically used these reproductive control methods to contribute to the eugenics movement. Morison (2021) explored coercive techniques, such as financial incentives that medical professionals targeted specifically at women of color to motivate them to try new, experimental forms of long-

term birth control. For example, one such practice included government subsidizing for the implantation of a birth control device, but no such funding for removal, forcing women to leave the device until they were financially able to pay for the expensive removal procedure (Price, 2020). Alternatively, the pro-life movement centers around the protection of unborn children, advocating that life starts at conception. They use this sacred value of life to argue for criminalized abortion. Despite this diametric opposition to the pro-choice movement, the pro-life movement also utilizes racist stereotypes of women of color to further their agenda. Since women of color seek abortions at higher rates than white women, the movement has previously run campaigns labeling black women as the perpetrators of genocide against people of color in America (Davidson, 2018). This rhetoric villainizes women of color for choosing not to reproduce, burdening them with the responsibility of repopulating the race. It also frames the reproduction of women of color again as something to be manipulated by others.

Because of a lack of representation and consideration of black women by the reproductive rights movement, RJ was created. It was coined by The Women of African Descent for Reproductive Justice in Chicago at the Illinois Pro-Choice Alliance in 1994 in Chicago, based on an intersectional framework created by the Combahee River Collective, a group of black women, some involved in the pro-choice movement of 1994, to bridge the gap between reproductive health and racial justice (Ross, 2017). Its framework defines reproductive freedom by three basic rights: the right to have children, the right to not have children, and the right to parent children in a safe environment.

Previous literature presents RJ as a movement focused less on the legislation regarding abortion access, but instead on social factors involved in limiting the reproductive abilities of

women. Morison (2021) frames it as women not living in a vacuum. Unlike the pro-life or pro-choice movements, the RJ movement recognizes that just a change in abortion legislation will not expand the reproductive freedom of most women. It suggests that factors such as poverty, food deserts, environmental impacts, language barriers, health insurance, and other issues plaguing communities are the main factors limiting women from the freedom of birthing and raising children in a safe environment.

In addition to considering a multitude of factors, RJ utilizes an intersectional approach. Intersectionality, a term coined by Kimberly Crenshaw, is defined as the overlapping of minority identities to create unique experiences of oppression (Ross, 2017). RJ takes an intersectional approach because it considers how race interacts with oppression due to gender. An intersectional approach to reproductive health care also considers the unique reproductive experiences of transgender and intersex people. As we continue to see medicalized versus humanized approaches to childbirth, people of color disproportionately affected by inequalities in reproductive health care, and increasing maternal mortality, RJ frameworks are increasingly important (Zucker, 2014). Without considering a multitude of intersecting perspectives, in the sense of restricted access to resources and legal reproductive rights, posed solutions risk only benefiting the privileged majority of women.

Who is Advocating for Reproductive Justice?

Little to no research has been done to document the demographic differences between RJ advocates as compared to advocates for other issues. We know that Sister Song, the organization where RJ was first promoted, still consists of mostly women of color. Because our sample

consists of Pennsylvania State undergraduate students, we can reference the demographic distribution of on campus clubs centered around RJ advocacy. One such club, the Penn State Reproductive Justice Project (PSRJP), consists of 5.56% men and 94.44% women. This suggests that at Penn State, and possibly other universities, the majority of RJ advocacy work is done by women. Although we know these things, additional research must be done to make any broader generalizations about the actual proportion of RJ advocates that are women.

Generation Z

Members of Generation Z (Gen Z) are those born between 1997 and 2012 (Dimok). As all generational cohorts have some defining similarities in experiences and views, categorization into Gen Z, as opposed to another generation, is synonymous with an increased exposure to technology and a unique interest in activism. Research has found that 32% of Gen Zer's regularly engage in activism/advocacy compared to 24% of millennials (United Way NCA, 2024).

Perceptions of Advocacy

Previous literature has explored perceptions and motivations of advocates more broadly. Perception is important because, according to self perception enhancement theory, we know people want to be perceived in a positive light (Pfeffer & Fong, 2005). This suggests that people will avoid behaviors that they believe will result in them being perceived negatively. Because of this, we believe how people think they will be perceived informs the ways in which they choose to advocate or if they choose to advocate at all. Previous research also suggests that weak gender

identification may also be predictive of pro-choice activism across genders (Drażkowski et al., 2024). If gendered assumptions are made about advocates based on what they are advocating for and how they are advocating, it would make sense that those who feel more indifferent about how their gender is perceived by others may be more likely to participate in advocacy.

Additionally, research also shows that women who had a positive view about their gender were more likely to advocate for pro-choice, while men who had a negative view about their gender were more likely to advocate for pro-choice (Drażkowski et al., 2024). Although the reproductive rights movement does not align completely with RJ, it is fair to assume that these results would generalize to RJ advocates as well. These are important insights in understanding when and why marginalized folks choose to advocate for themselves and when and why allies choose to advocate for others.

The participation of advantaged group members in advocacy targeting disadvantaged group members can be beneficial. Rasinski and Czopp (2010) found that disadvantaged group members that confronted a target about discriminatory behavior were seen less favorably by bystanders than advantaged group members who stood up for another group. This supports the idea that disadvantaged group advocates may be seen as complainers, aggressive, and serving their own interests. There is not enough research to provide significant evidence that a halo effect exists in all advocacy contexts, meaning it is still unclear if advocates who do not have a direct stake in their cause are always seen more favorably than those who are advocating for something that personally affects them (Palmer, 2022). The possible existence of a halo effect could be a potential motivation for outgroup members choosing to advocate, but also may deter ingroup members from getting involved.

Although allyship within social justice movements is important, it is more harmful when it serves as a source of decentering of disadvantaged group member's voices or when disadvantaged group member's advocacy efforts are seen more negatively than advantaged group members (Palmer, 2022; Iyer & Achia, 2020). Disadvantaged group members tend to feel less trust and are more critical towards advantaged group members especially when these advocates seem to be acting on self interest and when they feel like they are high in influence within the social movement (Macomber, 2018; Wiley & Dunne, 2019). Studies show that advantaged group members may have more trouble detecting and assessing the severity of cases of discrimination than disadvantaged group members who are experiencing injustice themselves. Allyship of advantaged group members becomes more beneficial when advocates face their own privilege, their role in the oppression of others, and their endorsement of legitimizing beliefs, which can help them better identify inequalities (Drury & Kaiser, 2014). Additional research suggests that when male leaders confront sexism publically, they are seen less favorably than female leaders (Gervais & Hillard, 2014). This may serve as both an example of how disadvantaged group members advocating for themselves may be seen more negatively in social movements and may provide evidence for how gender roles play a part in people's perceptions of advocates.

Previous research also suggests that gender presentation may serve as an important factor in who, if, and how someone advocates. Swim and colleagues (2019) suggest that perceptions of environmental activists depend on if an advocate's actions are seen as masculine or feminine. Advocates who advocated in a way that was expected based on their gender identity were perceived more positively. Men who did not were seen as feminine, and women who did not were seen as masculine. This resulted in more negative attitudes toward these advocates.

Research on masculinity threat has shown that men who are told they are feminine experience shame, anger, and participate in compensatory behaviors to reinstate their precarious masculinity (Vescio et al., 2023). This could serve as an explanation for the lack of men in RJ advocacy because of the gendered nature of the issue.

Abortion Stigma

Although RJ encompasses much more than abortion, when considering perceptions of RJ advocates, abortion as a globally controversial issue within the tenets of RJ, must be considered. Little is known about the perceptions of RJ specifically, but much is known about the perceptions of abortion as a medical practice. Because RJ encapsulates abortion, it is fair to assume that stigma related to abortion will likely be correlated with stigma related to RJ.

About one in four women in the US has had an abortion before the age of 45, so why, if the procedure is fairly common, is there still a large-scale stigma surrounding it (Mollen et al., 2018)? Backer and colleagues (2023) found that eighty percent of participants in their sample felt that someone who had received an abortion should face consequences, including but not limited to fines, forced religious education, forced sterilization, and incarceration. Abortion stigma can be credited to social norms including gender roles, sexuality norms, religious doctrines, and the law. These things are socially constructed, and thus although abortion is a global and historically used practice, stigma surrounding it can vary greatly depending on the views of the country and community someone is a part of (Marecek et al., 2017). For example, a culture that highly values women who are nurturing may see someone who gets an abortion negatively due to a possible violation of this expectation. Additionally, in countries that have legal restrictions on abortion,

people might make assumptions about the amorality of abortion from the legislative guidelines in place. Kumar (2018) suggests that stigma towards abortion is related to feelings of disgust, specifically sociomoral disgust, and that these feelings could be related to these social norm violations or general disgust with bodily processes like menstruation and birth. Rhetoric and false messaging about fetal pain, fetal mutilation, do-it-yourself abortions, and dangerous medication abortion procedures all produce negative emotional responses. In research on misinformation related to abortion stigma, Mollen and colleagues (2018) found a moderate relationship between accurate knowledge about abortion and pro-choice attitudes, which corroborated previous findings of this pattern in the public. This further highlights the use of misinformation to generate abortion stigma.

Additional research on social norm violations related to abortion has found that abortion stigma is an effective tool in dehumanizing people, woman or not, who have had an abortion to become simply a violation of the expectations of womanhood (Dyer et al., 2023). Dyer and colleagues (2023) suggest that anti abortion stigma can be used in tandem with objectifying and benevolent rhetoric that pregnant people are in need of protection from dangerous procedures that they don't fully understand the physical and psychological effects of. She credits this interplay to ambivalent sexism, in that it utilizes both hostile and benevolent sexism to control the reproductive decision making of others. Nolen and colleagues (2024) corroborate the idea that lack of access to legal abortion results in young women feeling objectified, dehumanized, and generally unsafe in their bodies.

Abortion stigma is relevant in studying perceptions of RJ advocates because we are interested in how the stigma of getting or providing an abortion might be similar to the stigma

related to advocating for RJ, which includes advocating for abortion access. If advocates do in fact adopt the stigma associated with the group they are advocating for, this would be an important finding in trying to determine barriers to people advocating for RJ, as they might not want to experience stigma associated with abortion.

Reproductive Justice in Psychology

Compared to other social sciences, the field of psychology has been slow to utilize the RJ framework in empirical research in replacement of conventional positivism and westernized thinking (Eaton & Stephens, 2020). Morison (2023) suggests that a RJ framework should be applied to psychological research, and explains that social psychologists are uniquely qualified to provide insight because they are trained in intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships. Social psychologists could apply this expertise in studying the multidimensional systems of power that affect the reproductive freedom of women of color. The RJ framework should be applied to other branches of psychology as well, including clinical psychology. Clinical psychologists should understand the overlapping systems of oppression that lead to negative mental health outcomes for targeted groups (Grzanka & Frantell, 2017). Experiences like abortion or carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term can also result in negative mental health outcomes with vastly varying severity depending on a plethora of intersecting factors like: religious affiliation, stigma within the community, age (Major et al., 2009). Utilizing a RJ framework clinical psychologists should prepare themselves to navigate this.

Although ways to incorporate the RJ framework have been suggested, little to no psychological, empirical research has adopted the methodology. To create scholarship that falls

under the RJ framework, researchers must center black women's needs and seek to disrupt systems of white supremacy in reproductive health care and beyond, as opposed to strengthening narratives used for dehumanization. RJ scholarship should also challenge postpositivist notions of how researchers' bias may invalidate their work (Avery & Stanton, 2020). Without utilizing theories that address intersectionality, instead of feminist or critical race theories that are less centered in identity interaction, current movements for reproductive freedom will only benefit privileged women, and psychological science will do little to challenge this status quo (Eaton & Stephens, 2020).

Across all reproductive movements, advocates share a value for human life. Even more specifically, both the pro-choice and RJ movements focus on protecting the lives and autonomy of women. When it comes to determining the best method to protect human life and autonomy, movements diverge. Likely the most beneficial approach includes the collaboration of movements that share a common goal, as to keep all perspectives considered in the allocation of resources. The goal of this research is to identify barriers that may keep people interested in social issues from advocating. We seek to determine the differences between attitudes towards male and female RJ advocates in general and establish how feminine or masculine specific advocacy actions in the realm of RJ are perceived. This research is important in identifying steps in creating a joint effort towards reproductive liberation.

The Current Research

In the current research, we conducted an online experiment with Gen-Z participants to examine how women and men who advocate for RJ or take an anti-RJ position are perceived by their peers. Based on previous research, we hypothesize that RJ advocates will be perceived as more feminine than anti-RJ advocates. We also hypothesize that men advocating for RJ will be seen as more likeable than women advocating for RJ due to a halo effect. We also used this study to explore how Gen-Z people initially feel about social advocates based on gender and advocacy viewpoint (in an open-ended prompt) and to explore how Gen-Z participants perceive various social advocacy behaviors— from posting on social media to donating money— as representing feminine, masculine, and confrontational behavior.

Chapter 2

Methods

This research was reviewed by Penn State's Institutional Review Board and determined to be exempt from oversight.

Participants

We collected data from Penn State students who were recruited through the SONA Psychology subject pool and compensated with course credit for participation in a 30-minute study. The initial sample comprised 277 participants. Ninety-two participants were assigned to a control condition; however, because of a technical issue with the presentation of the control condition vignette, their data was not usable. We also excluded 92 participants, 4 for indicating that they provided joking or unserious responses, 13 for failure or no answer of the gender manipulation, 10 for not answering a majority of the questions or spending less than three minutes on the entire survey, and 2 for not meeting the age requirement. The final sample ($N=156$) consisted of 60 men and 96 women aged 18-23 ($M=19.13$, $SD=0.98$). The majority of the sample was white (66.7%), followed by African American/Black (8.3%), Latinx (7.1%), Multiethnic (7.1%), Asian American/Asian (6.4%), Unspecified/Other (3.2%), and Middle Eastern American/Arab (1.3%). Participants' political orientation, measured on an 8-point scale (0 = *extremely liberal*, 7 = *extremely conservative*) averaged 3.99 ($SD = 1.50$) indicating the sample was left of center.

Design and Procedure

We collected data in Spring 2024. We advertised the study as examining “advocacy attitudes and perceptions.” Participants completed some demographic information (e.g., reported their gender), and read a randomly assigned vignette, that described either a male or female advocate who was either advocating for RJ or anti-RJ behavior. The vignettes described Michael or Michelle who was a 20-year-old college student. Both vignettes cited the overturning of *Roe vs Wade* as an event that sparked the advocate’s passion to get more involved in their community, and the vignettes varied as to what ideological position the advocate pursued (RJ or anti-RJ). See the Appendix for the full text of vignettes. After reading the vignette, participants answered a series of questions to gauge their attitudes toward the advocate that they read about.

First, participants answered an open-ended question about their opinion of the advocate to capture their general thoughts and first impressions before they were asked to answer more specific questions about their attitudes. They then answered additional, more directed questions about their attitudes and perceptions of the advocate, provided additional demographic information, and completed data quality checks (e.g., “People take surveys for a lot of reasons. Were you completely honest and serious in responding to this survey? Or were you joking around or giving less-than-honest responses?”). Finally, they were debriefed and exited from the survey.

Measures

All measures (except the open-ended prompt) were presented in a counterbalanced manner to avoid potential order effects.

Open-Ended Initial Impressions

Immediately after reading the vignette, participants engaged in a reflective activity to write about their perceptions of the advocate. This practice required them to engage with the content of the vignette, and also assessed their spontaneous impressions of the advocate, before they received close-ended questions. Participants read the following writing prompt and then were instructed to use the open-ended essay-style textbox to write: [“Please reflect on what you just read. What were your first impressions of the individual? What do you think about this person? There are no right or wrong answers.”].

Likeability

Participants responded to Reyson’s (2005) Likeability Scale. This 11-item scale evaluated how likeable each participant perceived their assigned advocate to be. Participants responded to these items on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Example items included “This person is friendly.” and “I would like to be friends with this person.” We averaged items together to get an overall likeability, with higher scores indicating higher likeability ($\alpha=0.96$).

Perceived Gender Expression of Advocates

Participants responded to three separate items, rating how *feminine*, *masculine*, and *androgynous* they perceived the advocate to be; “How...is the person you read about?”.

Response options ranged from 0 (not at all) to 5 (extremely).

Arbitrary Traits

Participants responded to a 15 item Arbitrary Traits Scale. This 15-item scale measured arbitrary positive characteristics that may be attributed to someone as a result of a halo effect, using researcher-generated items and items from previous research (Conley et al., 2013; Palmer, 2022). Participants rated how much each item applied to their advocate on a 7-point Likert scale (1=extremely unlikely, 7=extremely likely). Example items included: “The person would pay their taxes on time” and “This person would have had several parking tickets in the past year.” Items were averaged to calculate an overall arbitrary trait score, with higher scores indicating more positive arbitrary trait perception ($\alpha=0.89$).

Perceived Argumentativeness

Participants responded to Infante and Rancer’s (1982) 20-item argumentativeness scale. By rating each item on a 5-point scale (1=almost never true, 5=always true), this scale was intended to measure how confrontational participants perceived advocates to be. Example items included: “They enjoy avoiding arguments” and “They enjoy a good argument over a controversial issue.” Items were averaged to calculate an overall argumentativeness score, with higher scores indicating more argumentativeness perception ($\alpha=0.90$).

Perceptions of Advocacy Actions

We created a list of possible advocacy actions in which activists and advocates may engage (inspired by McKeever et al., 2023), and participants rated each as masculine, as feminine, and as confrontational. The purpose of including this rating task was to learn about how people perceive a variety of advocacy actions, which can assist with future study design in selecting advocacy behaviors to be used in study materials. We crowd-sourced potential advocacy behaviors from a large team of Gen-Z undergraduate research assistants. Example items included: “Creating a social media post” and “Organizing a protest”. In a counterbalanced order, participants rated each of the 12 items as masculine (1 = not at all masculine, 5 = very masculine), feminine (1 = not at all feminine, 5 = very feminine), and confrontational (1 = not at all confrontational, 5 = very confrontational).

Chapter 3

Results

Quantitative data were analyzed using R (4.3.1).

Effects of Advocate's Gender and Advocate Viewpoint on Ratings of the Advocate

We performed a series of two-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs), entering the gender of the advocate target and the viewpoint of the advocate target as factors, on all dependent variables: perceived likeability, perceived gender expression of advocates, arbitrary trait ratings, and perceived argumentativeness.

Perceived Likeability

The effect of advocate gender on likeability was non-significant ($p = .52$), but there was a significant main effect of advocate viewpoint, such that participants perceived the RJ advocate ($M = 60.28$, $SD = 11.61$) as more likeable than the anti-RJ advocate ($M = 49.56$, $SD = 17.25$), $F(1, 153) = 20.32$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.21]. There was no significant interaction of advocate gender and viewpoint ($p = .87$).

Perceived Gender Expression of Advocates

There was a significant effect of advocate gender on masculinity rating ($p < .001$), such that participants perceived the male advocate to be more masculine ($M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.08$) as compared to the female advocate ($M = 2.19$, $SD = 1.04$), $F(1, 154) = 30.36$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$, 95% CI [0.004, 0.13]. The effect of advocacy viewpoint was also significant ($p = .006$), such that

participants perceived the anti-RJ advocates as more masculine ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.22$) than the RJ advocates ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 1.03$), $F(1, 154) = 7.84$, $p < .006$, $\eta_p^2 = .16$, 95% CI [0.07, 0.27]. The interaction between advocate gender and advocacy viewpoint was non-significant ($p > .05$).

There was a significant effect of advocate gender on femininity rating, such that participants perceived the female advocate to be more feminine ($M = 3.05$, $SD = 1.16$) as compared to the male advocate ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.23$), $F(1, 154) = 30.36$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, 95% CI [0.28, 0.49]. The effect of advocacy viewpoint was also significant ($p = .01$), such that participants perceived the reproductive justice advocates as more feminine ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.22$) than the anti choice advocates ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 1.03$), $F(1, 154) = 6.19$, $p < .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, 95% CI [0.001, 0.11]. The interaction between advocate gender and advocacy viewpoint was non-significant ($p = .2$).

There was not a significant effect of advocate gender on androgyny rating, but there was a significant effect of advocacy viewpoint on androgyny rating, such that anti-RJ advocates were seen as more androgynous ($M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.03$) than RJ advocates ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 0.93$), $F(1, 154) = 7.84$, $p = 0.006$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, 95% CI [0.00,

Arbitrary Trait Ratings

There were no significant main effects or interaction of advocate gender and advocate viewpoint on arbitrary trait ratings of advocates ($p = .09$).

Perceived Argumentativeness

There were no significant main effects or interaction of advocate gender and advocate viewpoint on argumentativeness ratings of advocates ($p = .09$).

Rating of Advocacy Behaviors

We conducted a joint F -test to assess how the 12 advocacy behaviors were rated as masculine, feminine, and confrontational to determine if advocacy actions were rated significantly differently from one another. We then performed three parametric Tukey HSD tests (e.g., one for masculinity ratings) to determine which advocacy actions differed. See Table 1 for means, standard deviations, and statistical comparisons.

Based on these tests, we determined that the femininity rating of *creating a social media post* was significantly higher than the femininity rating of *engaging with policymakers*, *fundraising for a cause*, *donating money to an advocacy group*, *educating oneself*, and *vocally educating others*. We also determined that *reposting another person's social media post/message* was rated as significantly more feminine than *engaging with policymakers*, *fundraising for a cause*, *donating money to an advocacy group*, and *vocally educating others*. None of the other advocacy actions were significantly different from one another in femininity rating.

When performing our Tukey HSD test for masculinity ratings, we found that *creating a social media post* was rated as significantly less masculine than *engaging with policymakers*, *organizing a protest*, *donating money to an advocacy group*, *educating oneself*, *vocally educating others*, and *conducting research*. We also found that *reposting someone else's social media message* was similarly significantly less masculine than *engaging with policymakers*, *organizing a protest*, *fundraising for a cause*, *donating money to an advocacy group*, *educating oneself*, *vocally educating others*, and *conducting research*. *Engaging with policymakers* was also rated as significantly more masculine than *distributing education materials to others* and *advertising*.

In terms of confrontation, we found that *creating a social media post* was rated as significantly less confrontational than *engaging with policymakers*, *fundraising*, *donating money*, *educating oneself*, and *vocally educating others*. We also determined that *reposting someone else's social media message* was similarly rated as significantly less confrontational than *engaging with policymakers*, *fundraising*, *donating money*, and *vocally educating others*. None of the other actions were significantly different in confrontation rating.

The advocacy actions that were rated most feminine were *creating a social media post*, *reposting another person's social media post/message*, and *advertising (using clothing, laptop stickers, or other method to advocate for an issue)*, while the advocacy actions that were rated least feminine were *engaging with policymakers*, *donating money to an advocacy group*, and *vocally educating others*. The advocacy actions that were rated most masculine were *engaging with policymakers*, *donating money to advocacy groups*, and *vocally educating others*, while the advocacy actions that were rated least masculine were *reposting another person's social media message*, *creating a social media post*, and *advertising (using clothing, laptop stickers, or other method to advocate for an issue)*. The advocacy actions that were rated most confrontational were *organizing a protest*, *vocally educating others*, and *engaging with policymakers*, while the least confrontational were *educating oneself on an issue*, *donating money to an advocacy group*, and *conducting research*.

Based on these findings, we can observe that the most masculine advocacy behaviors were seen as least feminine and vice versa. We also find that there is overlap between masculinity rating and confrontation rating. These findings have implications for how people may choose to advocate, and the ways in which “performing gender” is present in chosen advocacy styles.

Table 1

Means (standard deviations) of rating social advocacy actions as masculine, feminine, and confrontational.

Advocacy action	Masculine	Feminine	Confrontational
Creating a social media post	2.12 (1.07) ^a	3.28 (1.32) ^a	2.69 (1.13) ^a
Reposting another person's social media message	2.07 (1.07) ^c	3.25 (1.32) ^c	2.53 (1.16) ^c
Signing a petition for a cause	2.46 (1.08)	2.93 (1.25)	2.39 (1.16)
Engaging with policymakers, legislators, or government officials (e.g., by phone, email, or in-person)	2.88 (1.20) ^{b, d, e}	2.63 (1.20) ^{b, d}	3.45 (1.28) ^{b, d}
Organizing a protest	2.63 (1.20) ^{b, d}	2.83 (1.25)	3.98 (1.10)
Fundraising for a cause by asking others to contribute money	2.54 (1.13) ^d	2.78 (1.16) ^{b, d}	2.96 (1.27) ^{b, d}
Donating money to an advocacy group	2.71 (1.20) ^{b, d}	2.73 (1.17) ^{b, d}	2.25 (1.11) ^{b, d}
Distributing educational resources to others	2.44 (1.11) ^f	2.97 (1.23)	2.69 (1.24)
Education oneself on an issue	2.64 (1.19) ^{b, d}	2.80 (1.23) ^b	2.07 (1.23) ^b
Vocally educating others by engaging in tough conversations	2.71 (1.18) ^{b, d}	2.78 (1.23) ^{b, d}	3.50 (1.23) ^{b, d}
Conducting socially-relevant research	2.56 (1.12) ^{b, d}	2.83 (1.23)	2.34 (1.23)
Advertising (using clothing, laptop stickers, or bumper	2.31 (1.08) ^f	3.03 (1.23)	2.78 (1.19)

stickers that advocate for an issue)

Note. Within each column, means that are indicated with the superscript *a* significantly differ from superscript *b*, *c* differs from *d*, and *e* differs from *f*, at $p < .05$.

Qualitative Insights

We used thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to analyze the qualitative data about initial impressions of the advocate, which allowed us to find relevant patterns. To begin, all potential coders familiarized themselves with the procedure of thematic analysis, and the authors chose two coders (one author and one research assistant). These coders illustrated a strong understanding of thematic analysis and represented diverse identities within Gen-Z.

Coders began by reading through all participant responses at least five times to satisfy the data familiarization requirement for qualitative analysis. As they were reading, coders documented first impressions and initial thoughts that would be used later for generating themes. Coders then met, shared ideas, and collectively came up with themes they felt were representative and relevant of the data as a whole. Collaboratively, they collapsed themes that were too similar or captured the same general idea. After coding utilizing the shared thematic guide, coders discussed any differences in categorization of responses. From our qualitative analysis, we discovered some important insights.

First, for participants assigned to a male advocate, gender was more salient compared to those assigned to a female advocate, either showing a halo effect for RJ men or an opposite negative effect for Anti-RJ men. Despite being more aware of the gender of an advocate when that advocate was male, participants more commonly expressed shock about their assigned

advocate when they read about the RJ Man as compared to participants exposed to other experimental groups (e.g., “I mean I agree with him that women should have more reproductive rights, but he is going the extra mile.”).

Second, participants assumed political positions of advocates based on advocacy conditions less than expected, but this occurred more often in the Anti-RJ advocacy condition, as compared to the RJ condition. Some participants simply made a statement about how political affiliation might be an explanation for the advocate's viewpoint (e.g., “She was probably raised in a conservative household.”), while others discussed how the political affiliation, they assumed their assigned advocate to have, related to their own political beliefs (e.g., “I think this person may be more conservative compared to me.”).

Third, we wanted to determine if participants thought that advocates who shared their viewpoint were more moral. We also wanted to know if participants attributed positive qualities to advocates in general, even when an advocate had an opposing viewpoint to their own. Across all groups, participants attributed more non-morality traits (e.g., educated, passionate, lazy), both positive and negative, to advocates than positive or negative morality traits (e.g., kind, rude, moral). Despite this, more positive morality traits were attributed to RJ advocates, as compared to Anti-RJ advocates, which is likely a reflection of the more liberal-leaning political demographic of our sample. Participants who agreed more with an advocate's position attributed more positive morality traits to them than participants who expressed disagreement with their position, but many participants expressed positive non-morality traits to advocates even of an opposing viewpoint to their own. This illustrates that participants did admire advocacy in general, but conditionally connected that advocacy to morality.

Chapter 4

General Discussion

This experimental study aimed to determine stigma related to RJ advocacy by determining differences in perceptions of advocates across genders and advocacy positions. It also aimed to establish if advocacy actions within RJ could themselves be perceived as either masculine, feminine, or androgynous.

Through our quantitative analysis, we found that Gen-Z participants rated RJ advocates as more likeable and more feminine than their equivalent anti-RJ counterparts across gender conditions. This is a key finding in further understanding how external perceptions may motivate or deter interested parties from advocating in RJ. Likeability may similarly motivate all people to want to advocate in RJ, but perceived femininity may serve as a unique barrier to men's involvement in RJ. Consistent with our hypothesis, within qualitative first impression responses, participants assigned to the RJ man condition seemed to perceive a halo effect towards their advocate, while participants assigned to the anti-RJ man condition felt more negatively about their advocate due to their gender. This corroborates previous research regarding admiration targeted at outgroup allies advocating for a cause they do not have a direct stake in (Palmer, 2022).

We also found that Gen-Z participants rated certain social advocacy actions (e.g., posting on social media, advertising through clothing and stickers) as feminine, and they rated other advocacy actions (e.g., engaging with policy makers, donating money) as masculine. Although there was no effect of advocate gender or advocacy viewpoint on argumentativeness, it seems that the more confrontational and vocal advocacy actions were rated as more masculine. This information is important for several reasons, such as specifying advocacy behaviors in future

studies and knowing what those behaviors convey about gender beliefs. Further, it is also useful to understand why people of different genders might engage (or not engage) in advocacy behaviors that align (or do not align) with their gender. For example, Gen-Z men who are committed to RJ but strongly identify as men or as masculine may be less likely to engage in publicly visible forms of action like social media posts and social issue advertising because those actions are perceived as feminine. This is an important question for future research to address.

That is, these findings have direct implications if members of Gen Z, especially men, choose to (not) advocate for RJ. If men are perceived as more feminine by association with RJ advocacy, they may avoid the issue to uphold their masculinity status. Despite this though, we found that men, even more than women, were esteemed for their RJ advocacy by those who also agreed with the RJ framework. This may be relevant in considering the settings in which men are comfortable advocating for RJ. Awareness of who may be perceiving them, and personal investment in gender identity, could play a role in if men choose to advocate for RJ and the ways in which advocacy actions within the realm of RJ were deemed gendered may inform advocacy as well. Advocacy actions that were rated more masculine by participants, like engaging with policy makers, were less passive and less accessible to young people as the actions that were rated more feminine, like posting or reposting on social media. This, as well as the previously mentioned factors, may partially explain why men, specifically in Gen-Z, are advocating for RJ less than Gen-Z women (Pew Research Center, 2020).

Limitations and Future Directions

Although this research is beneficial in understanding how RJ advocates are perceived, there are limitations to consider when interpreting the findings. First, our study did not include a control group. While a control group was present during the running of our study, a technical difficulty occurred within this condition, and thus all data was removed from analysis. This means that, within this study, we were unable to compare perceptions of advocates of a non RJ related issue to those of a RJ related issue. There also may be limitations to the generalizability of our findings because our sample consisted of only members of Gen-Z attending college. Our sample was majority women and liberal-leaning, which likely impacted which responses were in the majority. Gen-Z members not attending college probably differ demographically in ways that would affect responses, and thus we cannot generalize our findings to all members of Gen-Z. Further, participants likely lack the background knowledge on RJ as a broad concept and far reaching framework, so we had to rely on opinion on access to abortion legislation to cue an advocate's support or opposition to RJ. Because of this, we may have instead captured perceptions of advocates for reproductive rights. RJ is a broader framework that captures issues beyond abortion, including racial justice, gender equality, and socioeconomic disparities. Due to all that an RJ framework to social advocacy encapsulates, perceptions of someone advocating for the full range of RJ-related causes would likely be viewed differently than someone just advocating for abortion access.

Many of the limitations of this study can be addressed with additional research. Future studies should address the intersection of advocacy issues and advocacy actions to determine if likeability, gender perception, and argumentativeness changes when an advocate practices advocacy in a way that does not align with their gender identity. For example, a study should

look at perceptions of a woman advocating for RJ in a more confrontational way or a man utilizing social media as his primary advocacy platform compared to advocates choosing advocacy actions that align with their gender identity. This work would be useful in answering the question, if RJ advocates are so likeable, why isn't everyone doing it?

Future research should address how other advocacy issues may be similarly gendered to RJ, and how this may affect the gendered nature of advocacy actions within that domain. For example, would advocates for racial justice be viewed as androgynous, or is advocacy in general perceived as feminine? Would advocacy actions that were seen as feminine within RJ (e.g., posting or reposting on social media) be similarly perceived when done in congruence with a less gendered advocacy issue? Future research should also address if acting out of their expected gender roles within advocacy may serve as a gender threat for advocates. This would be useful in determining if the gendered nature of advocacy actions is actually known to advocates, and if it is strong enough to sway motivations towards or away from certain types of advocacy. Future research could also explore how a felt halo effect might change the motivations or productiveness of an advocate involved in an issue that does not personally affect them. Finally, another possible future direction might be to educate participants about RJ versus pro-choice framing and then evaluate how advocates are rated based on their choice of framing. This kind of research design would address the limitation of having participants unfamiliar with RJ frameworks.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This research sought to broaden understandings of the gendered nature of advocacy, specifically through determining perceptions of RJ advocates. Research on RJ, as a social movement, theoretical approach, and organizational strategy, is underdeveloped in the field of psychology (Eaton & Stephens, 2020) and this research helps to address that gap. By understanding stigma related to gendered perceptions, we can better remove obstacles that may deter interested individuals from advocating for RJ, and other similarly gendered advocacy issues. Although this research has provided important initial insights, future work must build on intersections between advocate gender, the issue they're advocating for, and what actions they partake in. Ultimately, this will lead to a more robust and fruitful RJ movement.

Appendix

Vignettes

RJ Woman

Michelle Johnson is a 20-year-old college student who has become interested in abortion access since the overturning of Roe vs Wade. She was upset with the lack of protection for bodily autonomy based on the Supreme Court's decision and decided she wanted to get more involved. She has been advocating for reproductive justice in a number of ways. She became more active and vocal on social media. For example, in one of her recent posts, she posted a photo with a caption that said: "Every person should have the right to have kids, not have kids, and raise kids in a safe and sustainable world." Michelle also joined a club of like-minded individuals at her university to advocate for her cause. Her club responsibilities include organizing on-campus rallies and events to promote reproductive justice. Finally, she tries to learn more about her cause whenever she has the opportunity. By reading articles and watching videos online, her interest in reproductive freedom has led to her educating herself more about what she can do.

RJ Man

Michael Johnson is a 20-year-old college student who has become interested in abortion access since the overturning of Roe vs Wade. He was upset with the lack of protection for bodily autonomy based on the Supreme Court's decision and decided he wanted to get more involved. He has been advocating for reproductive justice in a number of ways. He became more active and vocal on social media. For example, in one of his recent posts, he posted a photo with a caption that said: "Every person should have the right to have kids, not have kids, and raise kids in a safe and sustainable world." Michael also joined a club of like-minded individuals at his university to advocate for his cause. His club responsibilities include organizing on-campus rallies and events to promote reproductive justice. Finally, he tries to learn more about his cause whenever he has the opportunity. By reading articles and watching videos online, his interest in reproductive freedom has led to him educating himself more about what he can do.

Anti-RJ Woman

Michelle Johnson is a 20-year-old college student who has become interested in abortion access since the overturning of Roe vs Wade. She was upset with the lack of protection for unborn children based on the Supreme Court's decision and decided she wanted to get more involved. She has been advocating for the lives of unborn children in a number of ways. She became more active and vocal on social media. For example, in one of her recent posts, she posted a photo with a caption that said: "Every child should have the right to develop, be born, and live in a safe and sustainable world." Michelle also joined a club of like-minded individuals at her university to advocate for her cause. Her club responsibilities include organizing on-campus rallies and events to protest reproductive justice. Finally, she tries to learn more about her cause whenever

she has the opportunity. By reading articles and watching videos online, her interest in reproductive restrictions has led to her educating herself more about what she can do.

Anti-RJ Man

Michael Johnson is a 20-year-old college student who has become interested in abortion access since the overturning of Roe vs Wade. He was upset with the lack of protection for unborn children based on the Supreme Court's decision and decided he wanted to get more involved. He has been advocating for the lives of unborn children in a number of ways. He became more active and vocal on social media. For example, in one of his recent posts, he posted a photo with a caption that said: "Every child should have the right to develop, be born, and live in a safe and sustainable world." Michael also joined a club of like-minded individuals at his university to advocate for his cause. His club responsibilities include organizing on-campus rallies and events to protest reproductive justice. Finally, he tries to learn more about his cause whenever he has the opportunity. By reading articles and watching videos online, his interest in reproductive restrictions has led to him educating herself more about what he can do.

Bibliography

- Alexander-Floyd, N. G. (2023). Psychoanalysis and reproductive justice: Reflections on Dobbs and the possibilities of psychoanalytic political praxis. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00107530.2023.2241975>
- Avery, L. R., and Stanton, A. G. (2020). Subverting the mandates of our methods: Tensions and considerations for incorporating reproductive justice frameworks into psychological science. *Journal of Social Issues*, 76(2), 447-455. <https://doi-org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1111/josi.12386>
- Baker, M. R., Papp, L. J., Crawford, B. L., & McClelland, S. I. (2023). Abortion stigma: Imagined consequences for people seeking abortion care in the United States. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 47(1), 35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843221131544>
- Boeringer, S. B. (1999). Associations of rape-supportive attitudes with fraternal and athletic participation. *Violence Against Women*, 5(1), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778019922181167>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bryson, L. (1987). Sport and the maintenance of masculine hegemony. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10(4), 349–360. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395\(87\)90052-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-5395(87)90052-5)
- Conley, T.D., Moors, A.C., Matsick, J.L., & Ziegler, A. (2013). The fewer the merrier?: Assessing stigma surrounding consensually non-monogamous romantic relationships. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 13(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2012.01286.x>

- Crosset, T. (1999). Male athletes' violence against women: A critical assessment of the athletic affiliation, violence against women debate. *Quest*, 51(3), 244–257.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1999.10491684>
- Davidson, M. D. G. (2018). Black women's bodies, ideology, and the public curriculum of the pro- and anti-choice movements in the US. *Gender and Education*, 30(3), 310–321.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2016.1225011>
- Dimock, M. (2019, January 17). Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z begins. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>
- Downey, M. M., Daniel, C., McGlynn-Wright, A., & Haugeberg, K. (2023). Protect and control: Coverture's logics across welfare policy and abortion law. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 47(4), 478–493. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231186320>
- Drażkowski, D., Trepanowski, R., & Mikołajczak, G. (2024). Engagement in pro-choice protests: The role of gender, feminism, gender collective self-esteem, and reactance against abortion bans. *Sex Roles*, 90(11), 1550–1566. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-024-01522-w>
- Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against sexism: The role of men in confronting sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 637–652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12083>
- Dyer, R. L., Checkalski, O. R., & Gervais, S. J. (2023). Abortion decisions as humanizing acts: The application of ambivalent sexism and objectification to women-centered anti-abortion rhetoric. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 47(4), 528–546.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231173673>
- Eaton, A. A., & Stephens, D. P. (2020). Reproductive justice special issue introduction

- “Reproductive Justice: Moving the Margins to the Center in Social Issues Research.”
Journal of Social Issues, 76(2), 208–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12384>
- Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification*, 11(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01454455870112001>
- English, C. (2017). Toward sport reform: Hegemonic masculinity and reconceptualizing competition. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 44(2), 183–198.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2017.1300538>
- Fledderjohann, J., Patterson, S., & Owino, M. (2023). Food insecurity: A barrier to reproductive justice globally. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 35(2), 296–311.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2023.2201841>
- Gervais, S. J., & Hillard, A. L. (2014). Confronting sexism as persuasion: Effects of a confrontation’s recipient, source, message, and context. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 653–667. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12084>
- Grzanka, P. R., & Frantell, K. A. (2017). Counseling psychology and reproductive justice: A call to action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 45(3), 326–352.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017699871>
- Horowitz, J. M. (2020, July 9). Activism on gender equality differs widely by education among Democratic women. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2020/07/09/activism-on-gender-equality-differs-widely-by-education-among-democratic-women/>
- Howell, F. M. (2023). Resistance and gendered racism: Middle-Class black women’s experiences navigating reproductive health care systems. *Psychology of Women*

- Quarterly*, 47(4), 494–509. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231168113>
- Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 46(1), 72–80. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4601_13
- Iyer, A., & Achia, T. (2020). Mobilized or marginalized? understanding low-status groups' responses to social justice efforts led by high- status groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000325>
- Jewkes, R., & Morrell, R. (2018). Hegemonic masculinity, violence, and gender equality: using latent class analysis to investigate the origins and correlates of differences between men. *Men and Masculinities*, 21(4), 547–571. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X17696171>
- Jozkowski, K. N., Mena-Meléndez, L., Crawford, B. L., & Turner, R. C. (2023). Abortion stigma: attitudes toward abortion responsibility, illegal abortion, and perceived punishments of “illegal abortion.” *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 47(4), 443–461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231181350>
- Kirkendall, A., & Dutt, A. (2023). Refugee women's pregnancy and childbirth experiences in the US: Examining context through a reproductive justice framework. *Feminism & Psychology*, 095935352211491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593535221149166>
- Klann, E. M., & Wong, Y. J. (2023). Pregnancy decision making for women with mental health conditions: The roles of distress, lay beliefs, and self-efficacy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 47(4), 547–561. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231191505>
- Koss, M. P., & Cleveland, H. H. (1996). Athletic participation, fraternity membership, and date rape: The question remains—self-selection or different causal processes? *Violence Against Women*, 2(2), 180–190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801296002002005>

- Koss, M. P., & Gaines, J. A. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8(1), 94–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/088626093008001007>
- Kumar, A. (2018). Disgust, stigma, and the politics of abortion. *Feminism & Psychology*, 28(4), 530–538.
- Kumar, A., Hessini, K., & Mitchell, E. M. H. (2009). Conceptualising abortion stigma. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 11(6), 625–639. 0.1080/13691050902842741
- Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L. S., Celentano, E., & Cozza, T. M. (1992). *The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms*. 14(3), 325–337.
- Macomber, K. (2018). “I’m sure as hell not putting any man on a pedestal”: Male privilege and accountability in domestic and sexual violence work. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(9), 1491–1518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515618944>
- Major, B., Appelbaum, M., Beckman, L., Dutton, M. A., Russo, N. F., & West, C. (2009). Abortion and mental health: Evaluating the evidence. *American Psychologist*, 64(9), 863–890. 10.1037/a0017497
- Marecek, J., Macleod, C., & Hoggart, L. (2017). Abortion in legal, social, and healthcare contexts. *Feminism & Psychology*, 27(1), 4–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353516689521>
- McCray, K. L. (2015). Intercollegiate athletes and sexual violence: A review of literature and recommendations for future study. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 16(4), 438–443.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014537907>
- McKeever, B.W., McKeever, R., Choi, M., & Huang, S. (2023). From advocacy to activism: A multidimensional scale of communicative, collective, and combative behaviors.

Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 100(3), 569-594.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/10776990231161035>

Megan Carnegie. (2022, August 8). *Gen Z: How young people are changing activism*.

<https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220803-gen-z-how-young-people-are-changing-activism>

Melnick, M. (1992). Male athletes and sexual assault. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 63(5), 32–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1992.10604186>

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2020). Becoming a super-masculine “cool guy”: reflexivity, dominant and hegemonic masculinities, and sexual violence. *Boyhood Studies*, 13(2), 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.3167/bhs.2020.130203>

Messner, M. A. (1990). When bodies are weapons: Masculinity and violence in Sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 25(3), 203–220.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/101269029002500303>

Mollen, D., Hargons, C., Klann, E. M., & Mosley, D. V. (2018). Abortion knowledge and attitudes among psychologists and graduate students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 46(6), 738–760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000018795296>

Morison, T. (2023). Using reproductive justice as a theoretical lens in qualitative research in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 20(1), 172–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2022.2121236>

Neilson, E. C., Ayala, S., Jah, Z., Hairston, I., Hailstorks, T., Vyavahare, T., Gonzalez, A., Hernandez, N., Jackson, K., Bailey, S., Hall, K. S., Diallo, D. D., & Mosley, E. A. (2023). “If I control your body, I can fully control you”: Interpersonal and structural violence findings from the Georgia medication abortion project. *Psychology of Women*

- Quarterly*, 47(4), 462–477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231175388>
- Nolen, E., Siegel, J. A., Mendoza, R. R., Cubbin, C., Vohra-Gupta, S., Dosanjh, L. H., & Lewis-Smith, H. (2024). The impact of Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization on young women's experiences of objectification and sexual well-being. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843241238174>
- Palmer, L.E. (2022). Perceptions of advantaged and disadvantaged group members involved in social justice [Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University]
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois rape myth acceptance scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33(1), 27–68. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1998.2238>
- Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2005). Building organization theory from first principles: The self-enhancement motive and understanding power and influence. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 372–388. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0132>
- Poehling, C., Downey, M. M., Singh, M. I., & Beasley, C. C. (2023). From gaslighting to enlightening: Reproductive justice as an interdisciplinary solution to close the health gap. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2023.2203205>
- Price, K. (2011). It's not just about abortion: Incorporating intersectionality in research about women of color and reproduction. *Women's Health Issues*, 21(3), S55–S57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2011.02.003>
- Price, K. (2020). What is reproductive justice? *Meridians*, 19(S1), 340–362. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15366936-8566034>
- Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to

- confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(1), 8–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754>
- Reysen, S. (2005). Construction of a new scale: The Reysen likability scale. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 33(2), 201–208.
<https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2005.33.2.201>
- Ross, L. J. (2017). Reproductive justice as intersectional feminist activism. *Souls*, 19(3), 286–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999949.2017.1389634>
- SisterSong. (1997). *Reproductive justice*.
- Soulliere, D. M. (2006). Wrestling with masculinity: Messages about manhood in the WWE. *Sex Roles*, 55(1–2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9055-6>
- Swim, J. K., Gillis, A. J., & Hamaty, K. J. (2020). Gender bending and gender conformity: The social consequences of engaging in feminine and masculine pro-environmental behaviors. *Sex Roles*, 82(5–6), 363–385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-01061-9>
- Tyson, A., Kennedy, B., & Funk, C. (n.d.). *Gen Z, Millennials Stand Out for Climate Change Activism, Social Media Engagement With Issue*.
- United Way NCA. (2024, March 5). *The Gen Z Activism Survey*.
<https://unitedwaynca.org/blog/gen-z-activism-survey>
- Vescio, T. K., Schermerhorn, N. E. C., Lewis, K. A., Yamaguchi-Pedroza, K., & Loviscky, A. J. (2023). masculinity threats sequentially arouse public discomfort, anger, and positive attitudes toward sexual violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 01461672231179431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672231179431>
- Watson, L. B., Hargons, C. N., & Mollen, D. (2023). Rising up, pushing forward: Standing our ground in the face of injustice. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 47(4), 439–442.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231197674>

- Wexler, J. H., Cai, J., McKee, K. D., Blankenau, A., Lee, H., Kim, O. M., Kim, A. Y., & Lee, R. M. (2023). Understanding adoption as a reproductive justice issue. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 47(4), 510–527. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03616843231166376>
- Wiley, S., & Dunne, C. (2019). Comrades in the struggle? feminist women prefer male allies who offer autonomy- not dependency-oriented help. *Sex Roles*, 80(11-12), 656-666. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0970-0>
- Zhuang, J., Goldbort, J., Bogdan-Lovis, E., Bresnahan, M., & Shareef, S. (2023). Black mothers' birthing experiences: In search of birthing justice. *Ethnicity & Health*, 28(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557858.2022.2027885>
- Zucker, A. N. (2014). Reproductive justice: More than choice. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 14(1), 210–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12059>