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Based on the integration of previous research and the call for intervention research in confronting and reducing sexism, the present study utilized an intervention that explained subtle sexism and informed participants of its harm and pervasiveness. The present study then examined the effects of this intervention as well as participants’ gender on their sexist attitudes, labeling sexism, and likelihood of intervening to challenge sexism. A measure of social desirability was included to control for response biases. Data from 261 participants were analyzed in this study. Results indicated that gender predicted hostile sexist attitudes but not benevolent sexist attitudes. Neither harm nor pervasiveness predicted hostile or benevolent sexist attitudes. Results also indicated that gender predicted participants’ labeling of subtle sexism. This effect was qualified by an effect for the interaction of gender and pervasiveness on labeling sexism. Finally, the study found no effect for gender, harm, or pervasiveness on likelihood of intervening. The implications of these findings, as well as its limitations and future research directions, are discussed.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Society has progressed considerably since women were openly and legally discriminated against, but gender discrimination has not disappeared. Rather it has evolved into a more hidden, subtle, and insidious form. Understanding contemporary manifestations of sexism is critical to identifying, intervening, and reducing sexism. Researchers studying subtle manifestations of sexism draw from a variety of similar constructs in the literature, including modern sexism, everyday sexism, neosexism, ambivalent sexism, and gender microaggressions. The common thread across these terms is that they capture contemporary manifestations of sexism that are subtle, may be difficult to recognize, and have negative societal, interpersonal, and individual consequences. The purpose of the present study is to build on existing research in this area to design and test an intervention that can increase people’s recognition and labeling of subtle sexism as well as their likelihood of intervening.

Subtle Sexism Constructs

Swim, Aikin, Hall, and Hunter (1995) noted that many people are likely to hold traditional beliefs about women and believe that discrimination is no longer a problem. Those who endorse such beliefs are often not participating in obviously unequal treatment of women, but subscribe to a more subtle form of sexism, which the researchers called modern sexism (Swim, et al., 1995). According to Swim and colleagues (1995), modern sexist attitudes are characterized by denial of continued discrimination against women, antagonism toward women and their political and economic demands, and resentment toward educational and organizational policies designed to help women. For example, those who endorse modern sexist attitudes are
likely to agree with the following statements: society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement; it is hard to understand the anger of women’s groups in America; and over the past few years, the government and news media have been showing more concern about the treatment of women than is warranted by women’s actual experiences (Swim, et al., 1995).

The closely related concept of neosexism holds that contemporary sexism is manifested more subtly in the conflict between valuing egalitarian principles and residual negative feelings toward women (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995). Similar to modern sexism, neosexism is characterized by the refusal to recognize that women are discriminated against. Those who endorse neosexist attitudes do not necessarily oppose equality and can even maintain non-traditional gender roles. However, neosexism functions through denial of the existence of current discrimination and sexism against women, resentment of complaints about discrimination, and paternalistic views for women.

Another related type of subtle sexism is ambivalent sexism, which is composed of both benevolent and hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexism is inherently subtle because it consists of subjectively positive views toward women that simultaneously restrict their behavior and justify women’s subordinate status to men. For example, those who endorse benevolent sexist beliefs would likely agree with the following statements: women should be cherished and protected by men; women have a quality of purity few men possess; and no matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman (Glick & Fiske, 1996). On the other hand, hostile sexism is a more classic version of sexism consisting of
antagonistic views toward women that justify male power, promote traditional gender roles, and characterize women disparagingly to exploit them as sexual objects (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Those high in hostile sexism would likely endorse statements such as the following: women are too easily offended; women seek special favors under the guise of equality; and most women fail to appreciate all that men do for them. Though hostile sexism is typically considered more blatant and easier to recognize than other forms of subtle sexism, this hostility can manifest in subtle forms. For example, the hostility that characterizes hostile sexism underlies important components of modern sexism and neosexism, including the denial of continued discrimination against women, antagonism toward women’s demands, and paternalistic views of women.

In addition to characterizing the nature of subtle sexist attitudes, it is also important to consider manifestations of subtle sexism in women’s lived experiences. Swim, Hyers, Cohen, and Ferguson (2001) examined the incidence, nature, and impact of everyday sexism and found that, on average, women experience one to two sexist incidents each week. Swim et al. (2001) established that these incidents of sexism include traditional beliefs and behaviors regarding gender roles, degrading and demeaning comments and behaviors, and sexual objectification (Swim, et al., 2001). Examples of such experiences include the following: comments indicating that men have greater ability in gender stereotypic domains; sexist jokes; negative attitudes toward equality; and offensive comments about one’s body parts or clothing. These daily experiences are embedded in people’s lives and often encompass subtle expressions of modern, neo-, and ambivalent sexist beliefs.
Gender microaggressions offer another way to conceptualize women’s experience of subtle sexism. Gender microaggressions are defined as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative sexist slights and insults toward women” (Nadal, Hamit, Lyons, Weinberg, & Corman, 2013, p.193). These manifestations can range from subtle to overt, but the present study will focus on the subtle instances of microaggressions. The following are examples of subtle manifestations of gender microaggressions: expressing surprise that a woman is good at math; denying one’s bias toward women; believing that men and women are afforded equal political and economic opportunities; espousing traditional gender role belief; and whistling at a woman walking down the street. As with women’s experience of everyday sexism, modern, neo-, and ambivalent sexist attitudes often underlie gender microaggressions. Furthermore, research on gender microaggressions emphasizes that subtle sexism can be intentional or not and is often difficult to recognize, causing uncertainty in its perception (Sue, Capodilupo, & Holder, 2008).

Labeling Subtle Sexism

Recognizing and labeling sexism is an essential component of feminist consciousness (Downing & Roush, 1995). It is central to raising awareness of gender inequity and, in turn, challenging inequality and inspiring feminist work that still needs to be done (Liss & Erchull, 2010). In fact, according to the Confronting Prejudiced Responses Model, a model driven by prejudice reduction theory for understanding factors that promote versus inhibit the confrontation of discrimination, the first step in confronting discrimination is recognizing and labeling it as such (Ashburn-Nardo, Morris, & Goodwin, 2008). Detecting and labeling subtle sexism is particularly challenging
because rather than having immediately observable consequences, the effects of subtle sexism tend to be cumulative (Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2014). Furthermore, unless people are encouraged to pay attention to subtle sexism, it can be difficult to recognize and name because of its omnipresence (Becker & Swim, 2011). However, the commonplace nature of subtle sexism that makes it difficult to recognize combined with its deleterious cumulative effects are also precisely why it is so important to address (Swim, et al., 2001). Increasing people’s abilities to label subtle sexism may enable them to confront and combat the most common everyday manifestations of gender inequity. There is substantial variability in people’s labeling of sexist incidents (Swim, et al., 1995) and research points to several key predictors of this variability.

**Gender**

Gender is a strong, consistent predictor of labeling sexist events, with women being more likely than men to label sexist incidents as such at varying levels of subtly. For instance, regardless of the level of victim resistance or type of sexual violence, women were more likely than men to identify both sexual harassment and rape (Hannon, Kuntz, VanLaar, Williams, & Hall, 1996; Wiener, Hurt, Russell, Mannen, & Gasper, 1997). Furthermore, this gendered pattern has been demonstrated in labeling more subtle displays of sexism. For example, women were more likely than men to label sexist language, sexist beliefs, and sexist interpersonal behaviors and institutional practices as sexist or prejudicial (Blodorn, O'Brien, & Kordys, 2012; Swim, Scott, Sechrist, Campbell, & Stangor, 2003; Swim, Mallett, Russo-Devosa, & Stangor, 2005; Swim, Mallet, & Stangor, 2004). These findings support the broader literature indicating that members of marginalized groups are more likely to perceive discrimination than
members of privileged groups when discrimination is present (e.g., Inman & Baron, 1996; Operario & Fiske, 2001).

**Harm**

Another key predictor of labeling incidents of sexism is perceptions of those events as harmful, typically operationalized as wrong, inappropriate, or offensive. For example, Swim, et al. (2003) conducted a set of experiments that examined how perceptions an actor’s intent and the harm experienced by the victim impacted participants’ labeling of prejudice and discrimination. In all of the experiments, there was a main effect for harm such that potentially sexist scenarios that illustrated greater harm were associated with greater labeling of both the actor and the behavior as prejudiced and discriminatory (Swim, et al., 2003).

Even legislation in the United States is predicated upon using harm to label discrimination. In a landmark case for racial discriminaton, *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.* (1971), the Supreme Court ruled adverse impact and unintentional discrimination in employment to be illegal. This decision meant that illegal discriminatory behavior would be determined by the harm caused to the victim regardless of the intention of the perpetrator. Similar guidelines that focus on harm rather than intent have since been established in relation to workplace sexual harassment (*Harris v. Forklift Systems, Inc.*, 1993).

A recent correlational study also demonstrated that being a woman and holding hostile sexist attitudes each were associated with labeling subtle sexist incidents as such. Importantly, however, level of perceived harm fully mediated these relations (Lenzen, Moradi, & Platt, 2014). In other words, the associations of gender and sexist attitudes with labeling sexist incidents were full accounted for by level of perceived
harm. Taken together, these findings can inform the current study’s aim to increase the detection and labeling of subtle sexist events. Specifically, these findings point to perceived harm as a modifiable factor that can be targeted to increase labeling of subtle sexism. Based on this, the current study will focus on an intervention to increase participants’ perceptions of harm and, in turn labeling of sexist events.

**Experimental Manipulations to Influence Perceptions of Sexism**

Becker and Swim (2012) used a between-subjects experimental design to examine the role of perceived harm and perceived pervasiveness of benevolent sexism on endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist attitudes, evaluation of sexist dating profiles, and endorsement of a petition to address workplace sexism. In the two studies conducted, the samples consisted of German participants between the ages of 16-69 years (study 1) and 18-44 years (study 2). In the first study, participants read information defining benevolent sexism followed by descriptions of benevolent sexism as (a) harmful or not and (b) as pervasive or not. The researchers aimed to present this information in a neutral manner by avoiding words like “sexism” and “discrimination” in the description of benevolent sexism. There were a total of four experimental conditions: (1) high harm, high pervasiveness; (2) high harm, low pervasiveness; (3) low harm, high pervasiveness; (4) low harm, low pervasiveness. In addition to these four conditions, some participants were part of a control group that read text about stress in people’s lives.

After reading the texts, participants engaged in three separate tasks for researchers to gauge participants’ endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist attitudes. First, they completed the benevolent and modern sexism scales as a measure of post-experimental manipulation sexist attitudes. Next, participants evaluated the
dating profiles of one benevolent sexist, one modern sexist, and one non-sexist man. Finally, participants were shown a petition that advocated for organizations receiving incentives to hire women and asked if they agreed with the petition or not and to select the argument(s) among those provided by the researchers that supported their decision. The researchers provided antibenevolent sexist arguments for agreeing with the petition (e.g. “I agree, because by having a well-paid job, women are financially independent from their husbands”) and disagreeing with the petition (e.g. “I disagree, because women are competent enough to achieve this on their own”). Other arguments were also provided that represented modern sexist, antimodern sexist, and neutral reasons for agreeing or disagreeing with the petition, but these were excluded from analyses.

The results revealed a main effect for harm such that both men and women participants who were told that benevolent sexism is harmful, as opposed to those who were told that benevolent sexism is benign and those in the control group who read about stress, endorsed lower levels of benevolent sexist beliefs, rated the benevolent sexist man from the dating profile as more sexist (e.g., How sexist do you perceive this man to be?) and unfavorable (e.g. “How much would you like to get to know this man?” reverse coded), and more likely to select an antibenevolent argument in their petition decision. There were no significant main effects for pervasiveness; that is, information about pervasiveness did not significantly affect endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs, the labeling of the benevolent sexist dating profile as sexist or favorable, nor the selection of an antibenevolent argument in their petition decision. For the outcomes regarding modern sexism, there was a main effect for gender such that compared to women, men endorsed higher levels of modern sexist beliefs and perceived the modern
sexist dating profile as more favorable and less sexist. The results also showed that regardless of gender, participants who were told that benevolent sexism is both harmful and pervasive, as opposed to those who were told that benevolent sexism is either benign, not pervasive, or both benign and not pervasive, endorsed lower levels of modern sexist beliefs and rated the modern sexist man from the dating profile as more sexist and unfavorable. Additionally, compared to the control group, participants who were told that benevolent sexism is both harmful and pervasive endorsed lower levels of modern sexist beliefs and rated the modern sexist man from the dating profile as more unfavorable, but not as more sexist. Finally, there were no interaction effects involving gender suggesting that the experimental manipulation may have eliminated potential gender differences in the outcome variables. However, this cannot be determined with certainty because comparisons with the control group were not reported in detail. Taken together, these findings suggest that rejecting and labeling of benevolent sexism may be increased by increasing perceptions of harm whereas rejecting and labeling modern sexism may require increasing perceptions of both harm and prevalence.

In the second study, the researchers replicated elements of the first study, adding a measure of social desirability, eliminating the control group, and using only the ratings of dating profiles as the outcome measure (Becker & Swim, 2012). The findings of the second study followed the same pattern as the first despite the addition of social desirability as a covariate in the analyses. Specifically, there was a main effect for harm in the rating of the benevolent sexist dating profile, indicating that participants in the “high harm” conditions perceived the benevolent sexist profile to be less favorable and more sexist than those in the “low harm” conditions. No other effects were significant for
the favorability and sexism ratings of the benevolent sexist dating profile. Again, there was a main effect for participant gender in the rating of the modern sexist dating profile indicating that compared to women, men perceived the dating profile as more favorable and less sexist. There was also a two-way interaction effect of harm and pervasiveness for the ratings of the modern sexist profile. Simple main effects analyses revealed that the information that benevolent sexism is both pervasive and harmful increased both men and women participants’ tendency to rate the modern sexist profile as less favorable and more sexist. In contrast, the information that benevolent sexism is pervasive but not harmful did not have an effect on the favorability and sexism ratings. This shows that the first study’s results were replicated above and beyond the potential confounding role of social desirability. These are important findings that show that teaching people about the harm caused by benevolent sexism, a form of subtle sexism, can reduce sexist attitudes and promote negative evaluations of sexism. They also suggest that teaching people about the pervasiveness of sexism in addition to the harm of sexism, in some cases, may reduce sexist attitudes and promote negative evaluations of sexism.

The present study builds on Becker and Swim’s (2012) findings and prior research in several ways. Specifically, the present study extends the intervention from teaching about the harm of only benevolent sexism to teaching about the harm of various manifestations of subtle sexist incidents, including elements of modern sexism (Swim et al., 1995), neosexism (Tougas et al., 1995), ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996), everyday sexism (Swim et al., 2001), and gender microaggressions (Nadal, et al., 2013). As in Becker and Swim’s (2012) research, the present study also investigates
the role of pervasiveness in these relations. Finally, the present study adds to the focus on changing sexist attitudes as an outcome by investigating whether teaching about harm increases the labeling of sexist events and the likelihood of intervening. The focus on labeling as an outcome is important because labeling discrimination is the first step toward confronting discrimination through bystander intervention (Ashburn-Nardo, et al., 2008).

**Bystander Intervention**

In addition to increasing labeling, the present study will target participants’ willingness to confront and challenge subtle sexist events that they witness. Bystander intervention refers to help provided by someone who witnesses a problematic situation. Confronting discrimination through bystander intervention is a recently popular, successful strategy used primarily in the prevention of sexual assault (e.g. Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Katz & Moore, 2013). Its application has expanded to other domains including the reduction of school and workplace bullying (e.g. Denny, et al., 2015; van Heugten, 2011), risky driving behavior (Otto, Ward, Swinford, & Linkenbach, 2014), and notably, incidents of sexism (Brinkman, Dean, Simpson, McGinley, & Rosén, 2015).

To better understand bystander behavior in the context of sexism, Brinkman and colleagues (2015) examined factors that might influence how bystanders respond when witnessing sexism. Participants were asked to recall a time when they witnessed a woman being a target of a sexist event and select one of the options provided by the researchers that best described how they responded to that scenario. The response options were coded as confrontational when the person intervened in the situation or communicated their displeasure to the perpetrator in some way (e.g. “tried to help the
victim,” “said something to the instigator”). All other response options were coded as nonconfrontational and included responses such as “doing nothing,” “ignoring the person,” and “leaving the situation.” Additionally, participants were asked if there was a response that they wanted to utilize during the sexist event but did not use. The response options were coded as either having a desired unutilized confrontational response or not (e.g. I did everything I wanted to do”).

The findings revealed significant gender differences in participants’ reports of having an unutilized response such that women were more likely than men to report a desired, unutilized confrontation response. However, there were no significant gender differences in the use of confrontational responses. The researchers also found that women’s reported use of a confrontational response was associated positively with women’s reported engagement in feminist activism (e.g. “I have taken some actions in my personal life to reduce sexism”). The same pattern did not emerge with men. However, participants’ (men and women) reported use of a confrontational response was not associated with participants report of negative affect during the witnessed event, evaluation of cost-effectiveness of intervening (e.g. I wonder if my response would be worth the effort”), nor concerns about violating social norms while intervening (e.g. “I reflected on how my response would make me look to others”).

The reasons bystander intervention is proposed as a useful strategy are twofold. First, intervening has been shown to provide benefits during the confrontation including stopping the discriminatory behavior, disrupting discriminatory social norms, and inducing greater feeling of empowerment in the observer and target of the discrimination (Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, & Vaughn, 1994; Hyers, 2007). Second, intervening
during incidents of discrimination has been found to reduce future incidents of discrimination (Good, Moss-Racusin, & Sanchez, 2012). The present study builds on Brinkman et al.’s (2015) findings about participants’ retrospective accounts of intervening in sexist incidents and examines whether potential to intervene can be enhanced by informing people of the harm and pervasiveness of subtle sexism.

**Present Study**

Based on the integration of the research presented above and the call for intervention research in confronting and reducing sexism (Becker, Zawadzki, & Shields, 2014), the present study will utilize an intervention that explains subtle sexism and informs participants of its harm and pervasiveness. Then the present study will examine the effects of this intervention as well as participants’ gender on their sexist attitudes, labeling of sexist behavior as sexist, and likelihood of intervening. A measure of social desirability will be included in all analyses of outcome variables in order to control for response biases, specifically participants’ tendencies to respond in ways that are presumed to be desired rather than honestly. Based on prior research (e.g., Becker & Swim, 2012; Blodorn, et al., 2012), the present study will examine the following hypotheses and research questions:

**Sexist Attitudes**

- **H1a:** Gender will predict participants' hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes such that average levels of hostile and benevolent sexism will be higher among men than among women.

- **H1b:** Harm will predict participants’ hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes such that average levels of hostile and benevolent sexism will be higher among participants in the low harm conditions than participants in the high harm conditions.

- **RQ1:** Does pervasiveness interact with harm to strengthen the aforementioned effects on sexist attitudes?
Labeling Sexism

- H2a: Gender will predict participants’ labeling of subtle sexism such that average levels of labeling sexism will be higher among women than men.

- H2b: Harm will predict participants’ labeling of subtle sexism such that average levels of labeling sexism will be higher among participants in the high harm conditions than participants in the low harm conditions.

- RQ2: Does pervasiveness interact with harm to strengthen the aforementioned effects on labeling subtle sexism?

Bystander Intervention

- RQ3a: Does gender predict participants’ likelihood of intervening in the subtle sexist scenarios?

- RQ3b: Does harm or the interaction of harm and pervasiveness predict participants’ likelihood of intervening in the subtle sexist scenarios?
CHAPTER 2
METHOD

Participants

Data were collected at a large Southeastern university. A total of 278 participants submitted surveys. Participants who did not complete at least 50% of the survey (17) were excluded from analyses. No data were missing from retained participants. Thus data from 261 participants were analyzed in this study. Participants consisted of 174 first year students (66.7%), 45 second year students (17.2%), 32 third year students (12.3%), 7 fourth year students (2.7%), 2 fifth year students or beyond (0.8%), and 1 graduate student (0.4%). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 47 years (M = 18.76 years, SD = 2.23, Mdn = 18). Of these participants, 199 (76.2%) identified as women, 61 (23.4%) identified as men, and one (0.4%) identified as other non-binary gender (e.g. genderqueer). Only participants who identified as women and men were used in analyses that tested the hypotheses. The majority of participants identified as White (131; 50.2%); 45 identified as Hispanic/Latino/a American (17.2%), 32 as Asian/Asian American (12.3%), 25 as African/African American/Black (9.6%), two as Arab American/Middle Eastern (0.8%), two as Pacific Islander/Pacific Islander American (0.8%), one as American Indian/Native American (0.4%), 20 as Biracial/Multiracial (7.7%), and three as other race/ethnicity (1.1%). Seven participants (2.7%) identified as international students. Regarding sexual orientation, 213 participants identified as exclusively heterosexual (81.6%), 26 as mostly heterosexual (10%), seven as asexual (2.7%), six as exclusively lesbian or gay (2.3%), five as bisexual (1.9%), two as mostly lesbian or gay (0.8%), and one as other sexual orientation (0.4%). One participant did not identify their sexual orientation.
Procedure

Participants were recruited from an introductory level psychology course via the online research participation system. Participants were provided a link to the informed consent document, including Institutional Review Board approval of the study and the researcher’s contact information. Upon affirming that they were at least 18 years old and indicating their agreement to participate, participants were directed to the survey and completed the measures.

Participants were told that the study consists of two parts: an evaluation of “abstract” information and an evaluation of “interpersonal” information. In the first part of the study, participants were randomly assigned to one of five conditions (four experimental, one control). In the four experimental conditions, all participants read information about what constitutes sexism (see Appendix A). This information was adapted from the text used in Becker and Swim’s (2012) intervention study. The information was kept as neutral as possible by avoiding words like discrimination and sexism. Depending on the condition they were assigned to, participants read varying text concerning harm and pervasiveness. In the high harm conditions, participants read that the beliefs and behaviors described are harmful whereas in the low harm conditions, they read that the beliefs and behaviors are benign. The texts were designed to be as similar as possible, but differed in the explanation offered regarding the presence or absence of harm. In the high pervasiveness conditions, the participants read that these beliefs and behaviors are very pervasive in the United States whereas in the low pervasiveness conditions, they read that these beliefs and behaviors are not pervasive at all in the United States. In the control condition, participants read information about stress in people’s lives. The length of this text was similar to that of
the texts in the experimental conditions. Based on a pretest of conditions with a small group of undergraduate students, the average length of time it took to read each of the passages was approximately the same. To obscure the purpose of the study, all participants were asked to evaluate the information presented by answering questions that are irrelevant to the present study (whether the text is interesting, understandable, etc.). These questions also included the manipulation check for participants in the experimental conditions (described below).

The second part of the study was introduced as an evaluation of “interpersonal” information in the form of short scenarios describing various interpersonal interactions. To hide the purpose of the study, participants were told that the researchers needed some information about their personal attitudes and experiences to be able to describe the characteristics of the sample. The measures of sexist attitudes and social desirability were included at this point. Questions about the participants’ romantic relationships were also included to disguise the true purpose of the study. The measures of sexist attitudes, social desirability, and romantic relationship questions were presented randomly to reduce order effects.

Next, participants were told that they would be evaluating a series of interpersonal interactions. The participants read scenarios that described instances of subtle sexism (see Appendix B). Six scenarios describing subtle sexist incidents were adapted from previous research on labeling subtle sexism (Lenzen, et al., 2014). These scenarios were informed by prior literature on subtle sexist events including literature on gender microaggressions (e.g., Sue, 2010), examples of male privilege (e.g., McIntosh, 1998), and daily diary studies that identified traditional gender role stereotyping,
demeaning and derogatory comments and behaviors, and sexual objectification as types of daily sexist occurrences (Swim, et al., 2001). The present study found the following mean sexism labeling values for the vignettes, from lowest to highest mean: vignette four \( (M = 3.67, \ SD = 1.95) \), vignette three \( (M = 4.12, \ SD = 1.76) \), vignette one \( (M = 4.69, \ SD = 1.74) \), vignette two \( (M = 4.72, \ SD = 1.90) \), vignette five \( (M = 5.61, \ SD = 1.47) \), vignette six \( (M = 5.95, \ SD = 1.36) \). Thus, as intended, on average, the vignettes were perceived to reflect moderate levels of sexism. The vignettes were presented randomly to reduce order effects. All of the scenarios were followed by the measures assessing perception of the scenarios, labeling of sexism, and likelihood of intervening.

Finally, participants reported demographic information and were asked about their thoughts on the study to see if anyone suspected the correct purpose of the study. Upon completion, participants were debriefed on the study’s true purpose, were thanked for their participation, and were provided with contact information for the researcher and the Institutional Review Board.

**Measures**

**Manipulation Check**

To check the manipulation of harm, participants were asked “Are the types of beliefs and behaviors described in the essay harmful for women?” using a six-point Likert-type scale (0 = not at all, 5 = very much). To check the pervasiveness manipulation, participants were asked “Are the beliefs and behaviors between men and women outlined in the essay common in the United States?” using a six-point Likert-type scale (0 = not at all, 5 = very much). These manipulation checks were embedded in other filler questions meant to disguise the purpose of the study. See Appendix C for the full list of questions.
Sexist Attitudes

Sexist attitudes were assessed with the 22-item Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) used to assess hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes toward women. Sample items include "Women fail to appreciate all that men do for them" (Hostile) and "Women should be cherished and protected by men" (Benevolent). Items were rated on a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree). Item ratings were averaged to yield Hostile and Benevolent subscale scores, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of sexist attitudes. Validity evidence for ASI Hostile and Benevolent scores has been garnered across a variety of samples and includes positive associations between these scores and scores on the Attitudes toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972), the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980), the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale (Swim et al., 1995), and the Modern Sexism Scale (Swim et al., 1995; Glick & Fiske, 1996). In prior studies with undergraduate student and nonstudent samples, responses to ASI Hostile and Benevolent items have yielded good Cronbach’s alpha reliability estimates (e.g., \( \alpha = .92 \) for Hostile Sexism and \( \alpha = .85 \) for Benevolent Sexism, Glick & Fiske, 1996). In the current study, Cronbach’s alpha reliability estimates were \( \alpha = .87 \) for Hostile Sexism and \( \alpha = .83 \) for Benevolent Sexism.

Labeling Sexism

To assess labeling sexism, participants responded to the following item after each scenario: “This passage contains sexism.” This item was rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Consistent with prior studies, the labeling of sexism ratings were averaged across the six vignettes to create an overall Labeling Sexism Index (e.g. Swim, et al., 2004; Swim, et al., 2005), with higher scores indicating greater labeling of sexism across incidents.
Likelihood of Intervening

Likelihood of intervening was measured by two questions that were adapted from previous research on bystander intervention (Brinkman, et al., 2015). The first question asked “Of the following options, which best characterizes what you would want to do if you witnessed or were informed of this scenario?” The response options were adapted from those used by Brinkman et al. (2015) and included: 1) say or do something to communicate displeasure to (perpetrator), 2) say or do something to support (victim), 3) ignore the event or do nothing, 4) other. The “other” response option was followed by a text box that allowed participants to specify how they would respond. All of the “other” responses were then coded dichotomously as either challenging sexism or not challenging sexism. Specifically, intervention responses that challenge sexism (options 1 and 2) were ones in which the person indicates a desire to intervene in the situation by communicating their displeasure to the perpetrator or offering support to the victim. The third option for responding (ignore the event or do nothing) was coded as not challenging sexism. All of the participants’ open-ended responses were coded with the same parameters in mind. Therefore, all responses were coded as either challenging sexism or not challenging sexism. The second question used to assess likelihood of intervening was “How likely are you to respond in the way you indicated above if you witnessed or were informed of this scenario?” Participants responded on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = extremely unlikely to 7 = extremely likely). The first question, coded dichotomously (i.e. 0 or 1) was then multiplied by the second question which was rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (i.e. 1-7) to produce a likelihood of intervention score for each vignette. The product of the first and second questions were then averaged across the six vignettes to create an overall Likelihood of Intervention score.
with higher scores reflecting a greater likelihood of intervention. The Likelihood of Intervention score was used for the study’s analyses.

**Perception of the Scenarios**

For exploratory purposes, participants’ perceptions of the subtle sexist scenarios were assessed to determine what specific perceptions (harmfulness, wrongness, unfairness, pervasiveness) drive any observed effects. Specifically, following each scenario, participants were asked to respond to four questions about the perception of harmfulness, wrongfulness, unfairness, and pervasiveness of the scenario. To assess the perception of harmfulness, participants were asked to indicate the extent they agreed with “The scenario described is harmful.” To assess perception of wrongfulness, participants were asked to indicate the extent they agreed with “The scenario described is wrong.” To assess perception of unfairness, participants were asked to indicate the extent they agreed with “The scenario described is unfair.” Finally, to assess perception of pervasiveness, participants were asked to indicate the extent they agreed with “Scenarios like this occur commonly.” Items were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Item ratings were averaged across the six scenarios to create overall perceived harmfulness, wrongfulness, unfairness, and pervasiveness scores for the subtle sexist scenarios. Higher scores indicate greater perceived harmfulness, wrongfulness, unfairness, and pervasiveness of the incidents.

**Social Desirability**

To assess social desirability, the present study used Strahan & Gerbasi’s (1972) short version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, called the M-C 1(10). The M-C 1 (10) consists of ten true or false items. A social desirability score was created by adding items together with higher scores reflecting greater social desirability.
In a review of several social desirability measures, this scale was recommended based on its efficiency, reliability, and validity (Fischer & Fick, 1993). In prior studies with undergraduate samples, responses to items on the M-C 1 (10) yielded good Cronbach’s alpha reliability estimates (e.g. $\alpha = .88$) and was highly correlated with the standard 33-item original scale (Fischer & Fick, 1993). However, in the current sample, the M-C 1 (10) yielded poor Cronbach’s alpha reliability estimates ($\alpha = .53$).

**Demographic Information**

For descriptive purposes, participants were asked to report their age, year in school, and identification with numerous social identities including gender identity, race and ethnicity, and sexual orientation.
CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

Manipulation Check

A manipulation check was conducted to examine whether participants in the high harm condition perceived more harm in the beliefs and behaviors described than those in the low harm condition and whether participants in the high pervasiveness condition perceived that the beliefs and behaviors described were more pervasive than those in the low pervasiveness condition. A 2 (Harm: low, high) x 2 (Pervasiveness: low, high) x 2 (Gender: woman, man) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on perceived harm and pervasiveness of sexism yielded a main effect for harm and pervasiveness, $F_s > 3, p < .05$. Univariate tests revealed that participants in the high-harm conditions ($M = 4.72; SEM = .17$) perceived more harm in the beliefs and behaviors described than participants in the low-harm conditions ($M = 4.08; SEM = .18$), $F(2, 201) = 3.41, p < .05, \eta^2 = .63$. Participants in the high pervasiveness conditions ($M = 5.46; SEM = .13$) perceived that the beliefs and behaviors described were more pervasive than participants in the low pervasiveness conditions ($M = 5.06; SEM = .14$), $F(2, 201) = 3.17, p < .05, \eta^2 = .20$. Thus, the manipulation had the intended effect. Gender did not interact with the manipulation check.

Preliminary Analyses

Given the assumption that only the high harm and high pervasiveness conditions would impact participants' sexist attitudes, labeling of sexism, and likelihood of intervention behavior, it holds that the control condition, text about stress, would not differ from the low harm, low pervasiveness condition. Three one-factorial ANOVAs with five levels (condition: high harm and high pervasiveness, high harm and low
pervasiveness, low harm and high pervasiveness, low harm and low pervasiveness, control) were conducted to test differences in sexist attitudes, labeling sexism, and likelihood of intervention across conditions. Results indicated that there were no significant differences across conditions in benevolent sexism attitudes, $F(4, 256) = 1.46, p = .21$, hostile sexist attitudes, $F(4, 256) = .98, p = .42$, labeling sexism, $F(4, 256) = .64, p = .63$, or likelihood of intervention, $F(4, 256) = .92, p = .45$ (see Table 3-1). Based on these findings, and the precedent set by previous research (i.e. Becker & Swim, 2012) the remainder of the analyses did not include the control condition.

**Hypothesis Testing**

**Sexist Attitudes**

Two 2 (Harm: low, high) x 2 (Pervasiveness: low, high) x 2 (Gender: woman, man) analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to examine effects on hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes (see Tables 2 and 3). Social desirability was included as a covariate in the analyses. The analysis revealed a main effect for participant gender on hostile sexist attitudes, $F(1, 202) = 5.39, p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$. This finding indicates that the average level of hostile sexist attitudes was higher among men ($M = 3.14$, $SEM = .12$) than among women ($M = 2.82$, $SEM = .07$). No other effects were significant. Specifically, there were no effects for gender, harm, pervasiveness, or the interaction of harm and pervasiveness on participants’ endorsement of benevolent sexist attitudes and no effect for harm, pervasiveness, or the interaction of harm and pervasiveness on participants’ endorsement of hostile sexist attitudes. Furthermore, there was no effect for social desirability on either hostile or benevolent sexist attitudes.
Labeling Sexism

A 2 (Harm: low, high) x 2 (Pervasiveness: low, high) x 2 (Gender: woman, man) analysis of variance (ANOVAs) was conducted to examine effects on labeling sexism (see Table 3-4). Social desirability was included as a covariate in the analysis. The analysis revealed a main effect for participant gender on labeling sexism, $F(1, 202) = 6.14, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$. This finding indicates that the average level of labeling sexism was higher among women ($M = 4.89, SEM = .09$) than among men ($M = 4.45, SEM = .16$). This main effect for gender was qualified by a significant two-way interaction between gender and pervasiveness on labeling sexism, $F(1, 202) = 6.52, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$ (see Figure 3-1). Posthoc comparisons with Bonferroni correction revealed that there was a significant effect for pervasiveness on labeling sexism for women, but not for men. Specifically, the average level of labeling sexism was higher for women in low pervasiveness conditions ($M = 5.13, SEM = .13$) than for women in the high pervasiveness conditions ($M = 4.65, SEM = .13$), but there was not a significant difference between men in the low pervasiveness condition ($M = 4.23, SEM = .22$) and men in the high pervasiveness condition ($M = 4.66, SEM = .22$). Posthoc comparisons with Bonferroni correction also revealed a significant gender difference in labeling sexism for participants in the low pervasiveness conditions, but not for participants in the high pervasiveness conditions. Specifically, the average level of labeling sexism was higher for women in low pervasiveness conditions ($M = 5.13, SEM = .13$) than for men in the low pervasiveness conditions ($M = 4.23, SEM = .22$). However, there was not a significant difference in average levels of labeling sexism between women in the high pervasiveness conditions ($M = 4.65, SEM = .13$) and men in the high...
pervasiveness conditions \( M = 4.66, \ SEM = .22 \). There were also no significant differences found between women in the low pervasiveness conditions and men in the high pervasiveness conditions or between women in the high pervasiveness conditions and men in the low pervasiveness conditions.

No other effects were significant. Specifically, there were no effects for harm, pervasiveness, or the interaction of harm and pervasiveness on participants' labeling sexism. Furthermore, there was no effect for social desirability on labeling sexism.

**Likelihood of Intervention**

A 2 (Harm: low, high) x 2 (Pervasiveness: low, high) x 2 (Gender: woman, man) analysis of variance (ANOVAs) was conducted to examine effects on likelihood of intervention (see Table 3-5). Social desirability was included as a covariate in the analysis. The analysis revealed no significant effects. That is, there were no effects for gender, harm, pervasiveness, or the interaction of harm and pervasiveness on participants' likelihood of intervening. Furthermore, there was no effect for social desirability on labeling sexism.
Table 3-1. Means and standard deviations (SD) of the dependent variables by condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High harm</th>
<th>Low harm</th>
<th>Low harm</th>
<th>Low harm</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High pervasiveness</td>
<td>Low pervasiveness</td>
<td>High pervasiveness</td>
<td>Low pervasiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>2.97(.95)</td>
<td>2.95(.80)</td>
<td>2.96(.86)</td>
<td>2.69(.87)</td>
<td>2.96(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>3.28(.77)</td>
<td>3.26(.85)</td>
<td>3.07(.85)</td>
<td>3.23(.87)</td>
<td>3.47(.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeling Sexism</td>
<td>4.68(1.30)</td>
<td>4.81(1.12)</td>
<td>4.67(1.14)</td>
<td>4.97(1.04)</td>
<td>4.84(1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Intervention</td>
<td>1.43(.82)</td>
<td>1.57(.88)</td>
<td>1.29(.82)</td>
<td>1.53(.81)</td>
<td>1.37(.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. There were no significant differences found in any of the dependent variables across conditions.
Table 3-2. Analysis of variance results with Hostile Sexist Attitudes as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harm (A)</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness (B)</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C)</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>5.388</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>149.523</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1923.810</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SDS = Social Desirability Scale
Table 3-3. Analysis of variance results with Benevolent Sexist Attitudes as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harm (A)</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness (B)</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C)</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>139.311</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2315.182</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SDS = Social Desirability Scale
Table 3-4. Analysis of variance results with Labeling Sexism as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harm (A)</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness (B)</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C)</td>
<td>7.747</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.747</td>
<td>6.135</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>2.649</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>8.237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.237</td>
<td>6.524</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>255.070</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5072.056</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SDS = Social Desirability Scale
Table 3-5. Analysis of variance results with Likelihood of Intervention as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harm (A)</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness (B)</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C)</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x C</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B x C</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>135.618</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>581.298</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SDS = Social Desirability Scale
Table 3-6. Pairwise comparisons of dependent variables for Harm with Social Desirability as covariate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Harm (M, SEM)</th>
<th>Low Harm (M, SEM)</th>
<th>Mean difference, 95% CI (High Harm –Low Harm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>3.050 (.09)</td>
<td>2.907 (.10)</td>
<td>.14, 95% CI = [-.13, .41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>3.337 (.09)</td>
<td>3.193 (.10)</td>
<td>.14, 95% CI = [-.12, .41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeling Sexism</td>
<td>4.618 (.12)</td>
<td>4.717 (.13)</td>
<td>.10, 95% CI = [-.45, .25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Intervention</td>
<td>1.447 (.09)</td>
<td>1.325 (.10)</td>
<td>.12, 95% CI = [-.14, .38]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-7. Pairwise comparisons of dependent variables for Pervasiveness with Social Desirability as covariate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Pervasiveness $\overline{X}$, SEM</th>
<th>Low Pervasiveness $\overline{X}$, SEM</th>
<th>Mean difference, 95% CI (High Perv - Low Perv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>3.057 (.10)</td>
<td>2.900 (.10)</td>
<td>.16, 95% CI = [-.12, .43]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>3.210 (.09)</td>
<td>3.320 (.10)</td>
<td>.11, 95% CI = [-.37, .15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeling Sexism</td>
<td>4.652 (.13)</td>
<td>4.682 (.13)</td>
<td>-.03, 95% CI = [-.39, .33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Intervention</td>
<td>1.307 (.09)</td>
<td>1.466 (.09)</td>
<td>-.16, 95% CI = [-.41, .10]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-8. Pairwise comparisons of dependent variables for Gender with Social Desirability as covariate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women $(M, SEM)$</th>
<th>Men $(M, SEM)$</th>
<th>Mean difference, 95% CI (Women – Men)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>2.819 (.07)</td>
<td>3.138 (.12)</td>
<td>-.32*, 95% CI = [-.59, -.05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>3.166 (.07)</td>
<td>3.364 (.12)</td>
<td>-.20, 95% CI = [-.46, .06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeling Sexism</td>
<td>4.889 (.09)</td>
<td>4.445 (.16)</td>
<td>.45*, 95% CI = [.09, .80]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Intervention</td>
<td>1.502 (.07)</td>
<td>1.271 (.11)</td>
<td>.23, 95% CI = [-.03, .49]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 3-9. Correlations of continuous variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hostile Sexist Attitudes</th>
<th>Benevolent Sexist Attitudes</th>
<th>Labeling Sexism</th>
<th>Likelihood of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.524***</td>
<td>-.441***</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexist Attitudes</td>
<td>.524***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.307***</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeling Sexism</td>
<td>-.441***</td>
<td>-.307***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.322***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Intervention</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.322***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001
Figure 3-1. Mean Labeling Sexism Scores for Interaction of Gender and Pervasiveness.

Note. Confidence intervals are represented in the figure by the error bars attached to each bullet.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

Discussion of Results

The present study contributed to the research on labeling, confronting, and reducing sexism by testing the effects of an intervention which describes subtle sexism and informs participants of its harm and pervasiveness in an effort to reduce sexist attitudes, increase labeling of sexist behavior as sexist, and increase likelihood of intervening.

First, a manipulation check confirmed that the beliefs and behaviors described in the high harm conditions were perceived as more harmful than those described in the low harm conditions. Also, the beliefs and behaviors described in the high pervasiveness conditions were perceived to be more pervasive than those described in the low pervasiveness conditions.

Next, predictors of sexist attitudes, labeling sexism, and likelihood of intervention were examined. Results indicated that gender predicted hostile sexist attitudes but not benevolent sexist attitudes. Specifically, the average level of hostile sexist attitudes was higher among men than among women, but there was no significant gender difference in endorsement of benevolent sexist attitudes. This is partially consistent with hypothesis 1a which held that gender would predict both hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. Previous research has found that gender is a robust predictor of hostile sexist attitudes (e.g. Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske 2001). For example, research with 15,000 men and women across 19 countries found that, on average, men scored higher on hostile sexism than women in all countries (Glick, et al., 2000). Though gender has also been found to predict benevolent sexist attitudes in previous research, the results
have been mixed and support has been more tenuous (e.g. Glick & Fiske, 1996; Zell, Strickhouser, Lane, & Teeter, 2016). Practically, the present results suggest that women, as compared to men, reject sexist attitudes that are hostile toward women at higher average levels, but that, on average, women do not differ from men in their endorsement of benevolent sexist attitudes that are seemingly positive (e.g. favorable stereotypes) and carry potential benefits for women (e.g. protected status).

According to Jost and Kay (2005), these “advantages” of benevolent sexism offset the “disadvantages” women experience through hostile sexism, resulting in an overall impression of a just society. Correlational data gathered across 19 countries documented the finding that women’s average benevolent sexism was as high or higher than men’s in countries where men’s hostile sexism was the strongest, suggesting that women may be motivated to endorse subjectively positive benevolent sexist attitudes in environments where women are surrounded by negative attitudes (Glick, et al., 2000). Fischer (2006) sought to test this suggestion experimentally by assigning women to one of three conditions which differed only in what participants were told about research findings on men’s attitudes toward women. The three conditions conveyed that 1) research showed that men hold negative attitudes toward women, 2) research showed that men hold positive attitudes toward women, and 3) research had been done on men’s attitudes (with no information on findings). After reading this information, participants completed the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. Fischer (2006) found that women who were told that men hold negative attitudes toward women reported greater benevolent sexist attitudes, on average, than did women who were told either no information about men’s attitudes or that men held positive attitudes toward women.
Women’s endorsement of hostile sexist attitudes was not significantly different across conditions. These findings help to explain the current study’s findings and suggest that, in an otherwise punishing environment, women’s relatively greater endorsement of benevolent sexism offers hope of reward (e.g. care, protection, honor) for at least some members of the group.

Inconsistent with hypothesis 1b, results indicated that telling people that subtle sexism was harmful (versus benign) did not reduce hostile or benevolent sexist attitudes. Furthermore, in answer to research question 1, pervasiveness did not interact with harm in a way that predicted participants’ hostile or benevolent sexist attitudes. These findings are not consistent with findings from previous research. The present study’s findings will be further explored in the context of the effectiveness of the study’s intervention below.

Results also indicated that gender predicted participants’ labeling of subtle sexism such that average levels of labeling sexism were higher among women than among men. This is consistent with hypothesis 2a and with a large body of previous research that has found that women, compared to men, identify sexism at higher average levels in varying manifestations including rape, sexual harassment, sexist language, and sexist interpersonal behaviors (Blodorn, et al., 2012; Hannon, et al., 1996; Swim, et al., 2003; Swim, et al., 2004; Swim, et al., 2005; Wiener, et al., 1997). The present study’s findings add to this body of research by demonstrating that the gender difference in labeling sexism extends to a broader range of subtle sexists events beyond the specific categories that have been previously examined. Gender differences in labeling of subtle sexism are also consistent with broader literature that shows that
members of marginalized groups are more likely to perceive discrimination than members of privileged groups (Inman & Baron, 1996; Operario & Fiske, 2001).

Additionally, there was an effect for the interaction of gender and pervasiveness on labeling sexism. Specifically, the average level of labeling sexism was higher for women in low pervasiveness conditions than for women in the high pervasiveness conditions. Moreover, the average level of labeling sexism was higher for women than men in low pervasiveness conditions, but not in the high pervasiveness conditions. These findings are inconsistent with past research that found no interactions between gender and pervasiveness (Becker & Swim, 2012). The findings suggest that either telling women that sexism is pervasive decreases labeling of sexism or that telling women that sexism is uncommon increases labeling of sexism. It could be that explaining subtle sexism as routine, common, and ubiquitous actually encourages women to not label the behaviors as sexist. This is consistent with a system justification perspective, which postulates that people are ideologically motivated to support the status quo to rationalize or justify the existing social order, even when supporting the status quo has substantial costs and relatively few benefits for them individually or for their in-group community (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004). From a system justification perspective, the current study’s findings suggest that when women are told that sexism is the status quo (i.e. sexism is pervasive), they are unconsciously motivated to maintain this status quo. By not labeling subtle sexist scenarios as sexist, women can rationalize that these incidents are “not a big deal,” thereby justifying and maintaining subtle sexism. Future research to test these findings using system justification theory
could help further explain the relationship between gender, perceived pervasiveness, and labeling sexism.

Contrary to hypothesis 2b, in the current study, results indicated that telling people that subtle sexism was harmful (versus benign) did not increase labeling of subtle sexism. Furthermore, in answer to research question 2, pervasiveness did not interact with harm in a way that predicted participants’ labeling of subtle sexism. These findings are inconsistent with findings from previous research. Further exploration of this inconsistency will take place in the context of the effectiveness of the study’s intervention below.

Regarding research question 3a, gender did not predict participants’ likelihood of intervening. In previous research, gender differences were found in participants’ unutilized intervention responses (Brinkman et al., 2015). That is, women were more likely than men to report having a desired, but unutilized, confrontational response to sexist events they had previously witnessed. However, there was no gender difference found in utilized confrontational responses to sexist events the participants had previously witnessed. It may be that, consistent with previous research, there is no gender difference in participants’ anticipated likelihood of utilizing a confrontational response to challenge sexism, but that women, on average, report higher levels of desired intervention responses that they are unlikely to utilize than men. This is consistent with research on the social costs of confronting discrimination (e.g. Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Diebels & Czopp, 2011; Shelton & Stewart, 2004). For example, Stangor, Swim, Van Allen, and Sechrist (2002) found that women and African Americans (low status groups) were more likely to attribute a failed test grade to
discrimination rather than personal ability when they made the judgement privately or in the presence of another in-group member. However, they were more likely to blame their poor score on lack of ability rather than discrimination when they made their judgement in front of a member of a high status group (men or European Americans). The attributions made by men and European Americans did not differ across the three audience conditions. Examining social costs of confronting discrimination helps to explain the difference in judgements across audience conditions. For example, Kaiser and Miller (2001) found that an African American who attributed a failing test grade to discrimination was evaluated less favorably and was perceived as more of a “complainer” than an African American who attributed a failing test grade to the quality of his responses, even when discrimination was portrayed as certain (versus possible or not present). These findings were replicated with gender discrimination such that a woman who attributed a failing grade to discrimination, compared to a woman who attributed a failing grade to answer quality, was evaluated as less favorable and more of a “complainer” as well as perceived as avoiding personal responsibility (Garcia, Reser, Amo, Redersdorff, & Branscombe, 2005). Clearly, there are social costs to challenging sexism, and discrimination more broadly. If confrontations against sexism are perceived as likely to elicit negative social consequences and unsuccessful results, it is likely that a bystander may refrain from challenging sexist events. Therefore, it may be that no gender difference was found in likelihood of intervention in the present study due to these anticipated social costs of intervening.

Regarding research question 3b, results indicated that neither harm, nor pervasiveness, nor the interaction of harm and pervasiveness predicted likelihood of
intervening in the subtle sexist scenarios. Notably, telling participants that subtle sexism is harmful (versus benign) and, with the exception of the interaction with gender on labeling sexism, telling participants that subtle sexism is pervasive (versus uncommon) was not found to predict sexist attitudes, labeling sexism, nor likelihood of intervention. These findings are inconsistent with what is to be expected based on previous research. Specifically, Becker and Swim (2012) found that describing benevolent sexism as harmful predicted lower levels of endorsement of benevolent sexist attitudes and that describing benevolent sexism as both harmful and pervasive predicted lower levels of endorsement of modern sexist attitudes. Furthermore, describing benevolent sexism as harmful predicted higher levels of labeling a benevolent sexist dating profile as sexist and unfavorable. The present study expanded on the intervention provided in Becker and Swim’s (2012) work to described subtle sexism more broadly. It may be that the changes to the intervention were ineffective and lacked enough specificity to elicit the same effects regarding the reduction of sexist attitudes and increased labeling.

The rise in the popularity of sexism as a concept may also help to explain the results. According to “Google Trends”, the word “sexist” reached its peak popularity in November 2016. In October and November 2016, the word “sexism” was the most popular it’s been in over ten years. Given that data were collected around this time of year, it is reasonable to question the impact that this may have on the results. Furthermore, when sexism is talked about in the mainstream media, its legitimacy is often undermined (Romaniuk, 2015). It may be that participants’ exposure to information about sexism increased relative to that of participants in previous studies, and in turn, there was increased exposure to explanations about sexism that undermined its
legitimacy (e.g. condemning sexism described as complaining, requiring overt examples of sexism as “proof” of its existence). It is possible that the study’s brief description of the harm and pervasiveness of subtle sexism was not enough to counter participants’ exposure to information that delegitimized the existence and harm of sexism prior to the study. Though this cannot be determined within limits of the present study, this may be a future direction of research to explore.

Moreover, it is worth noting the present study’s levels of labeling sexism and likelihood of intervening across conditions. First, the range of potential scores for labeling sexism was 1-7, with higher scores indicating greater labeling of sexism across incidents. The present study found the following mean labeling of sexism values for the conditions, from lowest to highest mean: low harm, high pervasiveness ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 1.14$), high harm, high pervasiveness ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.30$), high harm, low pervasiveness ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 1.12$), control ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 1.04$), low harm, low pervasiveness ($M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.04$). These means are all above the midpoint, indicating slight agreement with labeling subtle sexist incidents as sexist, on average across scenarios.

Also, there was a very low likelihood of intervening across all conditions in the present study. Though the range of potential scores was 1-7, the present study found the following mean likelihood of intervention values for the conditions, from lowest to highest mean: low harm, high pervasiveness ($M = 1.29$, $SD = .82$), control ($M = 1.37$, $SD = .91$), high harm, high pervasiveness ($M = 1.43$, $SD = .82$), low harm, low pervasiveness ($M = 1.53$, $SD = .81$), high harm, low pervasiveness ($M = 1.57$, $SD = .88$). Thus, on average, participants across conditions reported low levels of likelihood
of intervention, suggesting that additional intervention research to increase bystander intervention behavior is warranted.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

Findings from the present study should be interpreted in light of a number of limitations. First, the demographic composition of the sample reflects the boundaries of generalizability of the findings. Specifically, the current sample was drawn from a mostly young, undergraduate population. Thus, future research could examine the effectiveness of this intervention with samples that represent greater diversity in terms of age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of education, socioeconomic status, and other sociodemographic characteristics.

Additionally, the current study and much of the prior research on labeling sexism and bystander intervention assess participants’ views of attitudes and third-person scenarios. Most often, targets of the sexist attitudes or scenarios are unspecified or are hypothetical third-persons. Findings regarding denial of person discrimination (e.g. Crosby, 1984) suggest that people are less likely to perceive, report, and interrupt discrimination against themselves than against other members of their group. Therefore, it is important to consider that results regarding labeling sexism and bystander intervention in the present study may over-represent participants’ labeling sexism and bystander intervention behavior relative to when they themselves are the target of such behavior.

Understanding and increasing labeling of sexism and bystander intervention directed at others are valuable research and intervention aims because of the potential to reduce sexism and the association between recognizing sexism against others and recognizing sexism against oneself (Carney, Banaji, & Krieger, 2010; Good, et al., 2012;
Sechrist, Swim, & Stangor, 2004). However, it is also important for future research to test of impact of this intervention, as well as the roles and associations of sexist attitudes, labeling sexism, and bystander intervention behavior regarding incidents of sexism against oneself. Examples of this may include asking participants to imagine themselves as the targets of specified sexist incidents, having participants attend to and note experiences of sexism and their responses, or using an in vivo experimental design with confederates perpetrating acts of subtle sexism.

Finally, some of the current results are inconsistent with findings from previous studies. Specifically, there were a number of discrepancies between the present findings and the study by Becker and Swim (2012) after which the current study was modeled. Becker and Swim’s (2012) findings suggested that perceived harm of benevolent sexism decreased benevolent sexist attitudes and increased labeling and negatively evaluating benevolent sexism. Additionally, it was suggested that perceived harm in combination with perceived pervasiveness of endorsement benevolent sexism decreased modern sexist attitudes and increased labeling and negatively evaluating modern sexism. However, in the present study, neither perceived harm nor perceived pervasiveness of subtle sexism predicted sexist attitudes or labeling sexism, with the exception of the gender and pervasiveness interaction effect on labeling sexism. Further experimental and longitudinal research examining predictors of sexist attitudes and labeling sexism would be beneficial in light of these discrepancies. Additionally, given the very low endorsement of likelihood to intervene in the present study, we hope that the present study can contribute to a larger body of research that can inform interventions and enhance labeling and challenging sexist incidents.
APPENDIX A
CONDITION TEXT

Information about Sexism in General

In some ways, in thinking about the relationship between men and women, men are viewed as dominant and women are viewed as weak or submissive. Oftentimes, this message is communicated in subtle ways. For example, when people make comments that certain roles (e.g. secretary, mechanic) are more appropriate for women/men, traditional gender roles are enforced and men can be seen as more dominant. Other examples of how this message is subtly communicated is when people share negative views of gender equality, feel angry with women for receiving “special favors,” or make sexual comments or engage in sexually inappropriate behaviors (e.g. commenting on a woman’s appearance, catcalls). Many times, jokes that use gender as the punchline also communicate that men are superior to women.

In other ways though, women are viewed as delicate, special, and in need of the protection of men. The belief is that both women and men have unique attributes that add something important to relationships and to society overall. This implies that men without women are incomplete, and vice versa. It is believed that women are more likely to be pure, caring, sweet, and delicate while men are more likely to be strong, rational, tough, and less emotional. As a result, it is assumed that men must protect and cherish women as they cannot live without them. Furthermore, men are seen as providers that women are to support and comfort.
Harm

High

These beliefs and behaviors are classified as damaging. It is criticized that men are seen as dominant and women are seen as weak. When beliefs and behaviors portray men and women in this way, even subtly or in a joking manner, it reinforces the belief that women are in fact weak, and men are dominant. It is also criticized that women are portrayed as being weak, in need of protection, and as not having value beyond being sweet, caring, and pure. This view assumes that women are not suited for a wide variety of positions in society including those with high status. These characterizations of men and women lead to the disadvantaged position of women in society, even contributing indirectly to violence against women and rape.

Low

These beliefs and behaviors are considered benign. Although they point to differences between women and men and suggest certain social graces, endorsing or not endorsing the beliefs has little impact on women’s and men’s daily lives. Some women do not mind being characterized as weaker than men and appreciate being seen as sweet, caring, and pure. They enjoy being protected by men and are not bothered by sexual comments or jokes. Most women find these attitudes and behaviors have little impact in areas that are truly important to them such as their interpersonal relationships, their family, and their work lives.
**Pervasiveness**

**High**

These beliefs and behaviors are very pervasive in the United States. It has been demonstrated that 85% of the population endorses these beliefs and tries to apply the corresponding behaviors.

**Low**

These beliefs and behaviors are not at all pervasive in the United States. It has been demonstrated that only 15% of the population endorses these beliefs and tries to apply the corresponding behaviors.

**Control Condition Information**

Stress is the body's reaction to any change that requires an adjustment or response. The body reacts to these changes with physical, mental, and emotional responses. Stress is a normal part of life. Stress can be positive, keeping us alert and ready to avoid danger. Stress becomes negative when a person faces continuous challenges without relief or relaxation between challenges. As a result, the person becomes overworked and stress-related tension builds.

For college students in particular, stress has become more subtle and therefore stressful experiences can be less visible and go unnoticed by the public.

Whereas many people think that students have a pleasant and leisurely life, college students are exposed to many different stressors during their studies. There are four main sources of stress in college student’s lives: First, students are often stressed by school. They have to do lots of homework, attend many classes, and prepare themselves for several exams at a time. Furthermore, many students have difficulties
with group work, for example, when members of the group are unreliable or do not work.

Roommate problems are a second source of stress. Many students live together with, on average, one to four students and experience conflicts, including disagreements about noise, cleanliness standards, and financial issues. Besides these college-specific stressful incidents, students have problems with friends and romantic partners which can be very distracting and occupy a lot of time and energy. In addition, they often worry about not having enough time for their friends because academic responsibilities.

Although students have some liberties which other people do not have, they have a lot of obligations and responsibilities and are not protected against stress. The more problems come together, the higher the feeling of personal stress. These stressful incidences can have dramatic consequences for students: The rates of depression and anxiety disorders, especially during final exams are twice as high as in the normal population. Many students do not feel able to talk about their problems with friends or professionals since they want to perform well and do not want to be seen as weak from their fellow students. Such tendencies often worsen the symptoms of depression and anxiety.

Because of this, it is important to raise awareness about the stress in students’ lives. It is also important to expand counseling center services that may help provide resources and coping strategies to distressed students.
APPENDIX B
SUBTLE SEXISM SCENARIOS

Sarah works in an insurance office. A promotion that she is interested in has recently become available. She has been working especially hard lately to prove her competence. Sarah has been frustrated by the lack of notice taken by her coworkers when she does extra work. No one, including her boss, ever pays any attention to her work accomplishments. She had reached her last straw when she came to work with a new blouse and got several comments on how great it looked.

Sheila is a doctor in the cardiovascular unit at the hospital. When new patients come in, she looks over their charts then enters the rooms to meet them and find out more about their symptoms. After asking Mary, a new patient of hers, some questions, Sheila says she'll be back soon to check on her. Mary then asks when the doctor will be in to meet her. Sheila, somewhat annoyed, tells Mary that she is her doctor. Mary apologizes and Sheila smiles and says she'll be back soon.

Adam is the hiring manager at a successful sales company. He recently interviewed Emily, an intelligent woman who he believed would make a great addition to their company. However, when he called Emily to offer her the job, she did not accept. She told Adam that she had noticed his Sports Illustrated Swimsuit Edition calendar hanging in his office and did not want to work in an atmosphere that promotes sexism. Adam was taken aback by this comment. He believed he was lucky that she did not accept because it would have been a mistake to hire someone who is so sensitive in his sales company.

Abby is walking to class and stops to hold the door for a student walking behind her, Marcus. He refuses to walk through the door and insists on holding the door for
Abby instead, saying “ladies first.” Abby says, “No, please go ahead,” but Marcus again refuses to enter the door Abby is holding. Abby rolls her eyes then walks through the door as Marcus grabs the door to hold it for her.

Char and her husband are both professors at the same university. At the end of the semester, they receive students’ course evaluations in order to get feedback on the classes they teach. One night at dinner, they compared the comments they had received. Char found it ridiculous that some of her students had commented on her lack of makeup and limited number of outfits. Her husband had no similar comments related to his appearance.

Pete is a student who is known for his sense of humor. One day he was telling a joke to a group of friends and asked, “Why can’t women drive?” His audience had no answer so they replied, “Why?” He answered, “Because there is no road between the kitchen and the bedroom.” Most of his friends laughed, but Andrea was offended. Noticing this, Pete said to her, “Calm down. It’s just a joke.”
APPENDIX C
FILLER QUESTIONS AND MANIPULATION CHECK

Below is a series of questions regarding the passages you just read. Please indicate your answer to each question using a scale from 1-7 in which 1 = not at all, and 7 = very much.

Are the types of beliefs and behaviors described in the essay harmful for women? Are the beliefs and behaviors between men and women described in the essay common? How comprehensive did you find the essay? Was the essay easy to understand? How interesting will the essay be for a new reader? How new will the information be to a new reader?
APPENDIX D
AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY

Below is 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 using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for “equality.”
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.*
4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
5. Women are too easily offended.
6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.*
7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.*
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
13. Men are complete without women.*
14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.*
19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.*
22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Note. * = reverse-scored item.
APPENDIX E
LIKELIHOOD OF INTERVENING

1. Of the following options, which best characterizes what you would want to do if you witnessed or were informed of this scenario
   o Say or do something to communicate displeasure to (perpetrator)
   o Say or do something to support (victim)
   o Ignore the event or do nothing
   o Other: ________________________________

2. How likely are you to respond in the way you indicated above if you witnessed or were informed of this scenario?

   1---------2-----------3----------4--------5---------6---------7
   Extremely Unlikely Moderately Unlikely Slightly Unlikely Neither Likely nor Slightly Likely Moderately Likely Extremely Likely
APPENDIX F
PERCEPTION OF THE SCENARIOS AND LABELING SEXISM

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The event described in scenario is harmful.
The event described in scenario is wrong.
The event described in scenario is unfair.
Events like this occur commonly.
The event described in this passage contains sexism.
APPENDIX G
MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE, SHORT FORM 1 (10)

Read each item and decide whether it is true or false for you. Try to work rapidly and answer each question by selecting either True or False.

1. I like to gossip at times.
2. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
3. I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
4. I always try to practice what I preach.
5. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
6. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
7. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
8. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
9. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
10. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings.
APPENDIX H
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Please tell us a little about yourself. This information will be used to describe the sample as a group.

For each of the questions below, we have provided a number of options. However, we recognize that these options may not capture everyone’s identities or characteristics. Therefore, for some questions, we have also included an “Other” option for you to describe your identity in your own words if the categories provided do not capture it. Thank you for telling us about yourself!

1. What is your age?

2. How do you identify your gender?
   - Man
   - Woman
   - Non-binary or other gender identity (please describe in your own words)
     ______________

3. How do you identify your sexual orientation?
   Please select the one best descriptor. If the categories provided do not fully capture how you identify, please feel free to use the “Other” category to specify further.
   - Exclusively lesbian or gay
   - Mostly lesbian or gay
   - Bisexual
   - Mostly heterosexual
   - Exclusively heterosexual
   - Asexual
   - Other (e.g., queer, questioning) ______________

4. What is your race/ethnicity?
   Please select the one best descriptor, or use the “Biracial/Multiracial” option to specify further. If the categories provided do not fully capture how you identify, please feel free to use the “Other” category to specify further.
   - African/African American/Black
   - American Indian/Native American
   - Arab American/Middle Eastern
   - Asian/Asian American
   - Caucasian/European American/White
   - Hispanic/Latina/o American
   - Pacific Islander/Pacific Islander American
   - Biracial/Multiracial (please specify): ______________
   - Other race/ethnicity (please specify): ______________
5. How would you identify your current social class? Please select the one best descriptor.
   o Lower class
   o Lower middle class
   o Middle class
   o Upper middle class
   o Upper class

6. What is your approximate household income (that is, the income of you and those on whom you rely financially, like your parents or guardians)? Please select the one best descriptor.
   o $0 - $10,000
   o $10,001 – $20,000
   o $20,001 – $30,000
   o $30,001 – $40,000
   o $40,001 – $50,000
   o $50,001 – $60,000
   o $60,001 – $70,000
   o $70,001 – $80,000
   o $80,001 – $90,000
   o $90,001 – $100,000
   o $100,001 – $110,000
   o $110,001 – $120,000
   o $120,001 – $130,000
   o $130,001 – $140,000
   o $140,001 – $150,000
   o $150,001 – $160,000
   o $160,001 – $170,000
   o $170,001 – $180,000
   o $180,001 – $190,000
   o $190,001 – $200,000
   o More than $200,001
Please note in the space below any observations, comments, or questions you have regarding this study.

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX I
ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONS TO HIDE THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The following statements concern how you feel in romantic relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just in what is happening in a current relationship. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

1. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.
2. I worry about being abandoned.
3. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.
4. I worry a lot about my relationships.
5. Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away.
6. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
7. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
8. I worry a fair amount about losing my partner.
9. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
10. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her.
11. I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back.
12. I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away.
13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me.
15. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.
16. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
17. I try to avoid getting too close to my partner.
18. I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner.
19. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner.
20. Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment.
21. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
22. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
23. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners.
24. If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry.
25. I tell my partner just about everything.
26. I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like.
27. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.
28. When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure.
29. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.
30. I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like.
31. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help.
32. I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them.
33. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.
34. When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself.
35. I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance.
36. I resent it when my partner spends time away from me.
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