Lay misperceptions of the relationship between men's benevolent and hostile sexism

by

Amy W.Y. Yeung

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2012

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

Although there is a reliably positive association between hostile (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS), lay perceptions of this association have not been directly tested. I predicted that people perceive an illusory negative association between men's HS and BS attitudes because lay theories expect men to have univalent attitudes toward women. In Study 1, I manipulated the target's gender and responses on a subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (high HS, low HS, high BS, or low BS). The low BS male target (compared to high BS male target) was judged to be higher on HS, less supportive of female professionals, less good of father and husband, and more likely to perpetrate domestic violence. Ratings of the low BS male target were as equally negative as those of the high HS male target. In Study 2, low BS male targets were judged to be low in hostility towards women only if they explicitly stated that their low BS was motivated by egalitarian values, otherwise men's low BS was assumed to indicate misogyny. Implications of the misconception of BS in men and future directions are discussed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Richard Eibach for his support, patience, and encouragement throughout the past two years; this work would not be possible without his guidance every step of the way. Thank you to my thesis readers, Steve Spencer and Ramona Bobocel, for taking their time to review and offering helpful feedback on this thesis. I would also like to thank the rest of the social division faculty, and Mike Ross in particular, for providing encouragement and valuable suggestions on this line of research. Finally, thank you to my fellow students in the social division – I simply could not have asked for a more collaborative, inspiring, or supportive group of friends and colleagues.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

INTRODUCTION

Chivalry is a code of conduct that encompasses the traditional ways that men have valued women in Western culture. Specifically, chivalry instructs men to behave courteously and give preferential treatment to women. Feminists have critiqued chivalry as a problematic tradition that contributes to maintaining patriarchal power over women. They have thus called upon men and women to reject chivalrous codes of conduct and instead treat men and women as equals. However, the feminist critique of chivalry has faced considerable resistance and many people lament that gestures once considered kind and polite are now unjustly deemed undesirable and offensive. It is often claimed that feminists should focus on tackling "real sexism" instead of bickering over trivial matters like chivalry.

The feminist critique of chivalry may face a particularly serious challenge recruiting men to reject chivalrous norms. Men who are ideologically committed to gender equality may worry that their overt rejection of chivalry will be misunderstood by others. Given that chivalry represents the traditional way that men have valued women, men who reject chivalry may worry that they will be seen as not valuing women at all rather than valuing them as equals. In other words men may worry that if they behave unchivalrously towards women they will be labeled as misogynists rather than egalitarians. Since chivalry is subjectively positive in tone and is often seen as demonstrating men's positive attitudes toward women, men who reject it may be perceived as having hostile attitudes toward women The reputational risks that men may face in rejecting chivalry could be a significant barrier to feminist social change because reforming sexist traditions likely requires the shared efforts of both men and women. To investigate this potentially important barrier to feminist change, this thesis reports two studies that test the hypothesis that men who reject chivalry are vulnerable to being misperceived as misogynists.

Sexism as antipathy

Allport's (1954) definition of prejudice as an antipathy has set the course of research on prejudice in social psychology. Naturally, research on sexism has followed this trajectory in the study of old-fashioned sexism (Attitudes Toward Women Scale; Spence et al., 1973) and contemporary forms of sexism (Modern Sexism Scale; Swim et al, 1995; and Neosexism Scale, Tougas et al., 1995). This

conceptualization of sexism, while tremendously important for theoretical and practical reasons, failed to capture the more complex, multi-valenced attitudes that people have toward women.

The "women are wonderful" effect (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; 1993) was coined after the finding that both men and women have more favourable views toward women than toward men, such that people have a general tendency to attribute positive or pleasant traits to women but attribute negative or unpleasant traits to men. Indeed, the idea that attitudes toward women are often polarized was not new, from Freud's concept of the Madonna-whore complex to the more recent concept of the pedestal/gutter syndrome (Tavris & Wade, 1984). These concepts capture the way that women are often viewed in polarized terms such that they are either categorized as saints who are pure and deserving of being placed on a pedestal, or harlots who are immoral and undeserving of respect.

The traditional idea of sexism as antipathy assumes that sexist attitudes toward women are only negatively-valenced and does not account for the *subjectively positive* attitudes toward women that often go hand in hand with sexist antipathy. This conceptualization of sexism remained unchallenged until Glick and Fiske (1996) presented their theory which reconciled these ambivalent attitudes toward women.

Ambivalent Sexism Theory

Ambivalent Sexism Theory (AST; Glick & Fiske, 1996) conceptualizes sexism as a mixed-valence construct consisting of two broad components: *hostile sexism* and *benevolent sexism*. Ambivalent attitudes toward women stem from men's interdependence with women: while men have higher social status and wish to maintain power, they are also dependant on women for heterosexual intimacy and reproduction. On one hand, hostile sexism (HS) describes negatively-valenced attitudes toward women that are commonly recognized as sexist, such as beliefs that feminists seek to overpower men and women try to control men using their sexuality. On the other hand, benevolent sexism (BS) describes seemingly positive but patronizing views that promote traditional gender roles and depict women as weak, pure creatures who deserve men's protection and adoration.

Benevolent sexism can be further broken down into three subcomponents. *Protective paternalism* dictates that men should protect and care for women, such as rescuing them first in disasters or providing

for them financially. *Complementary gender differentiation* allows women to compensate for their lower

social status by ascribing positive traits to women in domains that do not challenge male authority, such

as viewing women as being morally superior or having a more sophisticated sense of culture.

Heterosexual intimacy romanticizes women as objects of admiration to be placed on pedestals and renders

men as incomplete unless they have the love of a good woman.

Hostile and benevolent sexism: Ambivalent allies in justifying inequality

Unlike hostile sexism, benevolent sexism is often not seen as problematic due to its subjectively

positive content. Putting women on a pedestal may be deemed "nice," "romantic," or even "respectful" to

women. However, HS and BS are complementary in maintaining gender inequality: while BS serves as a

"reward" for women who embrace traditional gender roles, HS serves as a "punishment" for women who

threaten the status quo. Together, HS and BS are the carrot and stick that confine women to traditional

gender roles. Indeed, research has well-established that HS and BS are complementary forms of sexism.

On the individual level, HS and BS scores have been found to correlate in the .40 to .50 range in the

United States (Glick & Fiske, 1996). On a broader level, a cross-national study conducted in 19 countries

demonstrated a strong positive correlation *(r = .89)* between national averages on HS and BS, which in

turn predict gender inequality on objective measures (Glick et al., 2000).

There is also evidence that exposure to BS leads to increased support for the status quo (Jost &

Kay, 2005) and undermines women's engagement in collective action for social change (Becker &

Wright, 2011). Misperception of the relationship between HS and BS also pose implications for women's

everyday lives. For example, women are more likely to accept being controlled by their male partners if

the restrictions are imposed in a protective paternalistic tone (Moya et al., 2007). Moreover, both HS and

BS positively correlate with attitudes that legitimize wife abuse (Glick et al., 2002). Disguised in positive

overtones, BS remains inconspicuous and unchallenged in daily situations, and is typically not recognized

as sexist. Indeed, Barreto and Ellemers (2005) found that benevolent sexists are evaluated more positively

than hostile sexists, and are also less likely to be perceived as sexist. As a result, people tend to

underestimate the negative impact of BS relative to women's reports of their actual experiences with BS

(Bosson, Pinel, & Vandello, 2009). Another troubling implication is that women, unaware of its negative consequences, may even endorse BS as a self-protective strategy in order to avoid hostile sexist backlash from men – simply informing women of men's hostile views (vs. neutral or positive views) toward women increased their endorsement of BS (Fischer, 2006).

Lay people's beliefs about the relationship between HS and BS

Given that sexism has traditionally been considered a univalent construct, and that the AST was a relatively recent development in the field of social psychology, the question of how lay people conceptualize sexism arises. Do lay people mistakenly think that sexism consists only of antipathy towards women, or do they accurately understand the relationship between HS and BS? I will first outline the contributions and limitations of two papers that have examined this question, and then discuss the ways in which my thesis extends on these works.

Kilianski and Rudman (1998) examined whether women "wanted it both ways" by endorsing BS while rejecting HS. Using items from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) to create profiles of nonsexist, hostile sexist, and benevolent sexist targets, they had female participants read and rate the likeability of the three profiles. As a measure of whether women perceived a relationship between HS and BS, participants were also asked to indicate the likelihood that the hostile sexist profile and benevolent sexist profile described the same person. The authors found that women considered it unlikely that the hostile sexist and benevolent sexist profiles belonged to the same person, especially among women who highly approved of the benevolent sexist while disapproving of the hostile sexist. Based on these findings, the authors suggested that women do not accurately perceive the link between HS and BS.

The study was followed-up by Bohner, Ahlborn, and Steiner (2010), who challenged that Kilianski and Rudman did not include an ambivalent sexist target, which was critical in order to make the claim that women do not see a relationship between HS and BS. The authors also found Kilianski and Rudman's findings to be difficult to interpret as the procedure may have induced demand characteristics or a motivation to maintain consistency, since participants were first informed that the profiles belonged to different people at the start of the study but were asked the likelihood of the profiles belonging to the

same person after evaluating them. To address these limitations, Bohner et al. used the ASI to create profiles of non-sexist (low BS, low HS), hostile sexist (low BS, high HS), benevolent sexist (high BS, low HS), and ambivalent sexist (high BS, high HS) targets, and asked female participants to read and rate each profile on likeability and typicality. They found that women rated the benevolent sexist as the most likeable but least typical, and that the ambivalent sexist was rated as most typical. Based on these findings, Bohner et al. concluded that women are aware of the link between HS and BS.

While Bohner et al.'s work addressed some of the limitations in Kilianski and Rudman's study, it also contained some methodological ambiguities. First, the study used a within-subjects design such that participants read and rated all four target profiles. Even though order effects of the profiles were controlled for using a Latin square design for counterbalancing, participants were allowed to look at all four profiles while completing the target evaluations. Although participants were not asked to make comparative evaluations of the targets, given the context of multiple ratings, it was unclear if participants' judgments of each target have been influenced by contrast effects. Second, because the study used a within-subjects design, all profiles must contain information on both components of sexism. For example, the benevolent sexist responses consisted of agreement with BS items and disagreement with HS items, and the hostile sexist responses consisted of agreement with HS items and disagreeing with BS items. As a result, it was unclear whether participants were responding to information pertaining to HS or BS in the profiles. This ambiguity can be overcome by manipulating only one type of sexism (HS vs. BS) and also manipulating the level of sexism (high vs. low). Third, and perhaps most importantly, typicality was used as a proxy for the perceived link between HS and BS. Bohner et al. argued that if women recognize a link between HS and BS, then they would rate the ambivalent sexist profile as the most typical. In order to assess lay people's perceptions about the link between HS and BS accurately, a clearer method would be to directly measure the inferences that they make about the target's attitudes and behaviours.

Building on the work of Kilianski and Rudman (1998) and Bohner et al. (2010), this thesis addresses the limitations discussed above by employing a between-subjects design, manipulating the level of one sexism component only, and directly measuring inferences about the target's attitudes and

5

behaviours toward women. An advantage to this approach is that it more closely mirrors real-life contexts, as lay perceivers often try to infer a target's broader attitudes from snippets of attitude expressions (e.g., a woman may try to infer her date's attitudes toward women from his offer to hold a door open for her). In addition, unlike previous work that has assessed only whether women perceive a link between HS and BS in male targets, this thesis examines both men's and women's perceptions of the HS-BS link in targets of both genders.

Overview of Studies

Since women have traditionally been valued as moral exemplars and innocent creatures that should be protected by men, disagreement with this notion could be interpreted differently depending on the target's gender. For example, if a woman disagrees with benevolent sexist ideas, then people may think that she views women and men on equal terms, as they may think it unlikely that she has negative feelings about her own gender. However, if a man disagrees with benevolent sexist ideas, then people may misattribute his beliefs to misogyny, since he is not valuing women in the traditional manner that people have been taught to. Based on this line of reasoning, I predicted that both male and female perceivers will assume that men, but not women, have univalent attitudes toward women. If people do assume univalent attitudes in men, then the male target's level of BS will influence his perceived level of HS, such that low (high) BS men will be rated as more (less) hostile towards women. A female target's level of BS, however, will have less impact on perceptions of her levels of hostility toward women.

This thesis reports two studies that examine lay people's perception of the relationship between men's HS and BS. Similar to previous work (Bohner et al., 2010; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998), participants were presented with target profiles and completed dependent measures about the target. In Study 1, I tested if laypeople misperceive the relationship between men's HS and BS attitudes by manipulating target information on one component of sexism and directly measuring the target's predicted score on the other component of sexism. In Study 2, I tested the role of attributional ambiguity in laypeople's misconceptions of BS in men by manipulating the attribution for the target's rejection of BS and directly measuring the target's predicted level of HS.

6

In both studies, I also measured participants' inferences about the target's attitudes and behaviours (e.g., support for female professionals, quality as a spouse and parent, and propensity for abusiveness). If people indeed have misconceptions about the relationship between men's HS and BS, then they would make more negative inferences about the low BS male target than the high BS male target. Thus, in Study 1, I expected that the low BS male target would be rated as more hostile towards women than the low BS female target and the high BS male target, but level of BS would have less impact on evaluations of the female target. In Study 2, I expected that the low BS male target who endorses egalitarian beliefs would be rated as less hostile toward women than the low BS male target who did not explicitly endorse egalitarian beliefs, but ratings of the low BS female target would be less affected by endorsement of egalitarianism.

CHAPTER TWO

TWO STUDIES INVESTIGATING LAY MISPERCEPTIONS OFTHE LINK BETWEEN HOSTILE

AND BENEVOLENT SEXISM.

Study 1: Misperceptions of the HS-BS link

Study 1 experimentally tested whether laypeople's theories of sexism lead them to assume that

men, but not women, have univalent attitudes toward women, by using a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ between-subjects

factorial design that experimentally manipulated target gender (female vs. male), sexism type (benevolent

vs. hostile seism), and sexism level (low vs. high). I was interested in what kinds of inferences people

would make about the target based on having information about the target's HS or BS. If people have

misconceptions about the relationship between men's HS and BS, then they may falsely attribute high HS

to the low BS male target and low HS to the high BS male target. Thus, I predicted that the low BS male

target would be perceived as more hostilely sexist, less supportive of female professionals, less good of a

spouse and parent, and more likely to perpetrate domestic violence than the high BS male target. In

contrast, regardless of the female target's level of BS, it is counterintuitive to assume that the target has a

negative view of her gender. Thus, I also predicted that the female targets' level of BS would have a

weaker effect on target evaluations.

Method

Participants. Three-hundred and ninety-six American adults (248 females, 146 males, and 2

unidentified; aged 17-65, $M = 31.6$) participated in the study for $0.50 USD via Amazon's Mechanical

Turk. No participants correctly guessed the purpose or hypotheses of the study when probed for

suspicion, therefore no participants have been excluded from analysis.

Procedure and materials. Participants were self-selected for an online study on person

perception and response prediction, in which they were given information about a target who was

allegedly a participant from a previous study. I manipulated the target's gender, as well as the level and

type of sexism in the target's survey response, resulting in 8 different target profiles.

Half the participants were shown survey responses from a male target and the other half were shown responses from a female target. Level of sexism was manipulated in the target's indication of moderate agreement (high sexism) or moderate disagreement (low sexism) with items from either the benevolent sexism subscale (e.g., "Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess", Appendix A) or the hostile sexism subscale (e.g., "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men", Appendix B). Immediately after viewing the target's responses on one subscale of the ASI, participants had the opportunity to provide open-ended comments about any thoughts they had about the target. Then, participants in the hostile sexist target condition (those who were given the target's response on the HS subscale) predicted the target's responses on the BS subscale ($\alpha = .90$). Participants in the benevolent sexist target condition (those who were given the target's response on the BS subscale) predicted the target's responses on the HS subscale ($\alpha = .95$). The HS and BS subscale items used a 6-point response format (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree).

Participants were then given additional measures about their impression of the target. The target's support for female professionals ($\alpha = .94$, Appendix C) was measured using 5 items (e.g., "How likely is this person to vote for a policy aiming to increase women's participation in fields where they are currently underrepresented?"). The target's quality as a spouse or parent ($\alpha = .90$, Appendix D) was measured using 3 items (e.g., "How likely is this person to be a good husband/wife?"). The target's likelihood of perpetrating domestic violence ($\alpha = .90$, Appendix E) was measured using 4 items (e.g., "How likely is this person to be physically abusive toward his/her spouse?"). The items used a 10-point response format (1 = not at all likely, 10 = extremely likely).

After responding to measures on their impression of the target, participants completed the ASI and demographics question, followed by a suspicion check and debriefing.

Results

The analyses for prediction of target's BS and HS scores were conducted separately, since only participants in the BS target condition predicted the target's HS and only participants in the HS target condition predicted the target's BS. The analyses for the target's support for female professionals, quality

as a spouse and parent, and propensity for perpetrating domestic violence were conducted with the full sample and included sexism type as a factor in the models.

Prediction of target's BS score. I conducted a 2 (Participant Gender: female vs. male) × 2 (Target Gender: male vs. female) × 2 (Sexism Level: high vs. low) ANOVA predicting estimates of the target's scores on the BS subscale. There was a significant main effect of participant gender, such that male participants predicted higher BS in the target than did female participants ($M_{FEMALE} = 3.12$, $SD_{FEMALE} = .89$, $M_{MALE} = 3.59$, $SD_{MALE} = .97$, $F(1, 186) = 11.91$, $p < .001$). The Target Gender × HS Level interaction did not reach significance, $F(1, 186) = 2.15$, $p = .14$). No other main effects or interactions reached significance (all $ps > .113$) and no significant simple effects were obtained (Table 1).

Prediction of target's HS score. Next, I conducted a 2 (Participant Gender: female vs. male) × 2 (Target Gender: male vs. female) × 2 (Sexism Level: high vs. low) ANOVA predicting estimates of the target's HS scores. There was a main effect of target gender, such that the female target ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.00$) was rated lower on hostile sexism than the male target ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.08$), $F(1, 192) = 44.40$, $p < .001$. The main effect was qualified by a significant Target Gender × BS Level interaction, $F(1, 192) = 19.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .093$. No other main effects or interactions reached significance (all $ps > .286$).

Simple effects analyses were conducted to test the study hypotheses (Table 2). The low BS male target ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.12$) was rated as more hostilely sexist than the low BS female target ($M = 2.29$, $SD = .869$, $F(1, 192) = 81.60$, $p < .001$) and the high BS male target ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .952$, $F(1, 192) = 9.78$, $p = .002$). The low BS female target was rated lower on hostile sexism than the high BS female target ($M = 3.09$, $SD = .959$, $F(1, 192) = 24.08$, $p < .001$).

Next, I conducted 2 (Participant Gender: female vs. male) × 2 (Target Gender: male vs. female) × 2 (Sexism Level: high vs. low) × 2 (Sexism type: BS or HS) ANOVAs for each of the following three dependent measures.

Support for female professionals. There was a main effect of Target Gender, such that the female target was rated as more supportive of female professionals than the male target ($M_{FEMALE} = 6.69$, $SD_{FEMALE} = 2.07$, $M_{MALE} = 5.33$, $SD_{MALE} = 2.15$, $F(1, 378) = 52.21$, $p < .001$). The main effect was

Table 1

Means and SD of BS prediction by HS target condition

	low HS	high HS
female	3.35_a	3.58_a
	(0.874)	(1.06)
male	3.21_a	3.13_a
	(0.990)	(0.853)

Note. Means not sharing the same subscript are statistically

different at $p < .001$.

Table 2

Means and SD of HS prediction by BS target condition

	low BS	high BS
female	2.29_a	3.09_b
	(0.869)	(0.959)
male	4.07_c	3.45_b
	(1.12)	(0.952)

Note. Means not sharing the same subscript are statistically different at $p < .001$.

qualified by a significant Target Gender $\times$ Sexism Type $\times$ Sexism Level interaction, $F(1, 378) = 18.866$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .048$.

I found that sexism type interacted significantly with sexism level for both the female target, $F(1, 378) = 15.75$, $p < .001$, and the male target, $F(1, 378) = 99.00$, $p < .001$. Further decomposing these results into simple effects (Table 3), I found that the low BS male target ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 1.70$) was rated as less supportive of female professionals than the high BS male target ($M = 6.04$, $SD = 1.89$, $F(1, 378) = 25.71$, $p < .001$) and the low BS female target ($M = 7.21$, $SD = 1.51$, $F(1, 378) = 71.30$, $p < .001$). Support ratings of the low BS male target and the high HS male target ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 1.63$) were not significantly different, $F(1, 378) = 1.97$, $p = .161$.

Quality as a spouse and parent. There was a main effect of target gender, such that the female target was rated as a better spouse and parent than the male target ($M_{FEMALE} = 7.30$, $SD_{FEMALE} = 1.83$, $M_{MALE} = 6.76$, $SD_{MALE} = 2.12$, $F(1, 378) = 8.86$, $p = .003$). The main effect of Target Gender was qualified by a significant Target Gender $\times$ Sexism Type $\times$ Sexism Level 3-way interaction, $F(1, 378) = 29.219$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .072$.

I found that sexism type interacted significantly with sexism level for the male target, $F(1, 378) = 72.47$, $p < .001$, but not the female target, $F(1, 378) = .956$, $p = .329$. Further decomposing these results into simple effects analyses (Table 4), I found that the low BS male target ($M = 5.26$, $SD = 2.22$) was rated as less good of a spouse and parent than the low BS female target ($M = 7.49$, $SD = 1.82$, $F(1, 378) = 39.01$, $p < .001$) and the high BS male target ($M = 7.86$, $SD = 1.65$, $F(1, 378) = 24.46$, $p < .001$). In addition, ratings of the low BS male target's quality as a spouse and parent were not significantly different from ratings of the high HS male target ($M = 5.87$, $SD = 1.68$, $F(1, 378) = 2.91$, $p = .089$)

Likelihood of perpetrating domestic violence. There was a main effect of target gender, such that the male target ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 2.13$) was rated as more likely to perpetrate domestic violence then the female target ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.74$, $F(1, 378) = 19.24$, $p < .001$). The main effect of Target Gender was qualified by a significant Target Gender $\times$ Sexism Type $\times$ Sexism Level 3-way interaction: $F(1, 378) = 27.513$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .068$.

Table 3

Means and SD of perceived support for female professionals by target condition

	low BS	high BS	low HS	high HS
female	7.21_a	6.88_a	7.54_a	4.93_c
	(1.51)	(2.06)	(1.65)	(2.13)
male	4.27_b	6.04_c	7.23_d	3.77_b
	(1.70)	(1.89)	(1.33)	(1.63)

Note. Means within columns and rows that do not share the

same subscript are statistically different at $p < .05$.

Table 4

Means and SD of perceived quality as spouse and parent by target condition

	low BS	high BS	low HS	high HS
female	7.49 $_a$	7.44$_a$	7.50$_a$	6.71 $_c$
	(1.82)	(1.78)	(1.81)	(1.89)
male	5.26 $_b$	7.86$_a$	8.03$_a$	5.87 $_b$
	(2.22)	(1.65)	(1.32)	(1.68)

Note. Means within columns and rows that do not share the same subscript are statistically different at $p < .05$.

I found that sexism type interacted significantly with sexism level for the male target, $F(1, 378) =$ 33.83, $p < .001$, but not the female target, $F(1, 378) = 2.41$, $p = .121$. Further decomposing these results into simple effects analyses (Table 5), I found that the low BS male target ($M = 4.96$, $SD = 2.30$) was rated as more likely to be abusive than the low BS female target ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.69$, $F(1, 378) = 45.41$, $p < .001$) and the high BS male target ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 2.15$, $F(1, 378) = 11.04$, $p < .001$), but also equally likely to be abusive as the high HS male target ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 1.90$, $F(1, 378) = 1.34$, $p = .248$).

Discussion

Prediction of the target's hostile sexism yielded the predicted Target Gender × Benevolent Sexism Level interaction. The results suggest that while people expect men to have univalent attitudes toward women, they do not expect women to have univalent attitudes toward women. Whereas the low BS female target was perceived as less hostile toward women than the high BS female target, the opposite pattern emerged for the male target: the low BS male target was perceived to be more hostile than the high BS male target and low BS female target, but also equally hostile as the high HS male target.

The Target Gender × Hostile Sexism Level interaction was not significant in analyses of participants' perceptions of the target's benevolent sexism. This may in part be due to subtyping – specifically, the hostile sexism subscale refers to attitudes about feminists and women who "complain" about gender discrimination or seek to challenge male authority. As such, participants may not think that the target's responses on the hostile sexism subscale are diagnostic of the target's attitudes toward traditional women (e.g., mothers and homemakers). That is, while the low BS male target may be judged as having hostilely sexist attitudes toward *all* women for not appreciating traditional women (who are the most "deserving" of paternalistic protection), the high HS male target (who dislikes non-traditional women) may still be judged as having some benevolently sexist attitudes toward *traditional* women.

Participants' open-ended responses about the target suggest that the low BS male target was perceived with greater ambiguity compared with other targets, such that there was less consistency in the content of the open-ended responses. For example, the low BS male target was perceived as uninterested in women or hostile towards women (e.g., "I believe through his answers, he is either single and bitter,

16

Table 5

Means and SD of perceived propensity to abusiveness
by target condition

	low BS	high BS	low HS	high HS
female	2.50_c	3.76_a	2.79_c	3.16_{ac}
	(1.69)	(1.96)	(1.51)	(1.60)
male	4.96_b	3.74_a	2.49_c	4.53_b
	(2.30)	(2.15)	(1.15)	(1.90)

Note. Means within columns and rows that do not share the

same subscript are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

homosexual and not interested in women, or has a girlfriend or wife but does not respect her"), a supporter of equality (e.g., "He seems to see women as equal to men,") or ambiguous (e.g., "It is hard to tell if he either does not like women, or simply sees them as equal to men"). In contrast, comments about the low BS female target were more consistently favourable in tone even when the participant disagreed with the target's views, conveying an impression that the target was strong (e.g., "She feels a man does not have to provide for a woman. She seems to be a modern and independent woman") and condoned egalitarian values (e.g., "Seems like she thinks men and women are quite equal, and may even be somewhat 'feminist'"). While participants attributed the female target's low BS to egalitarianism, their attributions for the male target's low BS were highly negative or very ambiguous. This finding supports the idea that men who reject chivalry and other forms of benevolent sexism face reputational risks and may be misperceived as misogynists rather than being seen as gender egalitarians. Study 2 tested whether negative evaluations of the low BS male target were due to attributional ambiguity about the target. If negative evaluations indeed stemmed from attributional ambiguity, then reducing ambiguities about the target (e.g., by highlighting the low BS male target's egalitarian motives) should lead to more favourable evaluations of the low BS male target.

Study 2: The Role of Attributional Ambiguity in Misperceptions of the HS-BS Link

Study 2 experimentally tested whether attributional ambiguity explained laypeople's misconception of benevolent sexism in men by using a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ between-subjects factorial design that experimentally varied Target Gender (female vs. male), Target Sexual Orientation (heterosexual vs. no mention), and Target Egalitarianism (egalitarian vs. no mention). I was interested in what kind of inferences people would make about the target's rejection of BS based on information about the target's gender, sexual orientation, and egalitarian beliefs. If attributional ambiguity plays a role in people's negative evaluations of the low BS male target, then providing information about the target's sexual orientation and identification as an egalitarian should reduce the negativity of the target evaluations. Specifically, information about the (low BS) male target's egalitarian beliefs should disambiguate the target's motives

18

and lead participants to attribute the male target's low BS to egalitarianism rather than to misogyny. This information, however, should have little impact on the (low BS) female target's evaluations, as people are unlikely to attribute the female target's low BS to misogyny. Hence, I predicted that the female target's evaluations would be unaffected by the target's professed egalitarian beliefs, but the egalitarian male target would be evaluated less negatively than the control male target. I also predict that the heterosexual male target would be rated less negatively than the male target whose sexual orientation was unknown, since participants may be less likely to attribute the target's low BS to lack of interest in, and concern for, women. The sexual orientation of a female target, like target's egalitarian beliefs, should have little effect on target evaluations.

Method

      Participants. Three-hundred and ninety-eight American adults (236 females, 160 males, and 2 unidentified; aged 17-71, $M = 32.4$) participated in the study for $0.50 USD via Amazon's Mechanical Turk. No participants correctly identified the purpose or hypotheses of the study when probed for suspicion, so none have been excluded from analysis.

      Procedure and materials. Study 2 used the same procedure as Study 1, with the exception that all participants were given information about a low BS target. I manipulated the target's gender, as well as the target's sexual orientation and identification as an egalitarian.

      Half of the participants were informed that the target was heterosexual and the other half was given no information about the target's sexual orientation, leaving his or her orientation ambiguous. Information about the target's gender and sexual orientation was manipulated by the statement: "When asked about his/her views on relationships between women and men, Tom/Tina [a heterosexual man/woman] stated the following". Immediately after the previous statement, participants were shown comments allegedly made by the target in which he or she expressed disagreement with conventional BS beliefs modeled on those that are measured in the BS subscale of the ASI. The following passage, containing no direct information about the target's identification as an egalitarian, was shown to participants in the control target condition:

"I disagree with the many people who think that women should be cherished and protected by

men. You know I'm strongly against that whole idea that in a disaster women should always be

rescued before men. And I really don't agree with those who say that men should put women on a

pedestal or that men are incomplete without women in their lives. There seems to be this popular

attitude that women are more pure and moral than men and that women should therefore be

treated with greater respect than men, but I think that's a lot of nonsense."

The passage in the egalitarian target condition was prefaced by an additional sentence stating

"I'm a firm believer in equality between men and women. And because of that…" indicating that the

target's disagreement with common BS beliefs was motivated by egalitarian values.

As in Study 1, participants then predicted the target's responses on the HS subscale of the ASI (α

= .94), as well as completing measures on the target's support for female professionals (α = .92), quality

as a spouse and parent (α = .86), and likelihood of perpetrating domestic violence (α = .94).

Results

I conducted a 2 (Participant Gender: female vs. male) × 2 (Target Gender: male vs. female) × 2

(Target Identification: egalitarian vs. control) × 2 (Target Sexual Orientation: heterosexual vs. no

mention) ANOVA for each of the following dependent measures. No significant main effects or

interactions were obtained for target's sexual orientation (all *ps* > .066).

Prediction of target's HS score. The predicted Target Gender × Target Egalitarianism

interaction was not significant, $F(1, 380) = 3.52$, $p = .062$, $\eta_p^2 = .009$. No other main effects or

interactions reached significance (all *ps* > .241). Follow-up simple effects analyses revealed the predicted

pattern of results (Table 6). The egalitarian male target ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.37$) was judged to be lower on

HS as the control male target ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 1.27$). However, this difference was not significant, $F(1,$

$380) = 1.90$, $p = .16$).

Support for female professionals. There was a main effect of Target Gender, such that the

female target was rated as more supportive of female professionals than the male target ($M_{FEMALE} = 7.12$,

$SD_{FEMALE} = 2.15$, $M_{MALE} = 3.99$, $SD_{MALE} = 2.11$, $F(1, 380) = 194.81$, $p < .001$), and a main effect of Target

Table 6

Means and SD of HS prediction by
target condition

	control	egalitarian
female	3.10_a	3.34_a
	(1.22)	(1.10)
male	4.30_b	4.05_b
	(1.27)	(1.37)

Note. Means that do not share the same subscript

are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Identification, such that egalitarian targets were perceived to be more supportive than control targets ($M_{EGALITARIAN}$ = 5.84, $SD_{EGALITARIAN}$ = 2.58, $M_{CONTROL}$ = 5.23, $SD_{CONTROL}$ = 2.67, $F(1, 380)$ = 4.55, p = .034). These main effects were qualified by a significant Target Gender × Target Identification interaction, $F(1, 380)$ = 4.32, p = .038, η_p^2 = .011. No other main effects or interactions reached significance (all ps > .182).

Simple effects analyses (Table 7) indicated that the egalitarian male target (M = 4.50, SD = 2.19) was judged to be more supportive of female professionals than the control male target (M = 3.51, SD = 1.92, $F(1, 380)$ = 25.02, p < .001). Also as hypothesized, support ratings of the control and egalitarian female targets did not differ significantly ($M_{CONTROL}$ = 7.08, $SD_{CONTROL}$ = 2.08, $M_{EGALITARIAN}$ = 7.20, $SD_{EGALITARIAN}$ = 2.23, $F(1, 380)$ = .357, p = .55).

Quality as a spouse and parent. There was a main effect of target gender, such that the female target was rated as a better spouse and parent than the male target (M_{FEMALE} = 6.97, SD_{FEMALE} = 1.97, M_{MALE} = 5.23, SD_{MALE} = 2.00), $F(1, 380)$ = 62.49, p < .001). The predicted Target Gender × Target Egalitarianism interaction was not significant, $F(1, 380)$ = .697, p = .404, η_p^2 = .002, and no other main effects or interactions reached significance (all ps > .072).

Even though the predicted Target Gender × Target Egalitarianism interaction was non-significant, simple effects analyses revealed the predicted pattern of results (Table 8). The egalitarian male target (M = 5.54, SD = 2.17) was judged to be a better spouse and parent than the control male target (M = 4.95, SD = 1.78), $F(1, 380)$ = 4.44, p = .036. Also as hypothesized, support ratings of the control and egalitarian female targets did not differ significantly ($M_{CONTROL}$ = 6.91, $SD_{CONTROL}$ = 1.90, $M_{EGALITARIAN}$ = 7.02, $SD_{EGALITARIAN}$ = 2.03), $F(1, 380)$ = .157, p = .69.

Perceived propensity for abusiveness. There was a main effect of target gender, such that the male target was rated as more likely to perpetrate domestic violence then the female target (M_{MALE} = 5.46, SD_{MALE} = 2.30, M_{FEMALE} = 3.90, SD_{FEMALE} = 2.05), $F(1, 380)$ = 40.86, p < .001. The main effect was qualified by a significant Target Gender × Target Egalitarianism interaction: $F(1, 380)$ = 6.42, p = .012, η_p^2 = .017. No other main effects or interactions reached significance (all ps > .073).

Table 7

Means and SD of perceived support for
female professionals by target condition

	control	egalitarian
female	7.08_a	7.20_a
	(2.08)	(2.23)
male	3.51_b	4.50_c
	(1.92)	(2.19)

Note. Means that do not share the same subscript

are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Table 8

Means and SD of perceived quality as
spouse and parent by target condition

	control	egalitarian
female	6.91_a	7.02_a
	(1.90)	(2.03)
male	4.95_b	5.54_c
	(1.78)	(2.17)

Note. Means that do not share the same subscript

are statistically significant $p < .05$.

Consistent with the previous two dependent measures, simple effects analyses (Table 9) showed that the egalitarian male target ($M = 4.94$, $SD = 2.52$) was judged to be less likely to perpetrate domestic violence than the control male target ($M = 5.91$, $SD = 2.00$), $F(1, 380) = 10.44$, $p < .001$. Also as hypothesized, support ratings of the control and egalitarian female targets did not differ significantly ($M_{CONTROL} = 3.86$, $SD_{CONTROL} = 2.08$, $M_{EGALITARIAN} = 3.95$, $SD_{EGALITARIAN} = 2.01$, $F(1, 380) = .096$, $p = .76$).

Composite measure. Finally, a composite measure ($\alpha = .93$) was created for a more reliable index using the target's predicted HS score, support of female professionals, quality as a spouse and parent, and likelihood of perpetrating domestic violence. First, I reverse-coded the positively-valenced items (i.e., support of female professionals and quality as a spouse and parent) and recalculated the scale means. Then, I converted the four measures to standard scores and averaged these scores to form the composite measure. Thus, higher score on the composite measure indicated more negative evaluations. There was a significant main effect of target gender such that the male target ($M = .418$, $SD = .656$) was rated more negatively than the female target ($M = -.430$, $SD = .537$), $F(1, 380) = 171.32$, $p < .001$. There was also a marginally significant main effect of Target Egalitarianism, such that egalitarian targets were perceived as less negative than control targets ($M_{EGALITARIAN} = -.076$, $SD_{EGALITARIAN} = .721$, $M_{CONTROL} = .080$, $SD_{CONTROL} = .742$), $F(1, 380) = 3.76$, $p = .053$. These main effects were qualified by a significant Target Gender × Target Egalitarianism interaction, $F(1, 380) = 7.56$, $p = .006$, $\eta_p^2 = .020$.

Simple effects analyses (Table 10) demonstrated that the egalitarian male target ($M = .253$, $SD = .711$) was judged to be less negative than the control male target ($M = .565$, $SD = .565$), $F(1, 380)$ 14.10, $p < .001$. Also as hypothesized, support ratings of the control and egalitarian female targets did not differ significantly ($M_{CONTROL} = -.445$, $SD_{CONTROL} = .520$, $M_{EGALITARIAN} = -.415$, $SD_{EGALITARIAN} = .553$), $F(1, 380) = .130$, $p = .72$.

Discussion

The results of Study 2 suggest that attributional ambiguity plays a partial role in negative evaluations of men who reject BS. Evaluation of the low BS female target did not differ based on whether the target explicitly endorsed egalitarian values. For the low BS male target, however, explicit

25

Table 9

Means and SD of perceived propensity to
abusiveness by target condition

	control	egalitarian
female	3.86_a	3.95_a
	(2.08)	(2.01)
male	5.91_b	4.94_c
	(2.00)	(2.52)

Note. Means that do not share the same subscript

are statistically significant at $p < .005$.

Table 10

Means and SD of composite rating by target condition

	control	egalitarian
female	-0.445$_a$	-0.415$_a$
	(0.520)	(0.553)
male	0.565$_b$	0.253$_c$
	(0.565)	(0.711)

Note. Means that do not share the same subscript

are statistically significant at p < .001.

endorsement of egalitarian values led to less negative evaluation than when the target made no mention of egalitarian values. Although explicit endorsement of egalitarianism reduced the negativity of the evaluation of the low BS male target, a gap still persisted between the egalitarian male and female targets, such that the egalitarian male target that rejected BS was perceived more negatively than the egalitarian female target that rejected BS.

CHAPTER 3

GENERAL DISCUSSION

In this thesis I presented two studies that documented lay people's misperceptions of the link between HS and BS in male but not female targets. Psychological research finds that benevolent sexism and hostile sexism are positively correlated, such that people have ambivalent attitudes towards women across these two types of sexism. I hypothesized that lay perceivers would understand how female target's attitudes towards women might be ambivalent across the two forms of sexism, but I hypothesized that they would assume that men's attitudes towards women are more univalent. Specifically, I hypothesized that men who do not value women in conventional ways – through expression of chivalrous and benevolent sexist attitudes – would be misperceived as harboring hostility towards women. Study 1 demonstrated that men's rejection of BS was equated with high hostility toward women and their endorsement of BS was equated with low hostility toward women. Study 2 tested the hypothesis that negative evaluations of low BS male targets may be due to conflicting attributions about the meaning of low BS in men. Lay perceivers may be uncertain whether low BS attitudes in men are due to resentment of women, egalitarian attitudes, or other reasons. Consistent with this hypothesis, in Study 2 I found that perceivers attributed less hostile sexist attitudes to a male target that rejected BS if this target's rejection of BS was explicitly connected to his endorsement of egalitarian values. For female targets it was not necessary to explicitly tie rejection of benevolent sexism to egalitarianism for perceivers to see the target as having non-hostile attitudes towards women. Together, the two studies suggest that both male and female participants assumed that men, but not women, have univalent attitudes toward women, and that attributional ambiguity regarding the meaning of low BS in men was partially responsible for the negative evaluation of low BS men.

Study 1 was able to address some ambiguities raised in past research on lay perceptions of HS and BS (Bohner et al., 2010; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998). By using a between-subjects design, manipulating only one component of sexism in the target profiles (HS vs. BS), and manipulating the level of sexism (high vs. low), the target profiles more clearly captured critical information without

29

confounding information. Whereas the previous studies measured the targets' perceived typicality as a proxy for perceived link between HS and BS, the current studies measured participants' inferences through target evaluations, which more directly assessed participants' perception of the HS-BS link. Moreover, this approach more closely mirrors real-life contexts where lay perceivers try to infer target's broader attitudes from snippets of their attitude expressions.

Both men and women assumed that low BS (vs. high BS) in men was indicative of higher HS and greater likelihood of perpetrating domestic violence, but assumed that high BS (vs. low BS) in women was indicative of higher HS and greater likelihood of perpetrating domestic violence. Not only did people perceive low BS men as more hostile and negative, but they also perceived low BS men as equally hostile and negative as high HS men.

These findings have troubling implications, as misunderstanding the link between HS and BS can lead to dire consequences. Not only are ambivalent sexist men more likely to classify women in polarized subtypes, such that women are either placed on a pedestal or in the gutter (Glick et al., 1997), but ambivalent sexism is also associated with men's and women's attitudes that legitimize violence against women (Glick et al., 2002). This suggests that women may prefer to date high BS men over low BS men, based on false assumptions that high BS men are loving partners who are unlikely to mistreat them, or that low BS men would be disrespectful and abusive towards them. The misconception of BS in men may also suggest why it is difficult for some women to leave abusive relationships. On the surface, ambivalent sexist abusers may seem like doting boyfriends or husbands when they place their partners on a pedestal during the "honeymoon" phase (Cycle of Violence; Walker, 1979); however, they may also lash out violently when their partners fail to conform to their unrealistic standards. Thus, women may think that their partners could change and remain in abusive relationships, without recognizing that the male abuser's positive treatment during the "honeymoon phase" goes hand-in-hand with his abusive behaviour whenever his partner deviates from cultural ideals of femininity.

Misunderstanding the link between HS and BS can also have negative implications for men. For example, men may endorse and perpetuate BS because they falsely think that BS is equated with respect

and affection for women. Even when men may disagree with BS, however, they may be unlikely to publicly reject BS because doing so could be interpreted as a sign of misogyny, or lead others to question their sexuality and psychological health. Results of Study 2 suggest that even if men explicitly state that their rejection of BS stems from their egalitarian values, they may still suffer a reputational cost in how they are evaluated by observers.

Future Directions

One major shortcoming of Study 2 was the lack of a high BS target condition, which would be crucial in order to demonstrate that the evaluations of the low BS egalitarian and control male targets did not differ simply because egalitarian males are evaluated more positively regardless of their level of BS. I plan to address this issue in my follow-up work by replicating Study 2 with a full design consisting of both high BS and low BS targets. Additionally, Study 1 had experimentally manipulated only two levels of sexism in the target profiles (high vs. low). In order to disambiguate whether people tend to misunderstand high or low BS in men, future studies should include a condition with a moderate or average level of sexism.

Why was the low BS male target derogated even when he explicitly stated that his views were motivated by egalitarian values? If negative reactions are based solely on ambiguity, then providing further evidence of the target's egalitarian values (e.g., the target's community service or charity donations, or highlighting the target's close relationship with his daughter) should be able to eliminate the negativity in target evaluations. If ambiguity does not fully explain the derogation of the low BS male target, then perhaps broader implications, such as commitment to ideology, are involved in the process.

Given that the results of these studies established that there indeed is misconception about men's BS, another future direction of my research will be to examine the potential real-life consequences of misunderstanding the link between HS and BS in men, such as women's romantic preferences. Similar to prior work showing that making men's hostile attitudes toward women salient increases women's endorsement of BS (Fischer, 2006), I expect that reminding women of men's hostile behaviour (e.g.,

reading about an abusive partner) would lead to stronger preference for dating profiles of high BS men than reminding women of men's neutral or positive behaviours toward women.

It will also be important to examine whether low BS takes on different meanings to male and female perceivers, as men and women may have different motivations to defend BS. For example, women may react negatively to low BS men because they view BS as a sign of affection or protection, while men may react negatively to low BS men because of their ideas about masculinity and how "real" men ought to behave towards women. Understanding potential differences in the meaning of BS for male and female perceivers may provide insight as to how interventions could target men and women in order to increase their awareness of BS as a problem.

Interestingly, not only was low BS interpreted differently in male and female targets, but also high BS was interpreted differently based on the target's gender. In Study 1, the high BS (vs. low BS) male target was seen as less likely to be abusive, while the high BS (vs. low BS) female target was seen as more likely to be abusive. Individual item analyses indicate that the high BS female target was rated higher on likelihood of perpetrating emotional abuse, but not physical or sexual abuse. This suggests that women who strongly endorse BS may be evaluated negatively because they are seen as having a sense of female superiority or entitlement. Indeed, participants' open-ended comments about the high BS female target seem to align with this explanation (e.g., "Honestly, the woman sounds like a b****. So, women are basically perfect and men are lacking without them. In addition to that, men need to give everything to women and expect little back... I believe men should take charge of the household and take responsibility for his family and wife, but getting little back is insane") It seems, then, that while men are socially rewarded by strongly endorsing BS, women could suffer social costs by strongly endorsing BS. Future research should further explore the different meanings attributed to benevolent sexist beliefs in men and women, as well as why these attributions are dependent on the target's gender.

Last, I also plan to examine if the effects presented in this thesis are applicable to other intergroup contexts. Specifically, I will study whether people who reject positive stereotypes of racial outgroups (e.g., stereotypes that Asian-Canadians are more intelligent or that African-Canadians are more athletic

than White Canadians) are misjudged as being motivated by resentment and hostility towards the outgroup, rather than the principle that individuals should not be stereotyped based on their group membership. Positive stereotypes about racial groups, like BS, carry negative consequences for the stereotyped group such as ironically impairing group members' performance by subjecting them to the pressures of elevated expectations (Cheryan & Bodenhausen, 2000). In addition, like BS, positive racial stereotypes is often not recognized as problematic (Czopp, 2008). This may be particularly troubling since positive outgroup stereotypes are more widely endorsed than negative outgroup stereotypes (Devine & Elliot, 1995).

Conclusion

Two studies demonstrated that lay people misperceive the relationship between hostile sexism (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS) in men, but not in women. While men's endorsement of BS is viewed as a sign of a univalently positive attitude towards women, their rejection of BS is perceived as a sign of univalent sexist antipathy. Low BS men were judged as more hostile towards women than high BS men, suggesting that perceivers inferred that low BS men were indeed misogynists. Negative evaluations were reduced when men's rejection of BS was attributed to egalitarian values, supporting the hypothesis that ambiguity about the motivations for low BS in men was partially responsible for the attribution of hostile sexist attitudes to low BS men.

References

Allport, G. (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: how it contributes to the

maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*(5), 633–642.

doi:10.1002/ejsp.270

Bohner, G., Ahlborn, K., & Steiner, R. (2009). How Sexy are Sexist Men? Women's Perception of Male

Response Profiles in the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. *Sex Roles*, *62*(7-8), 568–582.

doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9665-x

Bosson, J. K., Pinel, E. C., & Vandello, J. A. (2009). The Emotional Impact of Ambivalent Sexism:

Forecasts Versus Real Experiences. *Sex Roles*, *62*(7-8), 520–531. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9664-y

Cheryan, S., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). When positive stereotypes threaten intellectual performance:

The psychological hazards of "model minority" status. *Psychological Science, 11*, 399-402.

Czopp, A. M. (2008). When is a compliment not a compliment? Evaluating expressions of positive

stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(2), 413–420.

Devine, P. G., & Elliot, A. J. (1995). Are Racial Stereotypes Really Fading? The Princeton Trilogy

Revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*(11), 1139 –1150.

doi:10.1177/01461672952111002

Eagly , A. H. Mladinic , A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality

and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *15,* 543-558.

Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1993). Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers from research

on attitudes, gender stereotypes, and judgments of competence. In W. Stroebe & M.

Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp.1–35). New York: Wiley.

Fischer, A. R. (2006). Women's benevolent sexism as reaction to hostility. *Psychology of Women

Quarterly*, *30*(4), 410–416.

Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 1323-1334.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(3), 491.

Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Souza, M. A. de. (2002). Ambivalent Sexism and Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *26*(4), 292 – 297. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068

Glick, P., et al. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 763-775.

Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *88*(3), 498–509.

Killianski, S. E., & Rudman, L. A. (1998). Wanting it both ways: Do women approve of benevolent sexism? *Sex Roles, 39,* 333-352.

Moya, M., Glick, P., Expósito, F., de Lemus, S., & Hart, J. (2007). It's for your own good: Benevolent Sexism and women's reactions to protectively justified restrictions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*(10), 1421–1434.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2(4)*, 219-220.

Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(2), 199-214. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199

Tavris, C., & Wade, C. (1984). The longest war (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus Ça Change, Plus C'est Pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*(8), 842 –849. doi:10.1177/0146167295218007

Walker, L. E. (1979) *The Battered Woman*. New York: Harper and Row.

Low BS Target Profile

Instructions: Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

2. In a disaster, women ought to be rescued before men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

3. People are rarely truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

4. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

5. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

6. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

7. Men are incomplete without women.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

8. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

9. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

10. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

11. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

High BS Target Profile

Instructions: Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

2. In a disaster, women ought to be rescued before men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

3. People are rarely truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

4. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

5. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

6. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

7. Men are incomplete without women.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

8. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

9. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

10. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

11. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

Low HS Target Profile

Instructions: Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

2. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

3. Women are too easily offended.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

4. Feminists are seeking for women to have more power than men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

5. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

6. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

7. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

8. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

9. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

10. There are actually quite a few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

11. Feminists are making entirely unreasonable demands of men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

Instructions: Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

2. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

3. Women are too easily offended.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

4. Feminists are seeking for women to have more power than men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

5. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

6. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

7. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

8. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

9. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

10. There are actually quite a few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

11. Feminists are making entirely unreasonable demands of men.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

APPENDIX C

Target's Perceived Support for Female Professionals

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all likely									Extremely likely

1. How likely is this person to vote for a policy aiming to increase women's participation in fields where they are currently underrepresented?
2. How likely is this person to vote for a policy aiming to help stay-at-home moms return to the workforce?
3. How likely is this person to vote for a policy that provides incentives and loans to women who wish to start a business?
4. How likely is this person to vote for a policy aiming to increase women's average wage to match men's average wage?
5. How likely is this person to vote for a female candidate in an election?

APPENDIX D

Target's Quality as a Spouse and Parent

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all likely									Extremely likely

1. How likely is this person to be a good mother/father to a son?
2. How likely is this person to be a good mother/father to a daughter?
3. How likely is this person to be a good wife/husband?

APPENDIX E

Target's Perceived Propensity for Abusiveness

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all likely									Extremely likely

1. How likely is this person to be a perpetrator of domestic violence?
2. How likely is this person to be physically violent toward her/his spouse?
3. How likely is this person to be emotionally abusive toward her/his spouse?
4. How likely is this person to sexually abuse her/his spouse?