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[Abstract]

Internalized oppression is a phenomena in which individuals within a marginalized or discriminated group adopt externally imposed ideals to enforce upon themselves or other members of their group (David, 2014). Internalized oppression is measured by the actions, decisions, and dialogues- the ways an individual of an oppressed class express him or herself. However, with other factors such as race, age, gender, sex, socioeconomic class, and education that affect the construction of identity, it is difficult to determine to what extent internalization affects expression as well as to what extent expression can be used to measure the degree of internalization. It is necessary to determine the degree of internalization in order to recognize oppression within our society. This research examines how women characterize gender, how their definition reflects internalized gender stereotypes, and how their expression and recognition of internalized misogyny change by the gender of the person they interact with. By doing so, one can measure the degree of an individual’s internalized misogyny as well as the individual’s lack of awareness to her own prejudice- expressed in both ingroup and outgroup interactions. Through a four part self reported survey, I examined the following question: *to what extent does the gender of those involved in an interaction affect the female recognition and expression of misogyny?*
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[Introduction]

Gender as a socio-psychological characteristic, applies to all people regardless of race, age, education level, socio-economic standing, and/or any other variables comprising an individual’s identity. Unlike sex, the biological classification by reproductive functions, gender is classified by an individual’s cultural or societal identification to a sex. On this premise, the definition of gender can change based on the sex based stereotypes in a particular culture. Sex based stereotypes prompt sex based discrimination, or sexism, which includes misogyny, the prejudice against women, and misandry, the prejudice against men. According to Dr. E.J.R David, a renowned psychologist awarded by the American Psychological Association for his research on the psychology of minorities, gender roles are enforced in a way to establish male dominance and female submission (David, 2014). However, this practice of stereotyping and discriminating based on gender role stereotypes is recognized at varying levels: modern sexism denies the existence of discrimination towards women; ambivalent sexism responds to the female gender with benevolence (paternalism) or hostility (competition); neosexism recognizes a disparity in gender treatment but takes no initiative to change the status quo (Keener et. al, 2013). While these categories are primarily used to distinguish male recognition of sexism, females also vary in their recognition of sexism- even those (misogyny) expressed against them. The female failure to recognize or problematize misogyny and resulting female prejudice towards women/females can thus be defined as internalized misogyny.

In May 2016, a 22 year old woman was murdered in a gender neutral bathroom in downtown Seoul (Korea) by a man with suspected misogynistic intentions. The man killed the “first woman that walked in [bathroom]” after having let multiple men pass unharmed because “women ignore me [him]” (Lee, 2016). Asia Today, a Korean news organization that examines current events in the general East Asian region, interviewed multiple randomly selected individuals about the existence of misogyny in Korea. Of the interviewees, the majority of Korean men and some Korean women responded “no”; few women even extended to assert that “misogyny doesn’t exist and is an idea created by a few [feminists] on the web”, echoing a popular sentiment among Korean women (Lee, 2016). Similarly, in the United States, the Clinton campaign invoked internalized misogyny as a reason why 53% of white females voted for Trump despite his groping boast and denouncing of several female anchors by their sex. Female Trump supporters have dismissed the then-candidate’s sexist remarks as “typical male talk” and “just the way men are” (Moore, 2016). As exit polls show 94% of black women and 68% of latina women voted for Clinton against Trump, it is difficult to conclude internalized misogyny as the sole factor that influenced female votes (Moore, 2016). However, both examples in Korea and the US demonstrate the effect internalized misogyny has on the female awareness and understanding of individual and cultural gender-based oppression. Without acknowledging existing problems of gender-based discrimination and oppression, it is difficult to organize a united feminist (gender equality) movement nonetheless address institutionalized sexism in population policies, maternity leave, workplace wage gap, etc. This research seeks to examine the discrepancy between self reported identification with gender norms and observed expressions of internalized misogyny in describing gender-based behavior by asking, to what extent does the gender of those involved in an interaction affect the female recognition and expression of misogyny?
[Literature Review]

Numerous psychological, demographic, and gender-based studies have been conducted on the development of female perception of gender-based issues through phenomenological research, content analyses, surveys, and interviews. My research focuses on expanding from current literature to map the character of internalized misogyny arising from subjective perceptions of gender.

1. How is internalized misogyny noticed / observed?

While there is no set definition for internalized sexism, Dr. E.J.R’s definition of internalized oppression, “a phenomena in which individuals within a marginalized or discriminated group adopt externally imposed ideals to enforce upon themselves or other members of their group,” is widely considered to be the foundation of existing literature in the field (David, 2014). The psychological nature of internalization makes it difficult to detect and most times dependent on the analyses of actions and/or decisions that reflect an alleged adopted prejudice against the self. Existing studies can be categorized by two main approaches to measuring internalized sexism: categorizing expressions such as dialogues or actions into sex-based qualities, or self reporting one’s experience with sexism.

**Categorizing Expressions -Inferring Internalization by Behavior**

Bearman, Korobov, and Thorne (Bearman et al, 2009) conducted dialogue analyses of 45 casual conversations between female college students to determine six categories through which women exercise their unconscious internalized sexism: “incompetence, general ignorance claims, competitive banter, competition between women, objectification, and invalidation”. 90% of the sampled population were white women aged 19 on average, which allows for the examination of gender identity in a relatively controlled setting; the conversations between these women disregard the need for an additional evaluation of generational differences, age, race, and education level. The simplicity of this study lays foundation for the understanding of different categories of expression, which can be used as a piloted standard of evaluating internalized misogyny. For my research on the discrepancy between expression-based observation of internalization and self reported internalization, this research provides insight into the former measurement. However, this study is limited to female-to-female interactions, whereby each individual is relatively familiar with one another in a personal setting. Also, by limiting the study to female-female interactions, the study doesn’t address the possibility of change in behavior and dialogue in a female-male interaction.

Keener, Mehta, and Strough’s observational study (Keener et al, 2013) on the interactions between children in same-sex groups and mixed-sex groups presents a different perspective in assessing internalized misogyny. Their experiment asked 143 high schoolers (grade 9–12) to nominate peers they’d “hang out with” at home or “work on a project together” at school. Girls were found to adhere to same-sex groups in personal settings and interact with boys in academic settings that require the accomplishment of a specific task. The analysis also showed that girls who have less interaction with boys engender a greater hostility towards other girls, which lies in accordance with the ‘competition between women’ category proposed by Bearman et. al. This conclusion would modify Bem’s Gender Schema Theory (Keener et.al, 2013) that it is not just the segregation that causes an in-group bias but the setting and requirements of interpersonal interactions that promotes group identification or dissociation. This study is relevant in establishing how female to female interactions are different from female to male interactions to address the flexibility of internalization
in my focus. However, though the study demonstrates how gender-based interactions can be organized into Bearman et. al’s popularly cited categories of internalized sexism, by providing the survey respondents with a reason to interact with another individual, the study limits the flexibility of internalization and its expression to preconstructed parameters. Regardless, by surveying both girls and boys of different ages, this study supplements the gender and age variable which were neglected in Bearman et. al’s study. However, like Bearman et. al, Keener et. al focused on a sample population that’s 81% European American, which neither incorporates racial diversity nor eliminates its influence as a cultural influence on gender identification and alignment.

**Self Reported Recognition of Sexism and Experiences with Sexism**

The second frequently used method of measuring internalized sexism is evaluating self-reported recognition of sexism and personal gender stereotype identification. The two studies identified above minimally address the cultural variable and the act of expressing internalized sexism towards oneself rather than to others of the same sex. Willis (Willis, 2009) points out in response to Bearman et. al’s study, that the first step in quantifying behaviors of internalized sexism is to confirm the subject’s awareness of sexism. This focuses the perspective on the individual rather than the category of expression, and emphasizes the individual’s awareness of sexism as the prerequisite for expressing internalized prejudices. Leaper and Brown’s (2008) examination of women’s self reported experiences with three instances of sexism- sexual harassment, academic discrimination, and athletic discouragement- addresses the how women differ in their awareness and problematization of sexism. By deducing the role of age, achievement level, socioeconomic standing, and ethnicity as variables, Leaper and Brown (2008) concluded that “progressive” individuals are more conscious of differences in gender expectations.
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Diagram 1. Internalization and Expression Research Cause and Effect Relationship Loop

Building on Leaper and Brown’s (2008) study, one must question how gender expectations and norms are internalized. Williams (2012) theorized a process in which internalization occurs through a three step process of socialization, intergenerational transmission, and acceptance.
According to his theory, children at a young age incorporate their physical observations to organize their position in relation to the world (other people, other sex, etc.). These hypotheses are then substantiated through gender norms asserted from one generation to another, gradually leading to an acceptance of culturally/ socially idealized gender identities. This theory adheres to Leaper and Brown’s (2008) external variables of perception- such as interaction with the opposite gender- that enforce pressures in the socialization and acceptance process. Yet, Leaper and Brown’s conclusion is based on the theory that gender roles are internalized by others’ exercising of gender norms, which comes to a roundabout loophole on how the expression of internalized misogyny depends on the internalization process of misogyny which is affected by others’ expression of misogyny. Thus, at the core of the cause and effect loophole is the individual’s understanding and perception of gender expectations, which Leaper and Brown hypothesize to be positively correlated with gender identity content.

2. How does gender identity influence internalized misogyny?

The white-majority sample used in Bearman’s study, the private school student sample used in Keener’s study, and the variety of variables regressed in Leaper and Brown’s study all present interactions that affect the sample from the outside. Socioeconomic status, ethnicity, age, performance level, and exposure to feminism (or sexism) shape the individual’s perception of sexism as a learned experience. Condor (1984) shifts the focus to the individual’s own perception of sexism, independent of generally applicable external variables. Her ‘Gender Identity Model’ examines an individual’s conformity to traditional gender roles in conjunction with her identity content. By this theory, the individual can self assess themselves on whether they agree with traditional gender roles, and evaluate the degree to which there is a disconnection (progressive/conservative non/identifiers). This allows the individual to interject her own gender identification and perspective that formerly were unidentified. Then, based on their self reported gender identity content, one would be able to define an examination point to evaluate the degree of internalization that can be examined in relation to expression and interaction with others.

Diagram 2. Gender Identity Model (Condor, 1984)
[Methodology]

To examine the extent to which the gender of those involved in an interaction affect the female recognition and expression of misogyny, I chose a sequential exploratory mixed method study (Creswell, 2003) to analyze data collected from self-reported surveys qualitatively through content analysis and quantitatively through descriptive research.

Based on the literature review, I identified the two most widely used approaches to studying internalized sexism to be content analysis of expressions and self reporting of sexism and gender identity content. Each approach acknowledges the connection between an individual’s dialogues or actions and their state of internalization. However, both vary in the degree to which they incorporate the subject’s understanding of gender- which is flexible to context and setting- resulting in a discrepancy in the results yielded by each method.

My self-reported survey addresses these shortcomings by bridging together the previously isolated approaches. Self reporting is the most commonly used method in psychology due to its practicality and efficiency in understanding of how a respondent views him or herself (Robins, 2007). Because of the subjectivity of defining gender content and strength of an individual’s gender identification, a self reported survey provides the necessary foundation to a mixed method evaluation.

Experiment Approach

There are two types of self reporting: direct and indirect. Direct self reporting requests the respondent to report his or her characteristic or quality for the purpose of determining his or her characteristic. On the other hand, indirect self reporting intentionally misleads the respondent to answer multiple questions that in fact, are not being used to collect an answer to the question asked but for a different purpose of assessing a characteristic quality that can’t be self reported, such as narcissism (Robins, 2007). For my research, I used both types of self reporting. On the primary level, direct self reports provided insight into the respondent’s self perceived gender content. On the secondary level, the same question and responses were used for indirect reporting in which the respondents’ answers were not used to determine their gender content- what they reported- but the gender-based prejudice associated with their response. Together, the data gained from the respondent’s self reports measure the disconnection between the respondent’s self perception and internalized misogyny; the direct reporting evaluates the individual’s preexisting awareness of gender based discrimination while the indirect reporting expresses the consistency of their identification through different gender-based interactions. Content analysis in this set up is crucial to evaluating the indirect reporting on gender characterization as is descriptive research in integrating this qualitative data with the quantitative data from the direct reporting to sequentially explore the nature of internalized misogyny.

Experiment Design - The Survey

The survey consists of four major parts: background questionnaire, conversation 1, conversation 2, and conversation 3. The background questionnaire composed of two sections are direct reports to collect information about the general demographic background of the respondents, while the three conversation sections are an indirect test. The free responses from the testing sections were analyzed for content analysis which was then examined through descriptive evaluation in relation to the direct report sections.
As seen in the diagram above, each section is formulated to establish the respondent’s familiarity with sexism, their respective gender characterization (definition of the fe/male gender), and the change and finally evaluate their recognition of misogyny in two different types of interactions (male-female and female-female).

The conversation tests are used to experiment they research question- to measure the change, if any, in the respondent’s recognition of misogyny in relation to the gender of those involved in the interaction. The conversation tests were created as a mix of Bearman et. al’s dialogue analysis research and the implicit association test (IAT). The IAT is a test created by Project Implicit, an international collaboration among social psychology researchers, to measure implicit bias by tasking it’s participants to classify words into two given categories and measuring the time delay in switching the categories the terms generally belong to (“ProjectImplicit”). For example, the IAT can measure the implicit bias to gender and career by comparing how quickly participants categorized domestic work with women to how quickly they categorized domestic work with men. I found the switching of norms conducted in the IAT simple and effective, but because the method only allows for a limited study on correlation between two variables rather than the unconstrained influence of the two variables on each other, I decided to adopt that element into a conversation based survey. Respondents were asked to do the following for the same conversation: (1) determine the gender of Person A and Person B, (2) determine the misogynist given that Person A is male and Person B is female, and (3) determine the misogynist given that Person A and B are both female- and select misogynistic statements for each task.
Figure 1: Conversation used in survey

A:
- Did you see her picture? You should dress more like her. There’s a reason guys don’t find you attractive.
B:
- I don’t know.. If I had the time and money I would. But then again, I have better things to do than to spend my time on looks. I wouldn’t feel too comfortable with all that makeup on anyways.
A:
- Yeah. I never understood how they have time to put on makeup every morning. Don’t they have other things they want to do in that time? If they spent as much time on studying as they do on shopping..
B:
- But I guess they do look pretty. Guys like it. I mean no one finds me attractive.. I should start my diet again. Then hopefully I can find a boyfriend by Christmas.
A:
- Diet, diet, diet- as if it ever works. You don’t need to lose weight. You don’t have time for that. Not everyone has the time to spend on plastering on makeup. You’re not like other girls. You have strong values.
B:
- Thank you.

I wrote the conversation for the survey incorporating nuances and phrases from common Korean comments found on Facebook about female plastic surgery, diet, and makeup. I specifically chose to use a conversation because dialogue and conversations have been used to study the daily practice of socially constructed sexism to serve as a key method in understanding how speech can reflect internalization (Bearman et. al, 2009). If, like the Bearman et. al study, daily expressions can be used to determine the internalized misogyny of females, average individuals would be able to equate certain types of nuances and speech back to a specific gender. For the construction of the test, I used the sex of Person A as the quasi independent variable in assessing how female recognition of misogyny would change based on the gender of the person saying misogynistic comments. Given that the categories of expression are susceptible to change by culture and experience, I synthesized Korean speech and attitudes from social networks into Bearman et. al’s six categories of expression: incompetence, general ignorance claims, competitive banter, competition between women, objectification, and invalidation (Bearman et. al, 2009). Person B, noted as a female throughout all three conversations, was assigned various dialogues constructed to fit Bearman et. al’s categories of how women express their internalized misogyny. Person A, representative of the quasi independent variable, was not assigned to any gender-influenced speech but to common misogynistic comments made by Korean users on Facebook irrespective of gender.

Experiment Design- The Sample Population

By Mullaly’s equation of multiplicity (Moane, 1999), the experience of oppression is supposedly amplified by the interaction of other quasi independent social variables. This can be
observed in the 2016 election demographics mentioned in the introduction, in which female support for Trump was not solely divided based on sex but in combination with race; 54% of white women voted for Trump unlike 94% of black and 68% of Latina women who voted for Clinton. To reduce the number of quasi independent variables affecting the Korean female’s experience of gender-based oppression, I extracted nine major social categories defined by the American Psychological Association’s “Social Categories in Everyday Experience” (Wiley, 2012).

Figure 2. Independent - Dependent Variable Organization for Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Categories (Externally Imposed/Created)</th>
<th>Gender Identity Model (Internally Constructed):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>(1) Membership knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>(2) Gender compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Economic class</td>
<td>(3) Pressure for gender stereotype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ethnicity (and race)</td>
<td>conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sexual orientation</td>
<td>(4) Intergroup bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Religious affiliation</td>
<td>Social Role Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sex</td>
<td>(1) Traditional vs progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. National origin</td>
<td>(2) Traditional (non)identifiers, progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. physical/psychological/mental ability</td>
<td>(non)identifiers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the racially and ethnically homogenous population in Korea, I narrowed my study population to ethnic Koreans. I dismissed religious affiliation and physical ability as religion is adopted by choice not necessarily a category imposed or diagnosed at birth, and physical ability is a given difference between sexes. Education (mental/psychological ability), economic class, and sexual orientations were more vague in their influence on the internalization of misogyny but I minimized their influence if any, by further narrowing my study population to Korean high school students at Korean International School. The final population was thus comprised of Korean high school students, age range from fourteen to nineteen, economic class to upper/ high-middle class, of at least secondary education.

Limitations

The conversation used for the survey emphasizes and possibly exaggerates misogynistic speech and internalized expression. Because the conversation is a hypothetical dialogue unlike the casual conversations Bearman et. al analyzed, the casual fluency of the conversation is difficult to assess. I had no access to a professional panel experienced in dialogue analysis for oppression psychology as in the Bearman et. al study, so I conducted a sample test among a group of 4 high school boys and 4 high school girls for feedback on the nuance and fluency of the conversation. Although this sample test is nowhere close to the professional assessment done in other studies, the test run helped identify variables such as the proximity of the individuals in the hypothetical conversation that could affect the responses. I did not account for how the type of relationship could influence the interpretation of dialogue. However, because the existence of misogyny doesn’t change by the nature of the relationship, I kept the test structure as it is. Nonetheless, I would suggest controlling or addressing this point in future research.
[Discussion]

Over the course of five days, I received 113 survey responses, 100 of which were from Korean students- 63 female and 37 male. These responses were evaluated, first to determine the subjectivity of gender characterization, and second to observe the dependency of internalized misogyny on gender-based interactions. From my data, I was able to determine the varying types of misogynistic expressions associated with each gender, and how those gender-based associations influenced the female recognition and expression of misogyny.

Defining Gender Characteristics- Indirect Reporting of Independent Variable

The dialogues in the conversation were constructed to establish Person B as a female, using speech associated with self invalidation, objectification, and general incompetence (from Bearman et. al’s categories) as well as context clues portraying Person B being compared to other females. Thus, when asked to determine the gender of Person B based off the conversation, about 85% of both female and male respondents responded female. However, a content analysis of the free-response justifications (Table 1) showed that majority of the respondents had other reasons than the context-comparison leading to their conclusion. 20.4% of female respondents, for example, noted Person B’s behavior being directed for men (F-M behavior) as a reason why they identified B as female. Male respondents on the other hand, pointed to Person B’s sexuality as well as the sexuality of those around B to be an indicator of B’s female gender (41.9%).

Table 1. Reasons for Determining the Gender of Person B by Sex and Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>CAN’T DETERMINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>86% chose female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>83.7% chose female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | B’s optimism for a relationship (2.7%) | Comparison: 40.7%  
F-M Behavior: 20.4%  
Activity: 13%  
B’s Sexuality: 13%  
Acting for M: 7.4%  
Stereotypical: 3.7%  
Off topic: 1.8% | Gender Neutral: 44.5%  
Stereotyping: 22.2%  
Inconsistency: 22.2%  
Not suggestive: 11.1% |

The gender of Person A, as the quasi independent variable in evaluating how the female recognition of misogyny is affected by the gender they interact with, was used to identify which characteristics the respondents attributed to each gender. When asked to identify the gender of Person A based on the conversation, female respondents showed closely divided responses with “man (male)” at 40%, “cannot determine” at 32%, and “woman (female)” at 29%. Male respondents
overwhelmingly chose “cannot determine” at 46%, followed by “woman (female)” at 30%, and “man (male)” at 24% (Graph 1).

Female Responses CONV 1

Male Responses CONV 1

Graph 1. Comparison of Female and Male Responses to Conversation 1

The justification provided for picking either male, female, or cannot determine varied both by sex of the respondent and the sex the respondents chose. These responses were analyzed and grouped by recurring themes (Table 2). 48% of female and 33.3% of male respondents that identified Person A as male, noted Person A’s dialogue to be distancing himself from the female gender and doing so by comparing females to each other. This reasoning was unique to those who identified A as male. 56% of female and 72.7% of male respondents that identified A as female, stated that the nuance, delivery, and subject matter of the conversation resembled their personal experiences with female-female interactions. The “judgemental comparisons”, and “distancing statements” as described in numerous responses, was based off of the “competition between women” category from Bearman et. al. This form of misogynistic dialogue differs from the ones used in Person B’s dialogue as the subject of misogyny shifts from the self to others of the same [female] sex group. The association of this expression with either the female or male gender by the respondents demonstrates the subjectivity of characterizing gender, and therefore, the following descriptive analyses in conversation test 2 and 3 were organized with the “comparing females”, “distancing from [other] females” characteristic as the independent variable in distinguishing between males and females.

The female respondents that chose male for Person A represent the population that associates the aforementioned characteristic with males, while those that chose female for Person A represent the population that associates the characteristic with females. The third population that indicated they “cannot determine” the gender of Person A are more difficult to categorize in their definition of gender. 30% of females who chose “cannot determine” stated that the conversation is gender neutral, but was closely followed up by 25% who claimed they were unable to reach a decision because of, “the inconsistent mix of female and male characteristics Person A displayed”. Due to the varying reasons for which the respondents chose “cannot determine”, this population was not categorized as having any set tendencies in characterizing gender.
Table 2. Reasons for Determining the Gender of Person A by Sex and Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>CAN’T DETERMINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>Distancing/ Comparing: 48%</td>
<td>F-F Experience: 56%</td>
<td>Gender Neutral: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Empathy: 28%</td>
<td>- Nuance</td>
<td>Inconsistency: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-M Experience: 20%</td>
<td>- Delivery</td>
<td>Stereotyping: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off topic: 4%</td>
<td>- subject/activity</td>
<td>Not suggestive: 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy: 33%</td>
<td>Empathy: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off topic: 11%</td>
<td>Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Both are sexist”: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject/ Activity: 33.3%</td>
<td>F-F Experience: 72.7%</td>
<td>Gender Neutral: 64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude: 22.2%</td>
<td>- Nuance</td>
<td>Inconsistency: 17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of empathy: 11.1%</td>
<td>- Delivery</td>
<td>Not suggestive: 11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distancing/ Comparing: 33.3%</td>
<td>- subject/activity</td>
<td>Stereotyping: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off topic: 0%</td>
<td>Empathy: 9.1%</td>
<td>Empathy: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off topic: 9.1%</td>
<td>Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decline to judge to avoid conflict: 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flexibility of Internalized Misogyny by Gender Interactions

For conversation test 2, the respondents were given that Person A is male and Person B is female. They were then asked to pick out all statements if any, that were misogynistic, and asked to pick out the misogynist if possible. The responses from this conversation test were quantitatively compared with the responses from conversation test 3, which asked the respondents to do the same tasks again, but given that both Person A and B are female. The comparison of these two tests indicate how the gender of Person A affects the respondent's’ recognition of misogyny.

Graph 2.Comparison of Female Responses from Conv 2 / Conv 3 for Identifying the Misogynist
From conversation 2 to conversation 3, one can observe the increase in the “neither” is misogynistic option and the decrease in “Person A” is misogynistic option. Though there is a 2% increase in those who found just Person B to be misogynistic, the data shift indicates a general dismissal by the female respondents, of the fact that females as well can be misogynists.

Graph 3. Male-Female (Conv 2) - Misogynistic Statements picked by Females

Graph 4. Female-Female (Conv 3) - Misogynistic Statements picked by Females
The phrases and the extent to which the female respondents recognized misogyny were also different (Graph 3, 4). For example, 62% of the respondents initially indicated the phrase, “You should dress more like her,” was misogynistic. After the gender of Person A was changed to female, only 41.3% of the respondents noted it to be misogynistic. However, while the general trend indicates that females tend to be weaker in recognizing misogynistic statements made by other females (internalized misogyny), the specific analysis of responses in relation to the three gender characterization populations from conversation test 1 indicate otherwise.

Graph 5. Male-Female Conversation Female Responses Analyzed by Conv 1 Responses

Those who responded Person A is male in conversation test 1 associated misogyny expressed through comparing women/ distancing oneself from women- with males. Those who responded Person A is a female in conversation test 1 associated this expression with females. Their varying levels in identifying misogynistic statements as well as the misogynist(s) reflect their contrasting gender characterizations. For example, 43% of those who chose male in conversation 1 found the
statement, “A: Yeah, I never understood how they have time to put on makeup every morning,” misogynistic compared to just 15% of those who chose female in conversation 1.

Graph 6. Female-Female Conversation Female Responses Analyzed by Conv 1 Responses

The changes are made more apparent in conversation 3; there extent to which each of the three gender-association populations from conversation 1 recognize the misogyny in the conversation show little to no agreement. As the gender of Person A was the only variable that was changed from conversation 2 to conversation 3, it can be confirmed that the gender of those involved in the conversation affect the recognition of misogyny by women, and that this recognition further varies on each subjective perception of gender.
[CONCLUSION]

Based on the sequential exploratory mixed method analyses of the self reported surveys, the qualitative characterization reports and quantitative recognition shifts indicate there are three different ways the gender of those involved in an interaction affect the female recognition and expression of misogyny (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>CAN’T DETERMINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>52% → 44%</td>
<td>50% → 56%</td>
<td>45% → 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person A</td>
<td>36% → 28%</td>
<td>39% → 17%</td>
<td>30% → 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person B</td>
<td>8% → 8%</td>
<td>0% → 6%</td>
<td>0% → 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>4% → 20%</td>
<td>6% → 11%</td>
<td>20% → 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t determine</td>
<td>0% → 0%</td>
<td>6% → 11%</td>
<td>5% → 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Females who associated in-group [female] comparisons and distancing with males correspondingly demonstrated a decrease in acknowledgement of misogyny when the same dialogues were expressed by a female- with a 16% increase in “neither person A nor B are misogynistic” response. Despite the fact that the dialogues were same throughout each conversation test, this negative shift of recognition indicates this particular group of respondents are weak in recognizing internalized misogyny. As for females who associated the characterization with females correspondingly showed an increase in acknowledgement when the same dialogues were expressed by a female. It is interesting how the amount of people that found Person A misogynistic decreased from 39% to 17% and the amount of people that found Person B misogynistic increased from 0% to 6% when A’s gender was changed from male to female. The gender of Person B was kept consistent throughout each conversation test, and the sudden positive shift in a female-female interaction can only be related to the fact that B is no longer interacting with a male but with a female. While no concrete conclusions can be made without further study, the shift seems to indicate how self [female] objectification and invalidation is perceived less favorably than in-group comparisons and generalization-based-discrimination by other females. Finally, the third group, for which I was unable to identify a gender-biased category, demonstrates an interesting increase from conversation 2 to 3, asserting Person A’s behavior is more misogynistic when expressed as a female than a male.

Taking into consideration that 57% of all the female responders reported to identify strongly to progressive and moderately to traditional gender identities, and 78% as self-identified feminists, this research therefore proves the discrepancy that arises from examining internalized misogyny in isolated methods as currently conducted in the field. However, while this research ameliorates the incoherence among currently practiced methods and accounts for the subjectivity of “gender”, there are several limitations to be acknowledged. In addition to the design limitations, the survey falls short in accurately representing the general Korean population. The survey was conducted among international school students, who are exposed to varying mixes of Korean and foreign culture. As a result, though I was able to control the racial, socioeconomic and education level variables, I cannot
confirm the degree to which Korean culture played a role in influencing the respondents’ perception of gender. Also, the survey was open to voluntary participation, which unlike random sampling is subject to participation bias. Because of the voluntary sample reporting, my survey findings apply predominantly to those, who like the respondents, have interest in the subject matter, and thus under-representative of the general population. These limitations should be taken into account for any future replication or research of this research.

To address some comments from participant feedback, I did not examine misandry and the Korean female backlash against men. However, I did analyze the male responses to the survey for possible indication of oppressor’s internalization (Tappan, 2006). Though I did not focus on male responses for the purpose of this research, I was surprised by how male misogyny identification shifts also varied dramatically by their gender characterization in conversation test 1. It would be interesting to compare the degree of shift expressed by both females and males for future research. Likewise, incorporating trans women and trans men’s perspectives could further our understanding of gender, sexism, and subconscious internalization.
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2. Survey

[CONSENT FORM]

Dear Participants,

You are invited to take part in a research survey about gender-based interactions and internalized misogyny in Korea. Your participation will require approximately 10 minutes and is completed online at your computer. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this survey.

Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to be in the study you can withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with anyone at Korea International School. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential (all anonymous), and digital data will be stored in secure computer files. Any report of this research that is made available to the public will not include your name or any other individual information by which you could be identified. If you have questions or want a copy or summary of this study’s results, you can contact the researcher at yuilee17@student.kis.or.kr. If you have any questions about whether you have been treated in an illegal or unethical way, contact KIS AP Research at larsson@kis.or.kr. Please feel free to print a copy of this consent page to keep for your records.

[ ] By checking this box, you are consenting to participate in this survey.

[BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE]

What is your race?

[ ] East Asian- Korean
[ ] Other: (open answer)

What is your grade level?

[ ] 9
[ ] 10
[ ] 11
[ ] 12

What sex were you assigned at birth, on your original birth certificate?

[ ] Male
[ ] Female

What is your current gender identity?

[ ] Male
[ ] Female
[ ] Trans male / Trans man
[ ] Trans female / Trans woman
[ ] Genderqueer / Gender nonconforming
[ ] A different identity
What is your sexual orientation?

[ ] Heterosexual
[ ] Homosexual
[ ] Bisexual
[ ] Asexual
[ ] Decline to Answer

Now you will begin the test portion of the survey. The test consists of three conversations. Directions are different for each of the conversations so please take your time to review the directions thoroughly before proceeding with each test.

[ ] Proceed

[CONVERSATION 1]

Please read the following conversation and respond to the questions below.

A:
- Did you see her picture? You should dress more like her. There’s a reason guys don’t find you attractive.

B:
- I don’t know. If I had the time and money I would. But then again, I have better things to do than to spend my time on looks. I wouldn’t feel too comfortable with all that makeup on anyways.

A:
- Yeah. I never understood how they have time to put on makeup every morning. Don’t they have other things they want to do in that time? If they spent as much time on studying as they do on shopping.

B:
- But I guess they do look pretty. Guys like it. I mean no one finds me attractive.. I should start my diet again. Then hopefully I can find a boyfriend by Christmas.

A:
- Diet, diet, diet- as if it ever works. You don’t need to lose weight. You don’t have time for that. Not everyone has the time to spend on plastering on makeup. You’re not like other girls. You have strong values.

B:
- Thank you.

Based on the conversation above, what gender is person A?

[ ] Male
[ ] Female
[ ] Cannot determine
What helped you determine the gender of the person? (OR) Why were you unable to determine the gender of person A? (free response)
- Please explain briefly; feel free to cite quotes from the dialogue or your experiences

Based on the conversation above, what gender is person B?

[ ] Male
[ ] Female
[ ] Cannot determine

What helped you determine the gender of the person? (OR) Why were you unable to determine the gender of person B? (free response)
- Please explain briefly; feel free to cite quotes from the dialogue or your experiences

[CONVERSATION 2]

The following is a conversation between person A (MALE) and person B (FEMALE). Select any and all statements, if any, in the conversation that are misogynistic*
- Misogynistic (adj): prejudiced against women

A: Did you see her picture?
A: You should dress more like her.
A: There’s a reason guys don’t find you attractive.
B: I don’t know. If I had the time and money I would.
B: But then again, I have better things to do than to spend my time on looks.
B: I wouldn’t feel too comfortable with all that makeup on anyways.
A: Yeah. I never understood how they have time to put on makeup every morning.
A: Don’t they have other things they want to do in that time?
A: If they spent as much time on studying as they do on shopping..
B: But I guess they do look pretty.
B: Guys like it.
B: I mean no one finds me attractive..
B: I should start my diet again.
B: Then hopefully I can find a boyfriend by Christmas.
A: You don’t need to lose weight.
A: You don’t have time for that.
A: Not everyone has the time to spend on plastering on makeup.
A: You’re not like the other girls.
A: You have strong values.
B: Thank you.
[ ] There are no misogynistic statements

Based on the conversation above, who is misogynistic?

[ ] A (male)
[ ] B (female)
[ ] Both
[ ] Neither
[ ] Cannot Determine

If you chose “cannot determine” for the previous question, why?

[CONVERSATION 3]

The following is a conversation between person A (FEMALE) and person B (FEMALE). Select any and all statements, if any, in the conversation that are misogynistic*

* Misogynistic (adj): prejudiced against women

A: Did you see her picture?
A: You should dress more like her.
A: There’s a reason guys don’t find you attractive.
B: I don’t know. If I had the time and money I would.
B: But then again, I have better things to do than to spend my time on looks.
B: I wouldn’t feel too comfortable with all that makeup on anyways.
A: Yeah. I never understood how they have time to put on makeup every morning.
A: Don’t they have other things they want to do in that time?
A: If they spent as much time on studying as they do on shopping..
B: But I guess they do look pretty.
B: Guys like it.
B: I mean no one finds me attractive..
B: I should start my diet again.
B: Then hopefully I can find a boyfriend by Christmas.
A: You don’t need to lose weight.
A: You don’t have time for that.
A: Not everyone has the time to spend on plastering on makeup.
A: You’re not like the other girls.
A: You have strong values.
B: Thank you.
[ ] There are no misogynistic statements

Based on the conversation above, who is misogynistic?

[ ] A (female)
[ ] B (female)
[ ] Both
[ ] Neither
[ ] Cannot Determine

If you chose “cannot determine” for the previous question, why?
[FINAL QUESTIONS]

How strongly do you identify with traditional gender norms*?
*traditional gender norms: traditionally practiced ideas of masculinity and/or femininity

[ ] Strongly
[ ] Moderately
[ ] Weakly

How strongly do you identify with progressive gender norms*?
*progressive gender norms: progressive ideas of masculinity and/or femininity
(i.e.) both men and women should share responsibilities for childcare, women are independent, etc.

[ ] Strongly
[ ] Moderately
[ ] Weakly

Do you believe gender is an essential component in defining your identity and your experiences?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Other: (open answer)

Do you identify as a feminist?
*feminism: the advocacy of women’s rights on the basis of the equality of the sexes

[ ] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Neutral

If you chose “No” or “Neither”, why? (choose all that apply)

[ ] I haven’t thought about it before
[ ] It doesn’t have anything to do with me
[ ] I believe in gender equality not feminism
[ ] Gender discrimination and sexism are not real
[ ] Feminism is too extreme
[ ] Other : (open answer)

Please feel free to leave any comments or thoughts about this survey. (free response)

Thank you for your participation!
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