

**Sexism In Context – Its Perceived Likelihood,
Collective Action Across Cultures,
And Possible Relation To Priming Effectiveness**

Dissertation

zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades (Dr. rer. nat.)
des Fachbereichs Humanwissenschaften
der Universität Osnabrück

vorgelegt von

Freyja Brigitte Fischer

aus Stuttgart

Osnabrück, 2018

Acknowledgements

Diese Arbeit wäre nicht möglich gewesen durch die vielerlei Arten von Unterstützung, die ich erfahren habe.

Ein herzlicher Dank geht natürlich an Julia Becker. Vielen Dank für die Unterstützung durch Nachfragen, Interesse, Feedback zu den Artikeln und natürlich auch so „trivialen“ Dingen wie Zeit im Labor und Versuchspersonenstunden! Vielen Dank dafür, dass du sie immer möglichst fair unter allen verteilst!

Vielen Dank auch an Inna Ksenofontov, meine Nachbarin, mit der ich so manches verzwickte Problem besprechen konnte und die sich in der Literatur unglaublich gut auskennt! Danke für so manchen Tipp und einfach auch für's Zuhören bei der einen oder anderen statistischen Überlegung, es hat mir viel Spaß gemacht mit dir als Nachbarin!

Und dann gibt es da noch ein ganzes Heer von Studentinnen und Studenten. Ich danke euch allen, die ihr bei mir Bachelorarbeiten und Masterarbeiten geschrieben habt und mit euren Ideen eure und meine Arbeit vorangebracht habt. Allen voran Eda Özdemir, ohne die eine Folgestudie in der Türkei falsch erhoben worden wäre und die viel Wissen über die Situation in der Türkei eingebracht hat, aber auch all die anderen, die sich mit mir und mit Sexismus auseinandergesetzt haben: Laura (x2), Dorothea (x2), Lisa, Julian, Marina... Und all die anderen, die kamen und gingen!

Jede die einmal selbst so eine Arbeit verfasst hat weiß, dass die emotionale Unterstützung durch die ganzen Hochs und Tiefs der Arbeit lebensnotwendig ist. Der große Batzen davon kommt natürlich von Toni, einfach auch weil er tagtäglich alle Entwicklungen sofort mitbekommt. Vielen Dank für deine Unterstützung und deine positive Sicht auf die Welt!

Ein großer Dank geht auch an Rima Maria Rahal. Vielen Dank für deine Unterstützung und deine Ratschläge. Ich bin so froh, dass ich dich als kompetente Fachfrau in der Hinterhand habe!

Ein ganz besonderer Dank geht auch an meine Tante, Gabriele Fischer. Obwohl es nach zwei Jahren vielleicht etwas früh war für das erste Nachfragen, wann ich denn „endlich“ fertig werde, danke ich dir für die viele Unterstützung und Begleitung die du mir schon mein halbes Leben lang entgegenbringst. Du warst die erste, die mir die Augen geöffnet hat für meine Erfahrungen mit der SchülerInnenfirma, in der seltsamerweise meine Ideen im Aufsichtsrat nicht berücksichtigt wurden, sobald aber einer der männlichen Aufsichtsräte die gleiche Idee geäußert hat, alle begeistert zugestimmt haben... Danke, dass du den Feminismus aus den 68ern in die Gegenwart mitgenommen hast und so freudvoll, lebendig, und positiv lebst. Ohne dich könnte ich mich nicht als Frau in dieser Gesellschaft leben.

List of attached studies

This dissertation is based on the work described in the following article and manuscripts:

Study 1

Fischer, F. B., Becker, J. C., Kito, M., & Zamantili Nayir, D. (2017). Collective action against sexism in Germany, Turkey, and Japan: The influence of self-construal and face concerns. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 20(3), 409-423. doi: 10.1177/1368430216683533

Study 2

Becker, J. C., Swim, J. K., de Oliveira Laux, S. H., Radke, H., & Fischer, F. B. (*Under Review*). Situational variables moderate the perceived likelihood and acceptability of benevolent and hostile sexist behavior: the impact of locations, interpersonal associates, and passively experienced processes.

Study 3

Fischer, F. B., & Becker, J. C. (*Under Review*). Are women getting smarter when primed with a female professor (compared to male professor)? Replication and extension of the professor stereotype priming effect on general knowledge.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Deutsche Zusammenfassung	3
General Introduction	5
1. Ambivalent Sexism	7
1.1 Definition of hostile and benevolent sexism	7
1.2 Measuring hostile and benevolent sexism	11
1.3 The double-edged nature of benevolent sexism.....	14
2. Reduction of Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Through Collective Action	17
The Presented Research.....	20
3. How Do Collective Action Intentions Vary Across Cultures?	20
3.1 Conflict management styles	20
3.2 Self-concept and its consequences for conflict management styles.....	25
3.3 Face concern and its influence on collective action	29
3.4 Relevance of face concern for collective action	31
3.5 An unaccomplished desire for collective action	33
3.6 Manuscript #1.....	35
4. How Do Situations Influence the Perceived Likelihood and Acceptability of Sexism?	101
4.1 Identifying a taxonomy of situations	102
4.2 The situational taxonomy of Saucier and colleagues	111
4.3 Manuscript #2.....	115
5. Can Inconsistencies in Stereotype Priming Effects Be Explained with Participants' Self-Concept Content?	156
5.1 The active-self account	157

5.2 Implications of the active-self account on stereotype priming effects.....	158
5.3 Manuscript #3.....	162
General Discussion.....	199
6. Summary of Study-Specific Results and Implications.....	199
6.1 How do collective action intentions vary across cultures?	199
6.2 How do situations influence the perceived likelihood and acceptability of sexism?.....	203
6.3 Can inconsistencies in stereotype priming effects be explained with participants' self- concept content?.....	205
7. General Implications.....	208
8. General Limitations	212
9. Future Studies	214
9.1 Reduction of sexism.....	214
9.2 Cross-cultural research.....	216
9.3 Priming.....	218
10. Conclusion.....	220
References.....	221
Attachment	253

Tables

Table 1: Preferences of Conflict Management Styles in Individualistic vs. Collectivistic Cultures..... 21

Abstract

Sexism is a worldwide phenomenon that limits women's potential in all areas of life. To limit its negative consequences, women engage in collective action. This work is about how culture and situations influence collective action and the prevalence of sexism. We hypothesized that an independent and interdependent self-concept as well as the cultural construct face influence women's collective action intentions in Japan, Turkey, and Germany (Manuscript #1). In line with our hypotheses, we found that the higher women's independent self-concept, the stronger their collective action intentions and that the higher women's endorsement of face, the lower their collective action intentions. Consequently, cultural constructs influence women's collective action intentions.

Regarding situations, we hypothesized that the perceived likelihood and acceptability of sexism vary systematically across situations, depending on targets present, gender composition of people present, location, and passively experienced processes (Manuscript #2). Our hypotheses were mainly supported. Given our findings on the pervasiveness of sexism in private life, interventions aiming at the reduction of sexism should extend beyond the work place.

Regarding stereotype priming effects, we derived our hypotheses from the active self-account (Manuscript #3). We expect that the extent of overlap between participants' self-concept and the stereotype prime influences priming effectiveness and can help explain previous, inconsistent stereotype priming effects. However, we could not replicate the original priming effect and, with one exception, did not find evidence for our moderators and mediators. Thus, further theoretical and empirical work seems necessary to identify boundary conditions for stereotype priming effects.

Sexism is a worldwide phenomenon crippling women's potential. This work informs about cultural and situational factors that have to be taken into account in order to successfully reduce its detrimental effects.

Keywords: Ambivalent Sexism, Collective Action, Independent Self-Concept, Interdependent Self-Concept, Face, Priming, Replication, Stereotype Priming

Thesis supervisor: Prof. Dr. Julia C. Becker

Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Sexismus ist ein weltweites Phänomen, das das Potential von Frauen in allen Bereichen des Lebens einschränkt. Um den negativen Konsequenzen von Sexismus entgegen zu wirken setzen sich manche Frauen für das Wohl aller Frauen ein; sie handeln kollektiv. In dieser Doktorarbeit geht es darum ob Kultur und Situationen solches kollektives Handeln beeinflussen und sich auf die Prävalenz von Sexismus auswirken.

Im Bezug auf den Einfluss von Kultur nehmen wir an, dass das Selbstkonzept und das kulturelle Konstrukt „Gesicht“ (aus der Phrase „das Gesicht wahren“) das kollektive Handeln von Frauen in Japan, der Türkei und Deutschland beeinflussen (Manuskript #1). Übereinstimmend mit unseren Hypothesen beabsichtigen Frauen mit einem stärkeren unabhängigen Selbstkonzept auch stärker kollektiv zu handeln. Frauen, die sich stärker Sorgen darum machen, „das Gesicht zu verlieren“ beabsichtigen hingegen weniger kollektiv zu handeln. Somit beeinflussen das Selbstkonzept und das Ausmaß in dem Frauen darüber besorgt sind „das Gesicht zu verlieren“, also zwei Konzepte aus der kulturvergleichenden Psychologie, die Intentionen von Frauen zum Wohle der Gruppe zu handeln.

Im Bezug auf den Einfluss von Situationen auf Sexismus nehmen wir an, dass über Situationen hinweg systematisch variiert, für wie wahrscheinlich und akzeptabel Menschen Sexismus halten. Wir nehmen an, dass die wahrgenommene Wahrscheinlichkeit und Akzeptanz von Sexismus abhängig davon variieren, (a) ob Frauen anwesend sind, gegen die sich Sexismus richten kann, (b) in welchem Anteil Männer und Frauen anwesend sind, (c) abhängig vom Ort, und (d) abhängig davon, ob potentielle Sexisten z.B. betrunken oder gestresst sind (Manuskript #2). Unsere Hypothesen wurden größtenteils bestätigt. Von unseren Ergebnissen zur wahrgenommenen Häufigkeit von Sexismus im Privatleben

ausgehend, sollten Interventionen zur Reduktion von Sexismus über den Arbeitsplatz hinaus gehen und auch das Privatleben miteinbeziehen.

Im Bezug auf Primingeffekte eines Stereotyps haben wir Hypothesen von der Theorie des aktiven Selbst abgeleitet (Manuskript #3). Wir nehmen an, dass das Ausmaß von Überlappung zwischen dem Selbstkonzept der Versuchsteilnehmer und dem Stereotyp, der als Prime verwendet wird, beeinflusst wie effektiv die Primingprozedur ist. Wir gehen davon aus, dass das Ausmaß dieser Überlappung frühere inkonsistente Primingeffekte von Stereotypen erklären kann. Allerdings konnten wir den Originaleffekt nicht replizieren und fanden, mit einer Ausnahme, keine Nachweise für unsere Moderatoren und Mediatoren. Hier muss dementsprechend noch weitere theoretische und empirische Arbeit geleistet werden um die Randbedingungen von Primingeffekten von Stereotypen zu identifizieren.

Sexismus ist ein weltweites Phänomen, das das Potential von Frauen lähmt. Diese Arbeit informiert über kulturelle und situationelle Faktoren, die man berücksichtigen muss um die negativen Folgen von Sexismus erfolgreich zu bekämpfen.

We cannot all succeed when half of us are held back.

– Malala Yousafzai

Every social justice movement that I know of has come out of people sitting in small groups, telling their life stories, and discovering that other people have shared similar experiences.

– Gloria Steinem

General Introduction

In October 2017, sexual abuse allegations against Harvey Weinstein were made public (Kantor & Twohey, 2017). Since then, the public is more aware about unequal treatment of the sexes. This is due to the high visibility of targets of sexual harassment, often female celebrities, who came forward in the #MeToo social media debate, and to publicly visible perpetrators, often male celebrities (Cooney, 2018). The #MeToo debate has extended the discussion from the dramatic arts into politics (Mischke, 2017) and draws attention to sexual harassment. However, the psychological basis underneath inequality, sexism, is hardly discussed. Sexism is defined as “beliefs that maintain or promote inequality between women and men” (Swim, Becker, Lee, & Pruitt, 2010, p. 138). It is a worldwide phenomenon (Swim, Becker, Lee, & Pruitt, 2009) that extends to every area of life. The consequences of sexism are annually delineated in the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Report. Among the 144 countries covered in the 2017 report, there is not a single country with equality between men and women in all areas assessed by the report (economy, education, health, and politics). This means that in every country in the world, compared to men, women participate less in the economy, are less educated, less healthy,

and/or have less political influence (World Economic Forum, 2017). In order to limit these extensive consequences, sexism has to be reduced. Women constitute half of the population worldwide and their being at disadvantage to fulfill their potential in any area of life, be it in obtaining education, practice a profession, receiving health care, or participating in politics is a severe violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948).

This work is about women's ability to reduce sexism and about the influence of culture and situations on its reduction. Specifically, I focus on three perspectives: First, on the influence of culture on confronting sexism in order to reduce it. Culture influences women's individual and collective strategies of dealing with sexism and therefore has to be taken into account when aiming for the reduction of sexism worldwide. Second, situations influence when women and men recognize sexism and when they find it acceptable, and thus indicate where interventions against sexism are necessary. Third, sexism is prevalent in current psychological research. So far, researchers have not considered that gendered self-concepts and gendered stereotypes might influence priming effectiveness. Stereotypes reflect our sexist society and gendered stereotypes are used to invoke prime-to-behavior effects. A male stereotype prime might be less effective for female compared to a female stereotype prime. This work explores this possibility.

In sum, this dissertation investigates how culture influences the confrontation of sexism, reports systematical situational variance in the occurrence of sexism, and explores whether stereotype gender influences priming effectiveness. Therefore, it advances our understanding of sexism and its reduction and hopefully inspires action leading to a fairer world.

1. Ambivalent Sexism

Women's lived experiences with sexism oscillate between the poles of hostility and benevolence. Although in total four aspects of sexism have been identified ("Pro-Egalitarian beliefs, beliefs about the Prevalence of Gender Discrimination, Hostility toward Women and Feminism, and Benevolent sexist beliefs"; Swim, Becker, & DeCoster, 2010), this work focuses on ambivalent sexism. The reasons for this focus are, first, this construct best reflects women's lived experiences in a sexist society. Second, ambivalent sexism is a valid construct in many cultures (see below) and thus is suitable for cross-cultural research. Third, pro-egalitarian beliefs are an important predictor for confronting sexism (van Zomeren, 2013; Van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008), and beliefs about the prevalence of gender discrimination can be used as a less obvious measure of sexism (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995), but only ambivalent sexism describes the kind of sexist behavior women encounter on a daily basis.

Ambivalent sexism towards men exists and complements ambivalently sexist attitudes towards women (e.g., see Glick & Fiske, 2001a). However, the current work focuses on the most frequent form (Becker & Sibley, 2016; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001), ambivalent sexism towards women.

1.1 Definition of hostile and benevolent sexism

Sexism is a form of prejudice "a positive or negative evaluation of a social group and its members" (Smith & Mackie, 2007, p. 561). The positive evaluation of women is captured in benevolent sexist beliefs. The negative evaluation of women is reflected in hostility toward women and feminism. Unlike other intergroup relations that are influenced by prejudice, such as racism, sexism is unique because women and men interact on a daily

basis, and most sexist men probably do not want to banish women from their lives. Positive and negative evaluations thus coexist.

These ambivalent evaluations result from women and men simultaneously interacting in a hierarchical social system that favors men and in personal relationships that afford power to women. Sexism is a part of patriarchy, the current social system in most countries where men hold positions of power in politics, in the economy, and in the family and are advantaged by health and educational politics (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001a; see also World Economic Forum, 2017). At the same time, men and women's interactions in personal relationships afford dyadic power to women (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001a). Dyadic power is power that originates from the dependencies in two-person relationships (Guttentag & Secord, 1983), and the dyadic power of women over men originates from heterosexual relationships in which women fulfill men's sexual and psychological intimacy needs (Glick et al., 2000; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Hammond & Overall, 2017).

Consequently, Glick and Fiske define two ambivalent aspects of sexism, hostile and benevolent: Hostile sexism reflects hierarchical relationships in the society and comprises attitudes of open hostility toward women and feminism. Benevolent sexism is superficially positive and reflects personally cooperative interactions between men and women in (intimate) relationships. Benevolent sexism is defined as

“... a set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist in terms of viewing women stereotypically and in restricted roles but that are subjectively positive in feeling tone (for the perceiver) and also tend to elicit behaviors typically categorized as prosocial (e.g., helping) or intimacy-seeking (e.g., self-disclosure. [...] its underpinnings lie in traditional stereotyping and masculine dominance (e.g, the man

as the provider and woman as his dependent), and its consequences are often damaging.” (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 491)

Hostile and benevolent sexism are beliefs about relationships between men and women and occur in the domains paternalism, gender differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy. In each of these domains, hostile and benevolent beliefs about men and women emerge.

Paternalism is “the policy or practice on the part of people in authority of restricting the freedom and responsibilities of those subordinate to or otherwise dependent on them in their supposed interest.” (“paternalism | Definition of paternalism in English by Oxford Dictionaries,” n.d.). In a patriarchal system, the term refers to the power men have over women (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001a). Glick and Fiske use the term ‘dominative paternalism’ to describe the restricting, blatantly hostile element, “the belief that men ought to have more power than women and the corresponding fear that women might manage to usurp men’s power” (Glick & Fiske, 2001a, p. 120). ‘Protective paternalism’ describes the superficially benevolent aspect, which is that men hold power over women in women’s “supposed interest”, the belief that “men ought to protect and provide for the women on whom they depend” (Glick & Fiske, 2001a, p. 121).

Gender differentiation describes hostile and benevolent beliefs about the differences between men and women regarding their innate abilities. Gender differentiation probably originates from a combination of biological and ecological factors as well as psychological processes. Most societies show division of labor according to sex (Murdock & Provost, 1973). This distribution of men and women in different roles is thought to be determined by biological factors (childbearing ability and nursing vs. muscle strength) combined with ecological attributes and form of subsistence (Alesina, Giuliano, & Nunn, 2013; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Gilmore, 1990). The observation of men and women in specific roles leads to

descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes that describe men as agentic and women as warm. These stereotypes support the homemaker/breadwinner dichotomy (Eagly & Steffen, 1984; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Williams & Best, 1990). Stereotypes help maintain this dichotomy that originates from requirements tied to other forms of subsistence than the current service-based industry, in which muscle strength is not a necessary condition for success. Beliefs regarding gender differentiation are outdated, irrational and sexist, and again come in a hostile and benevolent form: The blatantly hostile element of gender differentiation, “competitive gender differentiation”, is the belief that “women are ... inferior to men on competence-related dimensions” (Glick & Fiske, 2001a, p. 4). Competitive gender differentiation was, for example, reflected in the belief that women are of inferior intelligence and were especially prevalent and openly expressed at the beginning up to the middle of 20th century (Rossiter, 1984). These beliefs are still present today in the belief that women perform worse in MINT subjects (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999).

The superficially benevolent aspect, “complementary gender differentiation”, is the belief that women are warmer, more nurturing, more pure and delicate compared to men (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001a). These assumed characteristics are reflected in the fact that stereotypes of women are more positive compared to those of men (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989). The content of these positive stereotypes is in line with women’s childrearing role and with lower status roles (Conway, Pizzamiglio, & Mount, 1996).

Beliefs about heterosexual relationships are conceptualized as blatantly negative and superficially positive, too. Research into the meaning of close relationships shows that social support positively influences physical health and psychological well-being (Cohen, 2004; Uchino, Cacioppo, & Kiecolt-Glaser, 1996). When heterosexuality is the norm, this support often originates in intimate heterosexual relationships, although social support could also be

gained from other sources such as friendships. Therefore, “the belief that heterosexual romantic relationships are essential for true happiness in life for both sexes” (Glick & Fiske, 2001a, p. 123) is a benevolent sexist belief called heterosexual intimacy. Heterosexual hostility is “the belief in women’s sexuality as dangerous to men” (Glick & Fiske, 2001a, p. 123), also paraphrased as ‘femme fatale’. The concept of a ‘femme fatale’, “an active agent who uses physical attractiveness, intelligence, and guile to dominate and often destroy husbands and lovers” (Jankowiak & Ramsey, 2000, p. 58) seems universal, as it is present in 94% of cultures (Jankowiak & Ramsey, 2000). Men’s fear to be controlled by women, especially by their sexuality, is counterfactual: Women are sexually more compliant than men (Impett & Peplau, 2003) and at greater risk of being injured, sexually assaulted, or murdered by an intimate partner (Cronholm, Fogarty, Ambuel, & Harrison, 2011).

In sum, ambivalent sexism describes men and women’s beliefs about their relationships in society and justifies the patriarchal structure of society. Men should be more powerful than women (dominative paternalism) and have to protect women (protective paternalism). Women have dyadic power over men, resulting in the belief that they are vital for a men’s happiness (heterosexual intimacy) and resentment towards their sexuality (heterosexual hostility). Gender differentiation reflects differences emerging from men and women fulfilling different roles, with competitive gender differentiation describing women as incompetent in traditional male domains and complementary gender differentiation describing women as competent in lower status roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

1.2 Measuring hostile and benevolent sexism

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was developed in the U.S. to measure Ambivalent Sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Initially, the researchers selected 140 statements that they thought reflected hostile and benevolent sexism in the subdomains paternalism, gender

differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy. Glick and Fiske could not confirm the hypothesized structure of ambivalent sexism consisting of two superordinate factors, hostile and benevolent sexism, with three sub factors for hostile sexism (dominative paternalism, competitive gender differentiation, and hostile heterosexuality) and three sub factors for benevolent sexism (protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy). The sub factors emerged only for benevolent sexism. The empirical structure of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory therefore comprises two superordinate factors, hostile and benevolent sexism, and three sub factors of benevolent sexism. This structure emerged in a large mixed-sex undergraduate student sample ($N = 833$) and was confirmed in two student ($N = 171$, $N = 937$) and non-student samples ($N = 144$ and $N = 112$) in the U.S.

The final Ambivalent Sexism Inventory contains 22 Items, 11 for each superordinate factor. The structural model with two superordinate factors and three sub factors for benevolent sexism has a good fit across 19 nations in all parts of the world, from North and South America (United States, Chile, Brazil, Cuba, Columbia) to various European countries (The Netherlands, England, Germany, Spain, Belgium, Italy, Portugal), African nations (Botswana, Nigeria, South Africa), Middle East (Turkey), East Asia (South Korea, Japan), to Australia (Glick et al., 2000). Moreover, scores on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory meaningfully predict related constructs across the world. For example, in Turkey and Brazil hostile sexism is correlated with attitudes justifying violence against wives (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira, & de Souza, 2002). In the U.S., hostile sexism predicts negative stereotypes toward non-traditional subtypes of women (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997). Benevolent sexism predicts partner ideals in China and the U.S. (T. L. Lee, Fiske, Glick, &

Chen, 2010), and predicts positive stereotypes towards traditional subtypes of women in the U.S. (Glick et al., 1997).

Worldwide, men endorse hostile sexism more than women (Glick et al., 2000). They also often score higher than women on benevolent sexism, but sometimes the difference is non-significant (e.g., in Germany, Turkey, and Japan), and sometimes women are higher on benevolent sexism than men (e.g., in Cuba and three African nations, Glick et al., 2000). Thus, women are more likely to accept benevolent than hostile sexism and help maintain the status quo. Moreover, hostile and benevolent sexism were positively correlated in men and women in almost all countries (Glick et al., 2000), generally between $r = .37$ and $r = .74$ (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This seems contradictory because it means that people have positive *and* negative attitudes toward women *at the same time*.

To sum up, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory measures hostile and benevolent sexism reliably with the same factor structure across countries and significantly predicts relevant constructs. Men and women simultaneously hold positive and negative beliefs about women.

Hostile and benevolent sexism occur within the same individual: Most people in a New Zealand sample adhere to hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs to a similar, albeit moderate (44%) or mild (28%) extent, and 8-9% hold strong hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes (Sibley & Becker, 2012). Ambivalent sexist beliefs about women can be maintained within an individual because hostile and benevolent sexism are directed at different female subtypes. Men direct hostile sexism at women who challenge the status quo, for example, career women (Glick et al., 1997). To the contrary, men direct benevolent sexism at women who fulfill traditional roles and help maintain the status quo, for example homemakers (Glick et al., 1997), and toward lower status women (Delacollette, Dumont, Sarlet, &

Dardenne, 2013). The more ambivalent men's attitudes are, the more strongly they polarize subtypes (Glick et al., 1997), but women polarize, too. They think about female stereotypes that violate the status quo (e.g., feminists, career women) when filling out the hostile sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, but think about traditional subtypes such as housewives when completing the benevolent sexism subscale (Becker, 2010). Thus, men and women direct hostile sexism at career women and feminists, and benevolent sexism at homemakers.

This interplay between hostile and benevolent sexism is plausible from a system-justification perspective: Hostile sexism pushes women away from power and punishes them for agentic behavior, benevolent sexism rewards them for behavior indicative of lower status (Conway et al., 1996) and for status-quo maintaining behavior (Glick & Fiske, 2001b; see also Jost & Kay, 2005). This has consequences for gender equality at nation level (Glick et al., 2000): the higher men's hostile and benevolent sexism, the lower a country's gender-related development index ($r_{HS} = -.47, p < .05, r_{BS} = -.40, p < .10$) and gender empowerment measure ($r_{HS} = -.53, p < .05, r_{BS} = -.43, p < .10$). Both indices assess gender equality (United Nations Development Programme, 1998).

1.3 The double-edged nature of benevolent sexism

Benevolent sexism seems superficially positive: Women do not perceive it as sexist (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998) and like benevolent sexist men (Bohner, Ahlborn, & Steiner, 2010). Additionally, students overestimate the negative effect of hostile and underestimate the negative effect of benevolent sexism on affective reactions compared to the actual experiences women report (Bosson, Pinel, & Vandello, 2009).

Still, benevolent sexism has huge negative effects: After women are treated benevolently sexist, their performance (Dardenne, Dumont, & Bollier, 2007) and self-efficacy

(Jones et al., 2014) decreases, and their thoughts are disrupted by incompetence-related mental intrusions (Dardenne et al., 2007; Dumont, Sarlet, & Dardenne, 2010). Decreases in performance and mental intrusions are stronger after benevolent sexism compared to hostile sexism (Dardenne et al., 2007).

In the relationship domain, women who expect to be cared for by their male partner, that is, who expect to be treated benevolently sexist, are less interested in obtaining personal power in the form of high income and a high status job (Rudman & Heppen, 2003), and the higher women are on benevolent sexism, the stronger their preference for a partner with good earning capacity (Sibley & Overall, 2011; Travaglia, Overall, & Sibley, 2009).

Men who hold benevolent sexist views, or are exposed to benevolent sexism, offer dependency-oriented instead of autonomy-oriented help to a female partner (Shnabel, Bar-Anan, Kende, Bareket, & Lazar, 2016). In the same vein, women who hold or are exposed to benevolent sexism seek dependency-oriented help (Shnabel et al., 2016). Dependency-oriented help keeps help-seekers in an inferior position, only autonomy-oriented help empowers the recipient to solve their problems in the future (Nadler, 2015; van Leeuwen & Täuber, 2010). This pattern holds for interactions between heterosexual couples: The higher men are on benevolent sexism, the more they give dependency-oriented instead of relationship-oriented support of their female partners (Hammond & Overall, 2015). Men high on benevolent sexism neglect their female partners' abilities, and their partners, in turn, feel less competent (Hammond & Overall, 2015).

The superficially positive impression of benevolent sexism shifts when women violate traditional gender stereotypes: Men high on benevolent sexism blame the female victim of an acquaintance rape and perceive her as really wanting sex with the rapist, as intentionally leading the rapist on, and as deserving to be raped (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003).

Women high on benevolent sexism expect this shift when considering role-violating incidents. For example, women high on benevolent sexism expect more intimate partner violence from a husband after his wife was promoted (Expósito, Herrera, Moya, & Glick, 2010).

Finally, benevolent sexism undermines women taking action: Women cope less actively with sexual violence when the hypothetical perpetrator is described as having a benevolent sexist attitude, compared to hostile sexist attitude (Durán, Moya, & Megías, 2014). Women primed with benevolent sexism also endorse system justification beliefs more, thus they are less likely to act against inequalities (Jost & Kay, 2005). Social dominance orientation predicts benevolent sexism stronger in women compared to men. The higher women are on social dominance orientation, that is, the more they perceive that a society structured into more and less advantaged groups is legitimate, the higher their perceived personal need for protection from men, and thus, their benevolent sexism (Radke, Hornsey, Sibley, & Barlow, 2017).

To sum up the research on ambivalent sexism, both hostile and benevolent sexism help maintain the status quo of gender inequality, hostile sexism by pushing women out of status quo violating roles and benevolent sexism by rewarding women for compliance with the status quo. Both have negative consequences for women's economic participation, power, and mental health, and hinder women from holding non-traditional roles. To diminish the negative effects sexism has on women's lives, these sexist attitudes have to be reduced.

2. Reduction of Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Through Collective Action

Sexist attitudes can be reduced through various approaches: First, providing information about the harmful consequences of benevolent sexism and information about the pervasiveness of gender discrimination reduces men's and women's endorsement of benevolent sexism and modern sexist beliefs in the U.S. and in Germany (Becker & Swim, 2011, 2012). Second, targets of prejudice themselves can engage in various strategies to reduce prejudice in a situation or in society in general. When confronted with prejudice, targets can invoke a shared social identity such as sport team or university affiliation (Nier et al., 2001; Schmader, Croft, Whitehead, & Stone, 2013). They can also try to give positive feedback to possibly prejudiced people (Sinclair & Kunda, 1999), although this is tricky as it might often not be appropriate (Stone, Whitehead, Schmader, & Focella, 2011). Targets can also ask the perpetrator to take their perspective, although this potentially causes backlash (Stone et al., 2011), efficiency depends on the prior level of prejudice (Vorauer, Martens, & Sasaki, 2009), and questions that help the perpetrator to self-affirm (Stone et al., 2011) have to be included. Counter stereotypical behavior seems an intuitive way to escape prejudice but causes backlash (Rudman, 1998). All these strategies place responsibility for prejudice reduction with the target and might be effective in single situations. For long-term change however, the status of the individual and the group has to be changed to reduce sexism.

An effective long-term strategy to reduce sexism is collective action (Becker, Zawadzki, & Shields, 2014). Collective action occurs on behalf of one's group and is aimed at maintaining or enhancing the status of one's group (Wright, Taylor, & Moghaddam, 1990). Collective action occurs when groups or individuals try to improve the status of a group and not just that of an individual (Becker, Barreto, Kahn, & de Oliveira Laux, 2015). A group engages in collective action, for example, by holding a demonstration. Individuals engage in

collective action, for example, by signing petitions or confronting sexism on behalf of the group.

Confronting sexism has a number of positive consequences. While perceiving sexism is associated with poor mental health (Borrell et al., 2011), women who engage in individual or collective action against sexism benefit: U.S. American women who respond assertively to prejudice (racism, semitism, sexism) are more satisfied than those who only contemplate it (Cochran, Frazier, & Olson, 1997; Hyers, 2007). They feel empowered and experience a boost to their self-esteem and self-efficacy (Gervais, Hillard, & Vescio, 2010a; Kaiser & Miller, 2004, both U.S.). Confronting women are also perceived as competent by men and women observing the situation (Becker, Glick, Ilic, & Bohner, 2011), and, in the U.S., are perceived more positively than non-confronters (Boysen, 2013). Non-confronting women are viewed negatively in the U.S. and are less likely to be recommended for a job (Diekmann, Walker, Galinsky, & Tenbrunsel, 2012). Moreover, in the U.S., women like and respect a woman who confronts a sexist remark. Finally, confronting fosters change in the society: After being confronted, perpetrators use stereotypes and sexist language (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Mallett & Wagner, 2011, both U.S.) and hold less sexist attitudes (Hyers, 2007; Swim & Hyers, 1999, both U.S.). Even individuals who observe a confrontation hold less sexist attitudes afterwards (Boysen, 2013; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010, both U.S.).

Despite the positive consequences of confronting sexism for individuals and the group on whose behalf the confrontation occurs, direct costs and distal factors discourage women from confronting. Reasons for not confronting sexism (and other prejudices) are perceived social costs (Good, Moss-Racusin, & Sanchez, 2012; Shelton & Stewart, 2004), being perceived as a “complainer” (Kaiser & Miller, 2001) or “trouble maker” (Kaiser & Miller, 2003), possible repercussions when faced with a higher status perpetrator (Ashburn-

Nardo, Blanchar, Petersson, Morris, & Goodwin, 2014; Ayres, Friedman, & Leaper, 2009), and facing irritation on the part of the perpetrator (Czopp & Monteith, 2003).

Moreover, evaluations of confronters are not univocally positive: a confronting target is evaluated more negatively compared to a non-confronting target (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010), and although targets confronting prejudice can achieve more positive attitudes toward their group, they personally are evaluated negatively (Czopp et al., 2006).

Negative evaluations of a target depend on perceiver characteristics: Perceivers high on benevolent sexism perceive a woman who confronts benevolent sexism as cold and less suited for a warmth-related job compared to a non-confronting woman (Becker et al., 2011). Female observers like and respect a woman who confronts a sexist remark, and male observers respect her but don't like her (Dodd, Giuliano, Boutell, & Moran, 2001). Gender identification plays a role for this evaluation (Becker & Barreto, 2014; Kaiser, Hagiwara, Malahy, & Wilkins, 2009).

Beside direct costs of confrontation, distal factors such as the internalization of sexism and the traditional female gender role discourage women from confronting sexism. Expressing anger, yet alone group-based anger on behalf of all women, does not fit with the traditional female gender role and this impedes women from confronting sexism (Hyers, 2007; Radke, Hornsey, & Barlow, 2016).

In short, although collective action fosters change in the society, women confronting sexism might face direct negative consequences such as being perceived as a "trouble maker" and not being liked, and distal factors such as the internalization of sexism and the female gender role deter women from engaging in collective action.

The Presented Research

3. How Do Collective Action Intentions Vary Across Cultures?

Collective action against sexism seems a promising avenue to reduce sexism worldwide. However, studies on collective action are restricted in geographical range: Previous studies on benefits and costs of confronting were almost exclusively conducted in the U.S., with the exception of a few other WEIRD countries (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010), e.g., Germany (Becker & Swim, 2011), Greece, Denmark, and New Zealand (Pollay & Lysonski, 1993). Thus, we do not know how culture influences women's collective action intentions against sexism. Culture can be defined as "shared attitudes, beliefs, categorizations, expectations, norms, roles, self-definitions, values, and other such elements of subjective culture found among individuals whose interactions were facilitated by shared language, historical period, and geographic region" (H. C. Triandis, 1972, p. 3).

We attempt to predict collective action intentions from cultural variables. However, as collective action research has been restricted to WEIRD countries, we derive hypotheses about collective action intentions from research on conflict management styles.

3.1 Conflict management styles

Conflict is "with regard to interpersonal communications, the argument, conflict, and tension that arise whenever the behaviors or values of some people are not approvable to and rejected by other people" (Nugent, 2013). If women perceive sexism, their values are clearly different from that of the perpetrator, and they reject the perpetrator's sexist views, just as the perpetrator rejects their egalitarian views. Therefore, engaging in collective action against sexism can be construed as conflict.

Researchers investigating conflict created several taxonomies of dimensions that describe the behavior of parties in a conflict situation. The first of these theories was the

managerial grid (Blake & Mouton, 1964), based on dual concerns theory. Blake and Mouton state that conflict parties can be defined along two dimensions: To which extent they attempt to obtain their own goals (termed 'concern for production' because the original application was with line managers) and the attempt to maintain interpersonal relationships ('concern for people'). The conflict parties can endorse both concerns more or less, resulting in a 2x2 grid: Low on concern for production and low on concern for people – withdrawing; low on concern for production and high on concern for people – smoothing; high on concern for production and low on concern for people – forcing; high on concern for production and high on concern for people – problem-solving. In the middle of the grid, medium on concern for production and concern for people is the compromising conflict management style (Holt & DeVore, 2005).

Rahim (Rahim, 1983) applied these dimensions to conflict in general and renamed 'concern for production' as 'concern for self', and 'concern for people' as 'concern for others' and assigned new labels to the conflict management styles. Other authors derived similar conflict management styles from Blake and Mouton's work (Holt & DeVore, 2005). Collective action is similar to the forcing conflict management style because in response to being exposed to the perpetrator's values, the target wants to impose their own egalitarian values on the perpetrator who holds sexist values. 'Concern for self' is thus high, 'concern for people' low, thus representing the forcing conflict management style although the terminology is confusing here because the confronter is concerned for people, namely, the discriminated group. Withdrawing from conflict or avoiding conflicts has been interpreted as reflecting low concern for self and low concern for others (Holt & DeVore, 2005). However, as we will see below, it might actually reflect appropriate behavior for people in face cultures.

Research into conflict management styles in different cultures has compared countries along the individualism-collectivism dimension. Individualism and collectivism are often described as extremes on one dimension, reflecting the emphasis a society places on the person versus the group (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). “The core element of individualism is the assumption that individuals are independent of one another” (Oyserman et al., 2002, p. 4) whereas “the core element of collectivism is the assumption that groups bind and mutually obligate individuals” (Oyserman et al., 2002, p. 5). We can easily derive consequences for psychological processes from this basis: People with an individualistic mindset emphasize everything that is individual (goals, uniqueness, control, rights), people with a collectivist mindset emphasize everything that is related to the group (group goals, commonalities, situational constraints of behavior, duties; Oyserman et al. 2002). Individualism is thought to be rooted in Protestantism and in historical developments in Western societies that emphasize the individual’s decisions, freedom, rights, and self-actualization (Inglehart, 1997; Sampson, 2000). Consequently, it is assumed to be prevalent in Western industrialized societies. Collectivism, to the contrary, is assumed to be prevalent in South America, the Middle East, and Asia (Heine, 2011; Oyserman et al., 2002). Individualism and collectivism seem to be opposites, but research indicates that they resemble mindsets that make different aspects of life salient and both an individualistic and a collectivistic mindset can be activated in the same individual (Oyserman, 2015).

In individualistic cultures, concern for personal goals is likely to be more salient in conflicts, and indeed individualistic cultures compared to collectivistic cultures use the forcing conflict style more (Holt & DeVore, 2005). In collectivistic cultures, to the contrary, concern for the other conflict party is more salient, and members of those cultures prefer withdrawing, compromising, and problem-solving conflict management styles accordingly

(Holt & DeVore, 2005). In all these conflict management styles, both conflict parties are equally important. Table 1 gives more examples of preferences of conflict management styles in individualistic compared to collectivistic cultures. A cautionary note: Individualism and collectivism are often not measured in the studies cited here – the position of the selected countries in the studies is merely assumed. A meta-analysis showed that these assumed positions might not be accurate (Oyserman et al., 2002). However, these findings at least indicate that members of individualistic cultures prefer different conflict management styles than members of collectivistic cultures, an assumption we will use to derive predictions for collective action intentions.

Table 1

Preferences of Conflict Management Styles in Individualistic vs. Collectivistic Cultures.

Individualistic Cultures	Collectivistic Cultures
U.S. American participants use the dominating conflict style more compared to Japanese and Koreans (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991)	Chinese and Taiwanese participants use obliging and avoiding conflict management styles more than U.S. participants (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991)
U.S. Americans prefer assertive tactics over avoidance tactics (Ohbuchi, Fukushima, & Tedeschi, 1999)	Japanese prefer avoidance tactics over assertive tactics (Ohbuchi et al., 1999)
Participants with an individualist orientation	Chinese participants prefer an avoiding style

prefer a dominating rather than an obliging to other conflict management styles or avoiding style (Komarraju, Dollinger, & (Tjosvold & Sun, 2002) Lovell, 2008)

Taiwanese use an obliging and avoiding style U.S. American executives prefer obliging, more than U.S. American (Trubisky, Ting-dominating, and compromising compared to Toomey, & Lin, 1991) integrating and avoiding (Elsayed-Ekjiouly & Buda, 1996)

Asian Americans use the avoiding conflict style more than European Americans (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000)

Turkish participants prefer involving a third party to resolve a conflict, while U.S. Americans prefer direct communication (Kozan & Ergin, 1998)

Arab Middle Eastern participants used integrating and avoiding more than U.S. executives (Elsayed-Ekjiouly & Buda, 1996)

Mexican students prefer accommodation and collaboration compared to U.S. students (Gabrielidis, Stephan, Ybarra, Pearson, & Villareal, 1997)

Collectivists prefer an integrating style
(Komarraju et al., 2008)

3.2 Self-concept and its consequences for conflict management styles

Individualism and collectivism are cultural-level variables that describe a culture's orientation toward certain aspects of life. On the individual level, both variables can be internalized to different degrees. The internalization of individualism has been associated with having an independent self-concept (M.-S. Kim et al., 1996; M.-S. Kim, Aune, Hunter, Kim, & Kim, 2001), and the internalization of collectivism has been associated with having an interdependent self-concept (M.-S. Kim et al., 1996).

Self-concepts describe an individuals' concern about emphasizing the individual versus the group (Singelis, 1994). The self-concept is "all of an individual's knowledge about his or her personal qualities" (Smith & Mackie, 2007, p. 96). Markus and Kitayama (1991) made the distinction between independent and interdependent self-concept or self-construal prominent. People with an *independent self-concept* perceive themselves as separate from other individuals and strive for establishing independence from others. They attempt to achieve this normative goal through discovering and expressing their unique attributes (Cross, Hardin, & Gercek-Swing, 2011; Marsella, De Vos, & Hsu, 1985; Shweder & Bourne, 1984). Consequently, individuals with an independent self-concept are motivated by personal goals (Kitayama & Uchida, 2005; Markus & Kitayama, 2003).

In contrast, individuals with an *interdependent self-concept* are thought to perceive the self as fundamentally connected to others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Consequently, relationships to other people are important (Cross et al., 2011; Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and individuals with an interdependent self-concept see other people as part of themselves.

Therefore, they are more likely than individuals with an independent self-concept to conform to others' opinions (or at least not express disagreement openly) and have been shown to be motivated more by obligations to and attitudes of other people than by personal goals (Kitayama & Uchida, 2005; Markus & Kitayama, 2003). When someone has a chronically or experimentally activated interdependent self-concept, they tend to consider other's views and social and subjective norms more compared to those with a chronically or experimentally activated independent self-concept. When someone has a chronically or experimentally activated independent self-concept, they follow their intrinsic attitudes and take others' opinions, social and subjective norms less into account (Torelli, 2006; Verplanken, Trafimow, Khusid, Holland, & Steentjes, 2008; Ybarra & Trafimow, 1998).

Markus and Kitayama (1991) conceptualize the desire to maintain harmony as a part of the interdependent self-concept. Self-concepts influence predispositions of verbal communication: The independent self emphasizes an unique opinion and its expression, and consequently is positively related with approaching arguments, negatively related with fear of (imagined or real) communication (Kim, Aune, Hunter, Kim, & Kim, 2001), and associated with a dominating conflict management style (M.-S. Kim, Lee, Kim, & Hunter, 2004; Oetzel, 1998). In contrast, the interdependent self-concept is negatively related with approaching arguments, positively related with fear of communication (Kim et al., 2001), and associated with an avoiding conflict management style (M.-S. Kim et al., 2004; Oetzel, 1998). Thus, individuals with a chronically or experimentally activated independent self-concept seem to seek arguments, while those with an interdependent self seem to try to avoid arguments.

Given that individuals who confront sexism are perceived as complainers (Kaiser & Miller, 2001), probably even more so in contexts where people are generally discouraged from expressing their thoughts, we hypothesize that a more independent and less

interdependent self-concept correlates positively with the confrontation of sexism.

3.2.1 Measuring the self-concept

Singelis (1994) developed the Self-Construal Scale to measure the self-concept based on Markus and Kitayama's descriptions of the self-concepts (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The independent self-concept is measured by items such as "Speaking up during class is not a problem for me" and "I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects". The interdependent self-concept is measured by items such as "It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group" and "I will sacrifice my self-interest for the group I am in". Both scales had good reliabilities in a sample including various ethnic minorities. Some researchers criticized the Self-Construal Scale because expected cultural differences did not emerge when self-concepts were measured with this scale (Levine et al., 2003; Matsumoto, 1999; Oyserman et al., 2002). Therefore, Japanese researches refined and adjusted the scale. They argue that rejection avoidance, that is, being afraid of being disliked and not accepted, is an important part of the interdependent self-concept, but has been ignored in previous research (Hashimoto & Yamagishi, 2013). They argue that individuals with an interdependent self-concept rely on other people more than individuals with an independent self-concept, and thus have to ensure that they stay part of their social groups. Hashimoto and Yamagishi's final scale includes items to measure independence, rejection avoidance, and harmony seeking. Items measuring these constructs were chosen from previous scales and showed the expected three-factor structure and good reliability in a Japanese sample. The discriminant validity of the rejection avoidance and harmony seeking scales was demonstrated with a physiological measure. Participants were recorded reading a strongly self-complimentary self-introduction that puts individuals with an interdependent self-concept at risk of social rejection. Rejection avoidance, but not harmony seeking,

correlated with a physiological marker reflecting psychological stress. To sum up, Hashimoto and Yamagishi (2013) suggest a three-factorial scale to measure self-concepts and provide convincing evidence that their scale is more relevant to Japanese people than the original Singelis (1994) measure.

We decided to use this three-factorial scale in our studies to measure self-concepts because a) the measurement of the independent self-concept did not seem to differ greatly between the Self-Construal Scale and this scale b) the new conceptualization of the interdependent self-concept could possibly explain inconsistent previous findings regarding the distribution of self-concepts across countries and c) the additional component of the interdependent self-concept seemed a valid indigenous construct suitable for research in Japan.

3.2.2 Selection of countries

Individuals in all cultural contexts can see themselves as separate from or related with others. Different cultures emphasize one self-concept over the other and thus chronically activate one self-concept more than the other (Cross et al., 2011; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Oyserman, 2015; Singelis, 1994; Harry C. Triandis, 1989). An independent self-concept is considered to be chronically activated in the United States and other Western countries, an interdependent self-concept is expected to be chronically activated in non-Western countries such as Japan, but also in Africa and Central and South America (Cross et al., 2011; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In order to investigate how the self-concept influences collective action intentions, we should thus choose a Western country where an independent self-concept supposedly is active in participants, and a non-Western country where an interdependent self-concept supposedly is active in participants. We chose Germany as a Western country and Japan and Turkey as non-Western countries. Based on

previous research (Cross et al., 2011; Hashimoto & Yamagishi, 2013; M.-S. Kim et al., 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991), we expect German participants to have a strong independent and weak interdependent self-concept and the reverse for Turkish and Japanese participants. Within each country, however, we would expect participants to vary in their endorsement of the two self-concepts and we would expect this variation to influence confrontation of sexism. Within each country, the more participants endorse an independent self-concept and the less they endorse an interdependent self-concept, the more they should intend to engage in collective action against sexism.

3.3 Face concern and its influence on collective action

Cross-cultural psychologists often use the distinction between independent and interdependent self-concept. Only recently, researchers (Lin & Yamaguchi, 2007; Zane & Yeh, 2002) introduced the concept of face, which is more prevalent in ethnological research. The concept of face plays an enormous role for individuals who endorse it and their social interactions. We assume that it can explain unique variance in individuals who endorse it, such as Japanese participants who we decided to survey. Therefore, we decided to include it in our study (see also Chapter 3.4).

Researchers use the concept of face to describe differences in social behavior across cultures. The definition of this concept varies depending on the cultural context (e.g., China: Ho, 1976; or Japan: Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011b; see also Yabuuchi, 2004) and discipline in which it is described (cross-cultural psychology, sociology, and anthropology). It is a broad construct with facets influenced by aspects of intercultural communication, conflict, and politeness. Face is "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself [sic] by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes" (Goffman, 1955, p. 213). Thus, face is a

positive social image one presents towards others. This definition has a universal aspect, because individuals in all cultures to some degree are preoccupied with presenting themselves positively (Ho, 1976; Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011a; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). This universal aspect is mirrored in the fact that a “Loss of Face Scale” is valid in Asian Americans, European Americans, and Hong Kong and Mainland Chinese (Mak, Chen, Lam, & Yiu, 2008; Zane & Yeh, 2002), and that preoccupations with maintaining face are positively related to distress in Chinese and European Americans (Mak et al., 2008). In sum and across cultures, face is the positive social image we present towards others.

However, face also varies across cultures. Norm violation leads to loosing social approval and thus to loosing one’s positive image, thus, to face loss, but norms vary across cultures (Goffman, 1955; Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011a). For example, norm violation leads to face loss in Hong Kong Chinese and U.S. Americans (Liao & Bond, 2011), but face is personal in individualistic countries, and interpersonal in collectivist countries (Choi & Lee, 2002; Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011a).

Face is connected to the self-concept: The independent self-concept correlates positively with concern for maintaining one’s own face (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003), whereas the interdependent self-concept correlates positively with concern for maintaining other people’s face (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003).

Quantitative distinctions also exist: the degree of face concern, that is, an individual’s preoccupation with the possibility to loose face, varies. Face concern arises when face loss is imminent (Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011b). Face concern is higher in East Asian cultures (Ho, 1976; Zane & Yeh, 2002) than in Western cultures. For example, Zane and Yeh (2002) found that Asian Americans showed higher levels of face concern in social situations than their

European American counterparts. In sum, although face is a universal concept, qualitative and quantitative differences between cultures exist.

We will focus on the Japanese definition of face because we conduct the following study in Japan, and because there is empirical evidence for the Japanese conceptualization of face. Lin and Yamaguchi (2011b) specified the description of face. They asked Japanese students about situations in which they felt impending face loss. Results revealed that face loss is especially imminent when performing in a social role, position, or according to a social norm in the presence of others. Social roles named were professor, business man [*sic*], and television program host. There was no interaction effect between the importance of social role and presence of others on face concern. Thus, face is maintained through role-appropriate performance in the presence of others.

Maintaining face has positive consequences for Japanese: it increases joyfulness and self-esteem and decreases depressiveness. Even helping maintain other people's face increases joyfulness and calmness (Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011a).

3.4 Relevance of face concern for collective action

Face concern is relevant to collective action because it influences behavior in the presence of others. When social norms emphasize harmony, which is the case in face cultures, each interaction, and above all conflict, holds the imminent risk of face loss (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Thus, avoiding arguments and even the expression of own opinions becomes a strength and cultural ideal (M.-S. Kim et al., 2001). Japanese, who are part of a face culture (Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011b), avoid conflict to preserve relationships (Ohbuchi & Takahashi, 1994a). In fact, and in contrast to U.S. Americans, avoidance is their preferred conflict management style (Ohbuchi et al., 1999). Japanese, compared to U.S. Americans, also aim more at compromising in conflicts, (Ohbuchi et al., 1999). To avoid conflict,

individuals high on face concern downplay the expression of their own opinions, emotions, and rights (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998) and adjust them to situational norms (Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus, 2001). Downplaying one's rights is even considered adequate when facing unfair treatment:

It is not incumbent on the victim to directly redress the grievance him- or herself.

Direct retaliation by the victim is unnecessary because the group or a superior is able to punish the offender; in fact, direct retaliation would be undesirable because it would further upset the harmony of the system. (Leung & Cohen, 2011, p. 501)

Applied to hostile sexism, an unfair treatment on the basis of sex, a confrontation by the victim herself would thus be seen as undesirable. Thus, individuals in face cultures would probably defer punishment for hostile sexism either to the group or to a hierarchically higher person and not react themselves.

To sum up, building on research on face concern, we expect Japanese participants to be high on face concern, German and Turkish participants to be low on face concern, and expect individuals high on face concern to prefer an avoiding conflict management style to confronting a sexist perpetrator.

Face concerns would also apply to the confrontation of benevolent sexism. However, confrontation of benevolent sexism is unlikely: Japanese men and women hold benevolent sexist beliefs to a similar extent as U.S. American and German men and women (Glick et al., 2000). In the U.S. and Europe benevolent sexism is perceived positively (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Bohner et al., 2010). Therefore, we expect that benevolent sexism is perceived as positively in Japan as it is in the U.S. and Europe. Women will then be expected to accept benevolent sexist behavior: "Benevolence from a person in a superior role should, at least ideally, be reciprocated with deference and loyalty from a partner in an inferior role"

(Hendry, 2013, p. 105). (Men are afforded higher status than women in Japan if all other characteristics are equal; Hendry, 2013). Thus, face concerns would hinder collective action against benevolent sexism, too, and we expect that participants from Germany, Turkey, and Japan will not engage in collective action against benevolent sexism.

3.5 An unaccomplished desire for collective action

Women in the U.S. find themselves torn between the desire to confront sexism and gender role prescriptions that prevent them from confronting. The female gender role prohibits the expression of (group-based) anger (Hyers, 2007; Radke et al., 2016). At the same time, activist norms encourage women to confront sexism (Hyers, 2007). Consequently, a discrepancy between women's thoughts and actions arises: U.S. American women reported that in 34% of sexist events they reacted differently to sexism than how they actually wanted to, with the most common discrepancy being wanting to confront (91%) but not confronting (Brinkman, Garcia, & Rickard, 2011). Thus, women who do not confront sexism do not necessarily agree with it (Swim & Hyers, 1999). In Japan, this discrepancy between desired and actual behavior might be especially pronounced: Public behavior ('tatemae') or face ('kao') is clearly separated from one's real feelings ('honne') or heart ('kokoro'; Hendry, 2013). Japanese view the ability to distinguish between them as a sign of maturity (Doi, 1986).

Individuals endorsing the concept of face will attempt to perform optimally in their social roles, independent of their own perception of sexism (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). This leads us to assume that Japanese women encountering sexism might perceive it negatively, not confront it, and still have a desire to confront. Therefore, we will attempt to measure a new concept in collective action research, the "unaccomplished desire for collective action".

In short, women are subject to conflicting influences regarding the confrontation of sexism. This applies to women in the West (Hyers, 2007; Radke et al., 2016), and might be especially pronounced in Japanese women because of a cultural tradition of distinguishing between public behavior and private thoughts and feelings.

3.6 Manuscript #1

Collective Action against Sexism in Germany, Turkey, and Japan: The Influence of Self-Construal and Face Concerns

Fischer, F. ¹, Becker, J. C. ¹, Kito, M. ², & Zamantılı Nayır, D. ³ (2017). Collective Action against Sexism in Germany, Turkey, and Japan: The Influence of Self-Construal and Face Concerns. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 20(3), 409-423. doi: 10.1177/1368430216683533

¹ Institute of Psychology, University of Osnabrueck, Seminarstrasse 20, 49074 Osnabrueck, Germany

² Meiji Gakuin University, Japan, 〒108-0071 Tokyo, Minato, Shirokanedai, 1 Chome-2-37

³ Marmara University, Eğitim Mahallesi, 34722 Kadıköy/İstanbul, Turkey

Key Words: Benevolent Sexism, Hostile Sexism, Collective Action, Face Culture, Ambivalent Sexism, Independent Self, Interdependent Self

Abstract: 142 words, Main text: 5856 words, Notes: 307 words, references: 1630 words, tables: 565 words, 4 tables

Author note: Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Freyja Fischer, University of Osnabrueck, Department of Psychology, Seminarstr. 20, 49074 Osnabrueck, Germany, freyja.fischer@uni-osnabrueck.de. Parts of this work were supported by a grant from the German Research Foundation awarded to Julia Becker (DFG BE 4648/1-3), an EASP travel grant, and a mobility grant from Osnabrueck University. We would like to

thank Angelika Benz and Lea Hartwich for their helpful comments on this article, Andrea Schröder for helping with data collection in Germany and Turkey, and Misato Inaba for helping with data collection in Japan.

Abstract

We suggest that self-construal and face concerns influence individuals' collective action intentions against sexism. We examined female students from Germany ($N = 105$), Japan ($N=112$), and Turkey, ($N = 111$), exposed them to a benevolent and a hostile sexist scenario, and compared their collective action intentions and indirect conflict management styles (avoiding, outflanking) within countries. As predicted, German and Turkish female students' collective action intentions against sexism surpassed their intentions for indirect conflict management styles, whereas the reverse was true for Japanese female students. However, Japanese female students had an unaccomplished desire for collective action, suggesting that they wish to act but decide against open confrontation to maintain ingroup harmony. The higher individuals' independent self-concept and the less they value face the higher their collective action intentions against hostile sexism in all three countries. We discuss culturally appropriate ways of collective action.

Collective Action against Sexism in Germany, Turkey, and Japan: The Influence of Self-Construal and Face Concerns

Sexism constitutes “individuals’ attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, and organizational, institutional, and cultural practices that either reflect negative assessments of individuals based upon their gender or support unequal status of women and men” (Swim & Hyers, 2009, p. 407). Sexism exists across cultures (Glick et al., 2000), but studies examining how women respond to sexism in different cultural contexts are missing. In the present research, we examined female students’ collective action intentions in reaction to sexism in Germany, Turkey, and Japan. Below, we review the effectiveness of collective action as a means for reducing sexism, and then discuss how self-construals and face concerns might influence collective action intentions.

Collective Action as a Way to Reduce Sexism

Collective action is one of the most effective responses to sexism (Becker et al., 2014). Collective action is an action on behalf of one’s group that aims to maintain or enhance the status of that group (Wright et al., 1990). It can be performed collectively (e.g., participating in a demonstration) or individually (e.g., signing a petition, standing up and defending one’s group when being exposed to discrimination) – as long as it benefits the ingroup. As outlined in previous research, individual confrontation of sexism is an act of collective action as long as it aims at reducing sexism in general (and is not performed in order to positively distinguish oneself from the rest of the group; Becker, Barreto, Kahn, & Oliveira Laux, 2015). Collective action against sexism can effectively reduce future sexism (Hyers, 2007; Swim & Hyers, 1999), empower confronting women, and boost their self-esteem and self-efficacy (Gervais, Hillard, & Vescio, 2010b; Kaiser & Miller, 2004). It also reduces men’s use of sexist language (Mallett & Wagner, 2011).

Studies so far have examined how women respond to sexism in the U.S. and other Western countries (in the Netherlands: Barreto & Ellemers, 2005b; in Germany: Becker & Swim, 2011; in the U.S.: Hyers, 2007; in ethnic minority women: Matheson & Foster, 2013; in Greece, Denmark, and New Zealand: Pollay & Lysonski, 1993). However, we are not aware of any empirical research that explicitly examined cultural variables as predictors of collective action against sexism.

The main objective of the present work is to examine whether culture is related to female students' responses to sexism. Culture can be defined as „shared attitudes, beliefs, categorizations, expectations, norms, roles, self-definitions, values, and other such elements of subjective culture found among individuals whose interactions were facilitated by shared language, historical period, and geographic region“ (H. C. Triandis, 1972, p. 3).

Self-Construal and Collective Action

Individuals who strive to be unique, and express and promote their own goals are said to have an *independent self*. Individuals who place a higher value on maintaining harmony and “fitting in”, and primarily define themselves through their relationships with others, are said to have an *interdependent self*. An independent self is assumed to be more prevalent (i.e., chronically activated) in individuals in North America and Western Europe, whereas an interdependent self is assumed to be more prevalent in Asia, Latin America, and Southern Europe (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). We expect that an individual's chronically activated self-construal affects reactions to sexism. Individuals with an activated independent self strive to be unique, to express their opinion and to promote their own goals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Thus, when they are exposed to sexism, they are likely to stand up for themselves and thus respond with collective action rather than remain silent (or use more indirect conflict management). In contrast, individuals with an activated

interdependent self strive to maintain harmony, be accepted by others and avoid arguments (M. Kim, Aune, Hunter, Kim, & Kim, 2001). Collective action is difficult to combine with maintaining harmony, because activists are often perceived as complainers (Kaiser & Miller, 2001). Therefore, we expect that the more interdependent an individual's self-construal, the weaker their collective action intentions and the stronger their preference for indirect conflict management.

Face Concern and Collective Action

Face is the social worth that others see in a person (Leung & Cohen, 2011). It is thus a belief about what is important in a person, an expectation of how others behave, and a shared norm of behavior. Face is maintained through role-consistent behavior (Choi & Lee, 2002; Leung & Cohen, 2011; Mak et al., 2008; Ting-Toomey et al., 1991) and is irretrievably lost when others think that one behaves inappropriately, when one is criticized or criticizes others (Leung & Cohen, 2011; Mak et al., 2008). Individuals high on face concern downplay the expression of their own opinions, emotions, and rights (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998) and adjust them to situational norms (Kanagawa et al., 2001). We therefore expect that when face concerns are salient, collective action against sexism is very unlikely to occur, because standing up for themselves is deemed inappropriate for the target of the deviating behavior. In a face culture (a geographic region that shares beliefs, expectations, and norms concerning face), individuals use indirect conflict management strategies: They avoid conflict to maintain relationships (Ohbuchi & Atsumi, 2010; Ohbuchi & Takahashi, 1994b). An *avoiding* conflict management style means that a conflict topic, conflict partner, or conflict situation is avoided altogether. Alternatively, a third person known by both conflict parties can be engaged unobtrusively to negotiate the conflict. This is called an *outflanking* conflict management style. We expect that in a face culture, due to the more widely spread negative

connotations of criticism, indirect conflict management styles such as avoiding and outflanking are used more frequently compared to collective action against sexist behavior. We expect that women in a face culture have an *unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action*: They perceive discrimination and consider it to be negative (E. A. Lee, Soto, Swim, & Bernstein, 2012), they wish to stand up, but decide to comply with cultural norms due to social pressures to be polite (Swim & Hyers, 1999), and the social costs of violating those norms (Shelton & Stewart, 2004) and thus do not engage in collective action.

The Present Research

We compared reactions to hostile and benevolent sexism in Germany, Turkey and Japan, countries varying on the independent/interdependent self-construal and face concern. Hostile sexism reflects openly negative views on women (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexism is subtler and reflects supposedly positive views of women, for example, the belief that men should protect and provide for them. Benevolent sexism seems positive at first glance and is often not perceived as sexism (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Swim, Mallett, Russo-Devosa, & Stangor, 2005). However, benevolent sexism has several negative consequences. For instance, it predicts hostile sexism (Sibley & Perry, 2010), “rewards” only those women who behave in line with traditional gender roles (e.g., Becker, 2010; Glick & Fiske, 1996) and makes women more likely to support the status quo (Becker & Wright, 2011; Jost & Kay, 2005).

We compared these two types of sexism to achieve a maximum contrast in terms of collective action intentions. Benevolent sexism is often perceived as benign (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005b; Bohner et al., 2010) and seems to render collective action against it unnecessary. Our hostile sexism scenario, on the contrary, is unambiguously negative and

allows us to examine the role of face concerns under conditions that are clearly threatening for women.

We selected Japan as a face-culture, in which individuals have a more interdependent (compared to independent) self-construal. We selected Germany as a non-face culture in which individuals have a rather independent (compared to interdependent) self-construal. We selected Turkey as a non-face culture that has been found to combine the agency of an independent self with the connectedness of an interdependent self (Kagitçibasi, 1996). Turkey has not often been the subject of cross-cultural research despite its intriguing combination of self-construals. We aim to extend the scope of cross-cultural research beyond the Western-East Asian dichotomy. Furthermore, in the last 10 years, Turkish society has been polarized into women fulfilling traditional demands and women opposing them (Kandiyoti, 2015). We were interested in Turkish female students' approach to collective action after these societal changes.

Summary of Hypotheses

In the following, we refer to female students as 'students'. As outlined above, we expect that German and Turkish students' independent self-construal should be more pronounced than Japanese students'. In contrast, Japanese students' interdependent self should be more pronounced than German students'. We hypothesize that Japanese students' face concern will be higher than German and Turkish students' face concern. In terms of our main predictions, we expect that collective action is more likely as a response to hostile than to benevolent sexism (*Hypothesis 1*). We further expect that German and Turkish students will prefer collective action to indirect conflict management styles (avoiding, outflanking) when faced with both forms of sexism (*Hypothesis 2a*), whereas Japanese students prefer indirect conflict management to collective action (*Hypothesis 2b*).

We expect that all students support rather than confront benevolent sexism (*Hypothesis 3a*). We hypothesize that German and Turkish students confront rather than support hostile sexism (*Hypothesis 3b*), whereas Japanese students support rather than confront hostile sexism (*Hypothesis 3c*). We expect that for both types of sexism, German and Turkish students' collective action intentions will surpass their unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action (*Hypothesis 4a*) whereas Japanese students' unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action will surpass their collective action intentions (*Hypothesis 4b*). This would indicate that they perceive sexism negatively but social norms prevent them from acting against it.

However, variation in endorsement of cultural norms within countries is high, meaning that, for instance, not all individuals in Japan score high on face and higher on the interdependent self than the independent self. Similarly, Turks and Germans can also have concerns for losing face. We therefore expect that the three cultural factors can affect students in all three cultures in a way that a) a stronger interdependent self-construal, b) a weaker independent self-construal, and c) more face concerns are related to weaker collective action intentions (but to a stronger unaccomplished desire to confront) across cultures. We expect these correlations for hostile sexism but not necessarily for benevolent sexism because benevolent sexism is often perceived positively, rendering collective action against it unnecessary. Finally, we do not expect that the cultural dimensions affect the perceptions of sexism, because it is the public action not the private perception that can threaten cultural norms.

Method

Participants.

All participants were students in metropolitan areas. They were recruited in undergraduate classes and asked to report on “the behavior of different persons in interpersonal situations”. In *Germany*, data was collected at a university in the North-West of the country ($N = 126$). We excluded 21 participants because they did not have German nationality (6), did not indicate nationality (9), did not indicate for how long they were abroad (1), were 60 years old (1), were men (2), and multivariate outliers (2). The final German sample included 105 female students aged 18 – 33 years ($M = 21.83$, $SD = 3.35$). The majority studied psychology but minors in other subjects also participated. In *Japan*, students were recruited from two universities in the Northern part of the country ($N = 121$). We excluded nine participants from the analysis because they did not indicate their sex (4), were men (2), had been abroad for more than five years (1), did not understand the questionnaire (1), or were multivariate outliers (1). The final Japanese sample included 112 female students aged 18 – 23 years ($M = 20.13$, $SD = 0.99$) with the majority studying psychology. In *Turkey*, students were recruited at a university in the North-West of the country ($N = 112$). We excluded one participant because she indicated that she had been in Germany for an unknown period of time. The final Turkish sample included 111 female students aged 19 – 26 years ($M = 21.92$, $SD = 1.69$) with majors in business, economy, psychology, and other subjects. The MCAR-test showed that missing values were completely at random in every sample. Thus, we replaced them with Maximum Likelihood estimation (Expectation Maximization). No participant spent more than five years abroad; hence, all our participants were acculturated in their respective society (Masgoret & Ward, 2006).

Procedure

All participants completed a printed version of the questionnaire. In Germany, students could also participate online¹. Germans answered the questionnaire in German. For the Japanese version, the first and second author and their team translated and backtranslated the German questionnaire into English. Then, English-Japanese bilinguals translated and backtranslated the English questionnaire to Japanese, and the third author and her team carefully checked the adequacy of translation. For the Turkish version, the fourth author and her team translated and backtranslated the German questionnaire into Turkish. The questionnaire included two scenarios of sexist behaviors², and participants were asked to imagine being the woman in the scenario who was exposed to sexism and to answer questions regarding these scenarios. At the end of the questionnaire, participants answered items measuring cultural dimensions, demographic questions, and whether and how long they had been abroad. Finally, participants were thanked and fully debriefed.

¹ Meta-analyses and studies with large sample sizes showed that paper-pencil and online questionnaires are measurement equivalent (Cole, Bedeian, & Feild, 2006; Davidov & Depner, 2011; Gwaltney, Shields, & Shiffman, 2008; Meade, Michels, & Lautenschlager, 2007).

² We included four scenarios, but report only two. Results for one additional benevolent and one additional hostile scenario are reported in the supplementary online material. They basically show the same pattern as the results presented here. Exceptions are that, for H3a, Turkish students' answers confirm our predictions and for H3b German students' collective action intentions against hostile sexism are similar to their level of support.

Scenarios. Participants were presented with a benevolent and a hostile sexist scenario. All co-authors agreed that the scenarios were realistic and relevant in their respective cultural context. In the benevolent sexism scenario, participants read that, at work, a male colleague offers to do a virus scanner update for a female colleague because “As a woman you do not have to grapple with it.” (taken from Becker, Glick, Ilic & Bohner, 2011). In the hostile sexism scenario we focused on a very blatant form of sexism. Specifically, participants read about a 21 year old woman travelling in a crowded bus who is touched inappropriately by a man.

Measures

Positive and negative perception of the man’s behavior. After each scenario, participants reported how positively (nice, right, well-meant) and how negatively (problematic, discriminating, sexist) they perceived the man’s behavior. These and all other items were answered on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 7 (*totally agree*). Both perception scales were adopted from Becker and Barreto (2014) and were reliable across countries (positive perception: benevolent sexism: all α s > .73, hostile sexism: all α s > .81; negative perception: benevolent sexism: all α s > .85, hostile sexism: all α s > .62; country-specific alphas are provided in the supplementary material).

Collective action intentions. Three items were taken from Becker and Barreto (2014). In the benevolent scenario, the three items were: “I would tell my colleague that he is discriminating against women”, “I would talk to my colleague about the fact that his behavior was sexist”, and “I would slap my colleague in the face”. We removed the last item from the scale to improve reliability (all α s > .76). Decreased reliability is probably due to the non-normative nature of this item. Additional analyses regarding this item can be found in the supplementary material.

In terms of hostile sexism, the three items were: “I would say loudly that someone has groped me and that that is discriminating against women”, “I would say loudly that he should stop groping me because it is sexist”, and “I would slap that man in the face”. Again, we removed the last item to improve reliability (all α s > .78). Consequently, the range of intentions provided is comprised of intentions to confront and criticize on behalf of the group of women, not on behalf of the individual woman in the scenario, and thus constitutes collective action intentions.

Support of sexist behavior. In the benevolent sexism scenario, participants indicated “I would let my colleague sit on my chair to carry out the update”, “I would thank my colleague for carrying out the update”, and “I would reject to let my colleague do the update” (all α s > .77). In the hostile sexism scenario, items were “I would not do anything”, “I would pretend to not have noticed anything”, and “I would sidestep”. Due to low reliabilities, we dropped the last item. All three scales were reliable (α s > .78).

Avoiding. In the benevolent sexism scenario participants indicated whether, in the future, they would avoid their colleague and try to avoid having contact with him (all α s > .90). Items in the hostile sexism scenario referred to avoidance of the situation (Rahim, 1983). Due to low reliability (all α s < .38) we did not create this scale.

Outflanking. Following previous work (Tjosvold & Sun, 2002), in the benevolent sexism scenario, two items were used “I would try to talk to a supervisor about what had happened in order to avoid my colleague but to still change his behavior” and “I would talk to someone we both know about what had happened in order to change his behavior” (all α s > .57). In the hostile sexism scenario, participants indicated “I would tell the driver what happened and ask him/her for help” and “I would contact the bus company and tell them

what happened in order to encourage them to maybe do something against this kind of behavior” (SH: all α s > .71).

Unaccomplished desire for collective action. In terms of benevolent sexism, items assessing an unaccomplished desire for collective action were “I would like to do something about his statement but then I would prefer to do nothing” and “I would have the impulse to do something against my colleague’s statement, but then I would not spring to live” (all α s > .75). For hostile sexism, we replaced ‘my colleague’s’ with ‘this man’s’ and ‘statement’ with ‘behavior’ (all α s > .69).³

Face. We used 19 items (Mak et al., 2008) to assess to which extent participants were concerned about face loss. Sample items are “*During a discussion, I try not to ask questions because I may appear ignorant to others*” and “*I maintain a low profile because I do not want to make mistakes in front of other people*” (all α s > .68).

Self-concept. We used a three-dimensional model (Hashimoto & Yamagishi, 2013) to measure participants’ self-concept. Interdependent self-concept consists of rejection avoidance and harmony seeking. Three items measured *rejection avoidance*, the sensitivity towards rejection from important others. Sample items are “*I find myself being concerned about what other people think of me*” and “*I worry about what people think of me, and always feel that someone is watching me*” (all α s > .65). Seven items measured *harmony*

³ To measure the prevalence of sexism, we asked participants whether they themselves had experienced someone offering help to them because they are women (benevolent scenario) or someone touching them in an unpleasant way (hostile scenario). Answers options were “yes” or “no”. Table 4 in the supplementary online material displays the results; women in all countries were familiar with all types of sexism.

seeking. Due to low reliability in the German sample ($\alpha = .50$) we decided not to use this scale any further. Eight items measured the *independent self-concept*. Sample items are “*I always express my opinions clearly*”, and “*I always speak and act confidently*” (all α s $\geq .59$)⁴.

Results

Table 1 shows that, as expected, German and Turkish students scored higher on independent self-construal than on rejection avoidance and face. Japanese students scored higher on face and rejection avoidance than on independent self-construal. Measurement invariance was not established.⁵ Given the lack of invariance, we made only within-country comparisons.

To check whether the scenarios were perceived as intended, we tested whether participants in all countries perceived benevolent sexism more positively and less negatively than hostile sexism. Descriptive statistics are provided in Table 2. We compare the two types of sexism within country with Wilcoxon’s signed-rank test because the perception of hostile sexism was not distributed normally. As predicted, students in all countries perceived benevolent sexism more positively and less negatively than hostile sexism (all z s < -7.40 , all p s $< .001$, all r s < -0.70 ; z s < -5.97 , all p s $< .001$, all r s < -0.57 , respectively). In line with that and supporting Hypothesis 1, results showed that collective action against hostile sexism was more likely than against benevolent sexism in Germany and Turkey ($F(1, 104) = 49.91, p$

⁴ We sampled three additional behavioral intentions: attempts to show tit-for-tat behavior, internalization of sexism, and reappraisal of the situation. We do not report these due to low reliabilities. We also sampled two emotions: anger and gladness. We do not report these due to low reliabilities.

⁵ Results can be obtained from the first author.

< .001, $\eta^2 = .324$; $F(1, 110) = 10.36$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .086$, respectively). Japanese students had similarly low levels of collective action for both types of sexism ($F(1, 111) = 1.75$, $p = .188$, $\eta^2 = .016$).

Collective action intentions versus indirect conflict management (avoiding, outflanking).

Descriptive statistics are provided in Table 2. We tested our main hypotheses that for both types of sexism, German and Turkish students would show more collective action intentions than avoiding and outflanking intentions (H2a), whereas Japanese students would show more avoiding and outflanking than collective action intentions (H2b) using a repeated measures ANOVA with type of reaction as repeated factor. All comparisons of strategies were conducted separately for each type of sexism. In the text, we report the overall F -tests with Greenhouse-Geisser correction. Table 2 shows significance levels of planned contrasts comparing collective action intentions vs. avoiding and collective action intentions vs. outflanking within scenarios. H2a was confirmed: German and Turkish students were more likely to show collective action intentions than avoiding or outflanking (benevolent sexism: $F(1.51, 157.40) = 70.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .405$; $F(1.57, 172.81) = 57.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .342$, respectively; hostile sexism: $F(1.85, 192.08) = 35.82$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .256$; $F(1.88, 206.75) = 34.57$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .239$, respectively). H2b was partly supported: In response to hostile sexism, Japanese students were more likely to show indirect conflict management styles than collective action intentions ($F(1.96, 217.31) = 82.88$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .427$). In response to benevolent sexism, however, Japanese students showed equally low levels of collective action intentions and indirect conflict management styles ($F(1.71, 189.69) = 2.28$, $p = .114$, $\eta^2 = .020$).

Collective action intentions versus support of sexist behavior.

We expected that when faced with benevolent sexism, female students in all countries would support sexism rather than intend to engage in collective action against it (H3a). The hypothesis was supported for Japanese students ($F(1, 111) = 135.34, p < .001, \eta^2 = .549$), and approached significance for German students ($F(1, 104) = 3.11, p = .081, \eta^2 = .029$); but Turkish students intended to engage in collective action rather than support benevolent sexism ($F(1, 110) = 32.75, p < .001, \eta^2 = .229$).

As predicted (H3b), German and Turkish students intended to engage in collective action to confront hostile sexism than to support it ($F(1, 104) = 25.94, p < .001, \eta^2 = .200$; $F(1, 110) = 238.82, p < .001, \eta^2 = .685$, respectively). As expected (H3c), Japanese students were more likely to support hostile sexism than intending to engage in collective action, ($F(1, 111) = 33.33, p < .001, \eta^2 = .231$ respectively).

Collective action intention versus unaccomplished desire.

We predicted and found that German and Turkish students' unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action was weaker than their actual intentions to do so (H4a), all $F_s > 29.55$, all $p_s < .001$, all $\eta^2 > .221$. The reverse was true for Japanese students (H4b, benevolent sexism: $F(1, 111) = 6.59, p = 0.12, \eta^2 = .056$; hostile sexism: $F(1, 111) = 22.68, p < .001, \eta^2 = .170$).

Within-country relations between cultural dimensions and collective action intentions.

Finally, we tested whether self-construal and face were related to collective action intentions across countries. As can be seen in Table 3 and Table 4, in line with predictions the three cultural dimensions were mostly unrelated to perceptions of sexism. In terms of hostile sexism, as expected, face was negatively related to collective action intentions and positively related to the wish to confront in all three countries. The reverse was true for the

independent self-concept. Thus, the less students have an independent self-concept and the more they value face, the more they refrain from collective action (although they would like to engage) in all three countries. Finally, the more German and Japanese students had an interdependent self, the higher their unaccomplished wish to confront. Interdependent self-concept was negatively related to collective action intentions only in Germany. Results of regression analyses (see supplementary material) are mostly in line with the correlations. Face predicted collective action intentions negatively in all students, but only in German students the relationship was significant. The independent self as a positive predictor of collective action intentions approached significance in all three countries. The interdependent self did not predict collective action intentions. In terms of benevolent sexism, as expected, only few correlations were significant.

Discussion

Collective action against sexism has many positive effects. However, so far, research has not investigated cultural differences in responding to sexism. In the present work, we examined female students' responses to sexism in Germany, Japan, and Turkey. In addition, we tested whether cultural variables (self-construal and face) are related to collective action intentions within countries. The main finding of the present work is that when faced with sexism, German and Turkish female students intended to engage in collective action rather than to use indirect conflict management styles, whereas Japanese female students preferred indirect conflict management although they had a high unaccomplished wish to engage in collective action. In addition, the more pronounced German, Japanese, and Turkish female students' independent self and the less they were concerned with losing face, the more likely they were to engage in collective action against hostile sexism.

A strength of the present work is that we compared reactions to benevolent and hostile forms of sexism. Prior work on confronting has mostly focused on one form of sexism only. By including two forms of sexism, we were able to make within-country comparisons. These comparisons reveal that when examining collective action as a response to sexism, not only culture is important, but also the type of sexism. In the following, we summarize and outline the contributions of the present work for each culture separately, highlight novel findings, and then continue with an overall discussion.

Collective Action Intentions in Germany

The results for German female students are in line with prior work on collective action against sexism (e.g., Becker & Barreto, 2014). Their independent self-concept was higher than their interdependent self-concept. German female students perceived benevolent sexism more positively and less negatively than hostile sexism, intended to engage in collective action against hostile but not benevolent sexism, were more likely to support benevolent sexism than to engage in collective action against it, and preferred collective action to avoiding and outflanking for both types of sexism, and to supporting hostile sexism.

Collective Action Intentions in Japan

Japanese female students scored highest on face and have a more interdependent self as indicated by a relatively high endorsement of rejection avoidance. Similar to German female students, Japanese female students perceived benevolent sexism more positively and less negatively than hostile sexism, but their collective action intentions against benevolent sexism were as low as those against hostile sexism. In line with our reasoning that the expression of criticism is inappropriate in a face culture, Japanese female students

were more likely to employ indirect conflict management than collective action when faced with sexism, but had an unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action.

The unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action. This novel finding suggests that Japanese female students would like to confront sexism. Why don't they do so? First, speaking up as an individual against sexism might be too individualistic an approach. As outlined in the introduction, speaking up threatens ingroup harmony and is not appreciated in face cultures (Leung & Cohen, 2011). Second, a truly collective approach to collective action, that is, not acting as an individual on behalf of the group of women but acting as a group of women, might be a more appropriate approach in Japan. Japanese women have accomplished some major changes in policy through their engagement in women's associations, such as co-ops (Yamaguchi, 2013). This suggests that for Japanese women, engagement in women's associations might be more effective than individual actions to achieve social change. We interpret this finding as suggesting that although Japanese female students perceive hostile sexism negatively and would like to act against it, responses such as open confrontation do not fit societal norms. Thus, they actively choose the culturally appropriate way to deal with sexism. Low levels of outflanking suggest that this strategy is not an alternative for Japanese female students. Other ways of indirect confrontation might be telling a metaphorical story to address their discomfort with sexism. This might help maintain one's own and the other person's face (Brett, Behfar, & Sanchez-Burks, 2014). The use of this strategy should be researched in future studies. Importantly, our results also show that the lower Japanese female students' (and German and Turkish female students') face concern and the higher their independent self-concept, the higher their collective action intentions. This means that the less Japanese female students accept their face culture the more similar to German and Turkish female students they respond.

Thus, within-country differences in face concern and self-construal impact female student's decision of how to deal with sexism.

Collective Action Intentions in Turkey

As expected, Turkish female students scored low on rejection avoidance and face and had a rather independent self. Their independent self might reflect the societal changes that occurred in Turkey during the last few years in the educated middle class (for a summary see Kandiyoti, 2015). Turkish female students responded similarly to female students in Germany: They were more likely to intend to engage in collective action when faced with hostile sexism compared to using indirect conflict management and to supporting sexism. Contrary to our expectations, Turkish female students intended to engage in collective action against benevolent sexism rather than supporting it. This is surprising given that previous research found that most women support benevolent sexism (e.g., Bohner et al., 2010; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998). Why do Turkish female students want to act against benevolent sexism?

Responses to paternalism in Turkey. Paternalistic behavior is very common in Turkey and perceived positively (Öner, 2012), but only when directed from a superior to a subordinate. Paternalism is not necessarily resented by those lower in the hierarchy (Jackman, 1994; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). However, if someone uses this kind of behavior in a situation that does not involve the hierarchical relationship in which the behavior is expected – for instance, if one colleague uses it toward another as in our scenario – the recipient of the behavior might need to confront it because accepting the behavior might imply acknowledging the other's superior position. Our participants will likely work in later life and thus consider it important to defend their hierarchical position. Second, the increasing polarization of Turkish society in recent years (Kandiyoti, 2015) has led

modern women such as female students to become more politicized and participate in protests (Erhart, 2013). Policy rewards women fulfilling traditional roles and punishes women rebelling against traditional roles. Thus, benevolent sexism is embedded in politics (Kandiyoti, 2015). Experience with this polarization might render non-traditional women sensitive to the double-message expressed in benevolence and increase collective action intentions against it. Third, in communication in Arab societies people negotiate who dominates and who is dominated (Khūrī, 1990). Paternalism suggests that men dominate women. The need to determine who dominates and who is dominated might render the unequal status hidden in paternalistic behavior especially salient. Therefore, Turkish women might be more likely to protest against it. Future research could examine whether Turkish women are more inclined to protest against paternalistic behavior when they experience it from a coworker compared to when they experience it from a superior.

Limitations and Future Research

First, we could not establish measurement invariance. Consequently, we cannot conduct between-country comparisons to establish whether the differences we observe between samples are due to cultural differences. Therefore, our results are based on within-country comparisons. Future research could try to develop measurement invariant scales for collective action and indirect conflict management to compare women's responses across countries.

Second, we measured collective action intentions and not collective action behavior. Prior work illustrates that women tend to overestimate their engagement in collective action (Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). Thus, future work needs to study real-life protest behavior.

Thirdly, we assessed collective action intentions with a relatively short scale and did not distinguish between normative and non-normative forms of collective action. Future

research could use more comprehensive scales (see, for instance, Tausch et al., 2011). Besides the distinction between normative and non-normative collective action, culture-specific forms of collective action would be interesting to assess. As noted above, it might be more appropriate for women scoring high on face concern to address the problem of sexism in a group or using metaphors. In line with this, we controlled neither for the perceived efficacy of our collective action behaviors, nor for the perceived efficacy of avoiding and outflanking behaviors. Future research could examine which strategies are perceived as effective countermeasures against sexism in face cultures.

Fourthly, we relied on student samples only. Students are a highly selective sample (Henrich et al., 2010). We cannot predict how they differ from a representative sample from each country. Therefore, we strongly recommend that future work uses more diverse and representative samples in terms of age, gender, social class, education and area of living (urban vs. rural), in order to be able to generalize the findings and investigate cultural differences within countries.

Finally, we assumed outflanking to be an indirect conflict management style. We expected it to correlate positively with face and interdependent self, but negatively with independent self. Correlations are exactly reversed. The operationalization of outflanking might still have been too direct. Future research could identify behaviors perceived as outflanking behavior by individuals in a face culture.

Conclusions

To our knowledge, this study is the first examining collective action intentions as a response to sexism in cultures beyond the U.S.A, Australia, and Western Europe. We demonstrate that cultural-psychological variables predict female students' collective action intentions. The higher female students' independent self-construal and the lower their face

concerns, the higher their intentions to engage in collective action against hostile sexism. Moreover, German and Turkish female students intended to engage in collective action when faced with hostile or benevolent sexism compared to using indirect conflict management, whereas Japanese female students engaged less in collective action, but had a strong unaccomplished desire to do so.

Table 1.

Means and standard deviations of cultural dimensions.

	<i>M (SD)</i>		
	Germany <i>N</i> = 105	Turkey <i>N</i> = 111	Japan <i>N</i> = 112
Face	3.70 (0.81) _a	3.74 (0.61) _a	4.30 (0.85) _b
Self-Concept: Independent	3.69 (0.43) _a	3.83 (0.58) _a	3.10 (0.68) _b
Self-Concept: Interdependent	2.90 (0.90) _a	2.59 (0.79) _b	3.52 (0.93) _c

Note: Means with different subscripts between countries differ significantly, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 \in$ [.115, .380].

Table 2.

Means and standard deviations for the benevolent and hostile sexist scenario.

Strategy	Germany		Japan		Turkey	
	BS	HS	BS	HS	BS	HS
POS	4.27 (1.09)	1.21 (0.47)	4.38 (1.29)	1.02 (0.15)	2.64 (1.32)	1.19 (0.76)
NEG	4.33 (1.52)	6.25 (0.82)	4.21 (1.37)	5.67 (1.51)	4.49 (1.75)	5.86 (1.67)
CA	3.16 (1.75)	4.55 (1.81)	2.35 (1.53)	2.62 (1.58)	4.69 (1.93)	5.46 (1.70)
AV	1.64*** (1.03)	-	2.14 (1.26)	-	3.08*** (1.62)	-
OF	1.73*** (0.90)	2.87*** (1.74)	2.12 (1.17)	4.17*** (1.57)	2.92*** (1.41)	4.88** (1.74)
SU	3.70 (1.82)	3.30*** (0.92)	5.13*** (1.41)	3.88*** (1.29)	3.11*** (1.47)	2.56*** (0.92)
UD	1.99*** (1.15)	2.94*** (1.67)	2.75* (1.37)	3.72*** (1.61)	3.08*** (1.39)	2.26*** (1.46)

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action. Within each scenario, the reactions AV, OF, SU, and UD are compared with CA.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed.

Table 3.

Zero-order correlations of face, independent and interdependent self with perception of sexist behavior, collective action intentions, avoidance, outflanking, and unaccomplished wish for collective action in the benevolent sexism scenario.

Strategy	Germany			Turkey			Japan		
	Face	Independent Self	Interde- pendent Self	Face	Independent Self	Interde- pendent Self	Face	Independent Self	Interde- pendent Self
	POS	.11	-.02	.15 [†]	.19 [*]	-.19 [*]	.06	.26 ^{**}	.01
NEG	.01	.15 [†]	-.09	-.16 [†]	.29 ^{**}	.05	-.03	.07	.01
CA	-.09	.08	-.00	.02	.22 ^{**}	.07	-.13 [†]	.13 [†]	-.11
AV	.06	.18 [*]	.08	.10	-.11	.08	-.15 [†]	.05	-.17 [*]
OF	.15 [†]	.06	.06	-.03	-.03	.09	-.22 [*]	.04	-.13 [†]
UD	.26 ^{**}	-.10	.09	-.03	-.03	.00	.10	-.05	-.06

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, one-tailed.

Table 4.

Zero-order correlations of face, independent and interdependent self with perception of sexist behavior, collective action intentions, avoidance, outflanking, and unaccomplished wish for collective action in the hostile sexism scenario.

Strategy	Germany			Turkey			Japan		
	Face	Independent	Interde-	Face	Independent	Interde-	Face	Independent	Interde-
		Self	pendent Self		Self	pendent Self		Self	pendent Self
POS	.09	-.15†	.13†	.15†	-.18*	-.02	-.02	.03	-.05
NEG	-.12	.31**	-.15†	-.13†	.19*	-.05	.13†	.02	.11
CA	-.35***	.30**	-.23*	-.14†	.18*	-.07	-.20*	.22*	-.06
AV	.21*	-.09	.08	.37***	-.17*	.07	.26**	-.08	.15†
OF	-.23*	.28*	-.24**	.03	.21*	-.14†	-.19*	.24**	-.18*
UD	.47***	-.18*	.29**	.21*	-.18*	.04	.23*	-.16*	.32***

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, one-tailed.

References

- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005a). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(5), 633–642. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.270>
- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005b). The Perils of Political Correctness: Men's and Women's Responses to Old-Fashioned and Modern Sexist Views. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(1), 75–88.
- Becker, J. C. (2010). Why Do Women Endorse Hostile and Benevolent Sexism? The Role of Salient Female Subtypes and Internalization of Sexist Contents. *Sex Roles, 62*(7–8), 453–467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9707-4>
- Becker, J. C., & Barreto, M. (2014). Ways to Go: Men's and Women's Support for Aggressive and Non-aggressive Confrontation of Sexism as a Function of Gender Identification. *Journal of Social Issues*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12085>
- Becker, J. C., Barreto, M., Kahn, K. B., & Oliveira Laux, S. H. (2015). The Collective Value of 'Me'(and its Limitations): Towards a More Nuanced Understanding of Individual and Collective Coping with Prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*(3), 497–516.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the Unseen Attention to Daily Encounters With Sexism as Way to Reduce Sexist Beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684310397509>
- Becker, J. C., Zawadzki, M. J., & Shields, S. A. (2014). Confronting and Reducing Sexism: A Call for Research on Intervention. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 603–614. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12081>
- Bohner, G., Ahlborn, K., & Steiner, R. (2010). How Sexy are Sexist Men? Women's Perception

- of Male Response Profiles in the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. *Sex Roles*, 62(7–8), 568–582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9665-x>
- Brett, J., Behfar, K., & Sanchez-Burks, J. (2014). Managing cross-culture conflicts: a close look at the implication of direct versus indirect confrontation. In O. B. Ayoko, Neal M. Ashkanasy, & Karen A. Jehn (Eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Management Research* (pp. 136–154).
- Choi, S.-C., & Lee, S.-J. (2002). Two-Component Model of Chemyon-Oriented Behaviors in Korea Constructive and Defensive Chemyon. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(3), 332–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033003008>
- Cole, M. S., Bedeian, A. G., & Feild, H. S. (2006). The Measurement Equivalence of Web-Based and Paper-and-Pencil Measures of Transformational Leadership A Multinational Test. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9(3), 339–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106287434>
- Davidov, E., & Depner, F. (2011). Testing for measurement equivalence of human values across online and paper-and-pencil surveys. *Quality & Quantity*, 45(2), 375–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-009-9297-9>
- Erhart, I. (2013). Biopolitics & the Gezi Protests. In *Advances in Intelligent Systems Research Volume 47*. Hong Kong.
- Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting Sexism: The Role of Relationship Orientation and Gender. *Sex Roles*, 63(7–8), 463–474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>

- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 763–775. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763>
- Gwaltney, C. J., Shields, A. L., & Shiffman, S. (2008). Equivalence of Electronic and Paper-and-Pencil Administration of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Value in Health*, 11(2), 322–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1524-4733.2007.00231.x>
- Hashimoto, H., & Yamagishi, T. (2013). Two faces of interdependence: Harmony seeking and rejection avoidance. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 16(2), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12022>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Hyers, L. L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-Black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles*, 56(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8>
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. University of California Press.
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 498. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498>
- Kagitçibasi, Ç. (1996). The Autonomous-Relational Self. *European Psychologist*, 1(3), 180–

186. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.1.3.180>

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop Complaining! The Social Costs of Making Attributions to Discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(2), 254–263.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010>

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2004). A Stress and Coping Perspective on Confronting Sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(2), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00133.x>

Kanagawa, C., Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (2001). ‘Who am I?’ The cultural psychology of the conceptual self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(1), 90–103.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201271008>

Kandiyoti, D. (2015). The Gender Wars in Turkey: A Litmus Test of Democracy? *LSE Middle East Centre Collected Papers*, 4, 8–14.

Khūrī, F. I. (1990). *Tents and pyramids: Games and ideology in Arab culture from backgammon to autocratic rule*. Al Saqi.

Kilianski, S. E., & Rudman, L. A. (1998). Wanting it both ways: Do women approve of benevolent sexism? *Sex Roles*, 39(5–6), 333–352.

Kim, M., Aune, K. S., Hunter, J. E., Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2001). The effect of culture and self-construals on predispositions toward verbal communication. *Human Communication Research*, 27(3), 382–408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2001.tb00786.x>

Lee, E. A., Soto, J. A., Swim, J. K., & Bernstein, M. J. (2012). Bitter Reproach or Sweet Revenge Cultural Differences in Response to Racism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(7), 920–932. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212440292>

Leung, A. K.-Y., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within-and between-culture variation: individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 100(3), 507–526.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022151>

Ma, V., & Schoeneman, T. J. (1997). Individualism versus collectivism: A comparison of Kenyan and American self-concepts. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 19(2), 261–273. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1902_7

Mak, W. W., Chen, S. X., Lam, A. G., & Yiu, V. F. (2008). Understanding Distress The Role of Face Concern Among Chinese Americans, European Americans, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mainland Chinese. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(2), 219–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008316378>

Mallett, R. K., & Wagner, D. E. (2011). The unexpectedly positive consequences of confronting sexism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(1), 215–220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.001>

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>

Masgoret, A.-M., & Ward, C. (2006). Culture learning approach to acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Matheson, K., & Foster, M. D. (2013). Coping with the Stress of Gender Discrimination. In M. K. Ryan & N. R. Branscombe (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Gender and Psychology*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.

Meade, A. W., Michels, L. C., & Lautenschlager, G. J. (2007). Are Internet and Paper-and-Pencil Personality Tests Truly Comparable? An Experimental Design Measurement Invariance Study. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(2), 322–345.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106289393>

Ohbuchi, K.-I., & Atsumi, E. (2010). Avoidance Brings Japanese Employees What They Care About in Conflict Management: Its Functionality and 'Good Member' Image. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 3(2), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4716.2010.00052.x>

Ohbuchi, K.-I., & Takahashi, Y. (1994). Cultural Styles of Conflict Management in Japanese and Americans: Passivity, Covertness, and Effectiveness of Strategies¹. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24(15), 1345–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01553.x>

Öner, Z. H. (2012). Servant leadership and paternalistic leadership styles in the Turkish business context: a comparative empirical study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33(3), 300–316. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437731211216489>

Pellegrini, E. K., & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 566–593. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316063>

Pollay, R. W., & Lysonski, S. (1993). In the Eye of the Beholder: *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 6(2), 25–43. https://doi.org/10.1300/J046v06n02_04

Rahim, M. A. (1983). A Measure of Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 368–376. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255985>

Shelton, J. N., & Stewart, R. E. (2004). Confronting perpetrators of prejudice: The inhibitory effects of social costs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(3), 215–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00138.x>

Sibley, C. G., & Perry, R. (2010). An Opposing Process Model of Benevolent Sexism. *Sex Roles*,

62(7–8), 438–452. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9705-6>

Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—What did you just say?!: Women’s public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*(1), 68–88. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1370>

Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (2009). Sexism. In *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 407–430). New York: Psychology Press.

Swim, J. K., Mallett, R., Russo-Devosa, Y., & Stangor, C. (2005). Judgments of Sexism: A Comparison of the Subtlety of Sexism Measures and Sources of Variability in Judgments of Sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*(4), 406–411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00240.x>

Tausch, N., Becker, J. C., Spears, R., Christ, O., Saab, R., Singh, P., & Siddiqui, R. N. (2011). Explaining radical group behavior: Developing emotion and efficacy routes to normative and nonnormative collective action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(1), 129. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022728>

Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G., Trubisky, P., Yang, Z., Soo Kim, H., Lin, S.-L., & Nishida, T. (1991). Culture, face maintenance, and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: A study in five cultures. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 2*(4), 275–296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022702>

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: an updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22*(2), 187–225. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(98\)00004-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(98)00004-2)

Tjosvold, D., Haifa F., & Sun, H. F. (2002). Understanding Conflict Avoidance: Relationship, Motivations, Actions, and Consequences. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 13*(2), 142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022872>

- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Interscience.
- Woodzicka, J. A., & LaFrance, M. (2001). Real versus imagined gender harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00199>
- Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(6), 994. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.994>
- Yamaguchi, K. (2013). Housewives-Lib and Co-op in Japan (1970s-1990s). In F. de Haan, M. Allen, J. Purvis, & K. Daskalova (Eds.), *Women's Activism: Global Perspectives from the 1890s to the Present*. Routledge.

Supplementary Online Material

Table 1.

Cronbach's α for benevolent and hostile sexism scenarios.

	Germany	Turkey	Japan
	Positive perception		
Benevolent	.731	.800	.831
Hostile	.842	.867	.815
	Negative perception		
Benevolent	.867	.858	.880
Hostile	.627	.862	.781
	Collective action intentions		
Benevolent	.765	.962	.955
Hostile	.796	.780	.954
	Support		
Benevolent	.920	.772	.892
Hostile	.796	.780	.954
	Avoiding		
Benevolent	.955	.903	.924
Hostile	.380	.229	.317
	Unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action		
Benevolent	.905	.751	.797
Hostile	.904	.733	.696
	Outflanking		
Benevolent	.570	.638	.773
Hostile	.828	.717	.741
	Face		
-	.872	.686	.905
	Independent Self		
	.590	.777	.787
	Interdependent Self:		
	Rejection avoidance		
	.717	.658	.778

Table 2.

Percentage of sample that has experienced benevolent and hostile sexism.

	Germany	Turkey	Japan
Benevolent	53.3	49.5	87.4
Hostile	51.9	38.7	30.0

Table 3a.

Correlations for benevolent and hostile sexism scenarios for the German sample.

Strategy	POS	NEG	CA	AV	OF	SU	UD
POS		-.60***	-.42***	-.32**	-.20*	.57***	-.11
NEG	-.56***		.69***	.33**	.29**	-.63***	.19
CA	-.39***	.45***		.42***	.30**	-.51***	.24*
AV	-.10	.10	-.17†		.50***	-.25*	.21*
OF	-.21*	.29**	.47***	.10		-.08	.47***
SU	.25*	-.31**	-.67***	.13	-.50***		-.04
UD	.12	-.10	-.52***	.34***	-.16	.59***	

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action. Correlations above the diagonal are for the benevolent sexism scenario, correlations below the diagonal are for the hostile sexism scenario.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed.

Table 3b.

Correlations for benevolent and hostile sexism scenarios for the Turkish sample.

Strategy	POS	NEG	CA	AV	OF	SU	UD
POS		-.48***	-.46***	-.34***	-.45***	.53***	-.21*
NEG	-.45***		.42***	.14	.21*	-.49***	-.01
CA	-.21*	.22*		.20*	.29*	-.44***	.03
AV	.00	.13	-.07		.61***	-.20*	.33***
OF	-.10	.27**	.36***	.30**		-.31**	.21*
SU	.00	.05	-.06	.36***	.15		-.06
UD	.12	-.12	-.20*	.29**	-.09	.15	

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action. Correlations above the diagonal are for the benevolent sexist scenario, correlations below the diagonal are for the hostile sexist scenario.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed.

Table 3c.

Correlations for benevolent and hostile sexism scenarios for the Japanese sample.

Strateg y	POS	NEG	CA	AV	OF	SU	UD
POS		-.49***	-.43***	-.57***	-.44***	.64***	-.26**
NEG	-.15		.52***	.47***	.29**	-.49***	.36***
CA	.03	.21*		.55***	.43***	-.47***	.38***
AV	-.02	.23*	.10		.66***	-.60***	.50***
OF	-.12	-.05	.42***	.07		-.30**	.46***
SU	.02	.15	-.27**	.39***	-.29**		-.33***
UD	.10	.03	-.18†	.21*	-.19*	.59***	

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action. Correlations above the diagonal are for the benevolent sexist scenario, correlations below the diagonal are for the hostile sexist scenario.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed.

Table 4.

Z-value, p-value, and effect size of Wilcoxon signed rank test.

	Germany <i>N</i> = 105			Turkey <i>N</i> = 111			Japan <i>N</i> = 112		
	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i>
POS _{hostile} – POS _{benevolent}	-8.91	.000	-0.87	-7.40	.000	-0.70	-9.04	.000	-0.85
NEG _{hostile} - NEG _{benevolent}	-8.34	.000	-0.81	-5.97	.000	-0.57	-6.83	.000	-0.65

Note. POS_{hostile} = Positive Perception of Hostile Sexism Scenario, POS_{benevolent} = Positive Perception of Benevolent Sexism Scenario, NEG_{hostile} = Negative Perception of Hostile Sexism Scenario, NEG_{benevolent} = Negative Perception of Benevolent Sexism Scenario.

Table 5.

F-values and effect sizes of comparison of collective action intentions vs. other strategies.

	Germany <i>N</i> = 105		Turkey <i>N</i> = 111		Japan <i>N</i> = 112	
Collective action ...	<i>F</i> (1, 104)	η^2	<i>F</i> (1, 110)	η^2	<i>F</i> (1, 111)	η^2
Benevolent Sexism Scenario						
vs. avoiding	93.16***	.472	56.51***	.339	2.78	.024
vs. outflanking	73.50***	.414	82.56***	.429	2.89	.025
vs. support	3.11	.029	32.75***	.229	135.34***	.549
vs. unaccomplished desire	42.34***	.289	52.00***	.321	6.59*	.056
Hostile Sexism Scenario						
vs. avoiding	28.31***	.214	54.10***	.330	147.08***	.570
vs. outflanking	88.68***	.460	10.17**	.085	92.39***	.454
vs. support	25.94***	.200	238.82***	.685	33.33***	.231
vs. unaccomplished desire	29.55***	.221	189.16***	.632	22.68***	.170

*** p <.001, ** p <.01, * p <.05.

Table 6.

Means and standard deviations for the item “I would slap my colleague [this man] in the face”.^a

	Germany		Turkey		Japan	
Scenario	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Benevolent	1.17	0.69	1.74	1.28	1.29	0.66
Hostile	3.82	1.87	4.89	2.09	3.66	1.94

Note. We included the item „I would slap him in the face“ in our collective action intentions scale because it has been used in the literature before (e.g., Becker & Barreto, 2014). However, when we included it in the scale, Cronbach’s alpha in all countries decreased in all scenarios on average by .17. We assume that slapping someone is not seen as a normative, acceptable way of dealing with sexism. Thus, we assume that this item reflects a non-normative way of conflict management because it is a physically aggressive conflict management style.

^a Item wording: “my colleague” for benevolent sexism scenario; “this man” for hostile sexism scenario.

Table 7.

Regression of collective action intentions on face, independent and interdependent self in the benevolent sexism scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2
Constant	2.73	2.13			1.46	1.63			2.58 [†]	1.41		
Face	-0.26	0.28	-.12	.02	-0.10	0.32	-.03	.06 [†]	-0.15	0.21	-.08	.03
Independent self	0.24	0.44	.06		0.78	0.32	.23*		0.19	0.25	.08	
Interdependent self	0.18	0.24	.09		0.24	0.25	.10		-0.05	0.20	-.03	

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [†] $p < .10$.

Table 8.

Regression of unaccomplished desire for collective action on face, independent and interdependent self in the benevolent sexism scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2
Constant	0.68	1.36			3.51**	1.21			2.89*	1.26		
Face	0.46	0.18	.33*	.07*	-0.08	0.24	-.04	.00	0.28	0.19	.17	.03
Independent self	0.00	0.28	.00		-0.05	0.23	-.02		-0.13	0.22	-.06	
Interdependent self	-0.14	0.16	-.11		0.03	0.18	.02		-0.27	0.18	-.18	

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$.

Table 9.

Regression of collective action intentions on face, independent and interdependent self in the hostile sexism scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2
Constant	3.86†	2.04			4.84**	1.46			1.83	1.43		
Face	-0.61	0.27	-.27*	.16**	-0.41	0.29	-.15	.05	-0.35	0.22	-.19	.07*
Independent self	0.80	0.42	.19†		0.56	0.28	.19†		0.47	0.25	.20†	
Interdependent self	-0.01	0.23	.00		0.01	0.22	.00		0.25	0.20	.15	

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$.

Table 10.

Regression of unaccomplished desire for collective action on face, independent and interdependent self in the hostile sexism scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2
Constant	-0.65	1.82			2.36†	1.22			1.42	1.42		
Face	0.95	0.24	.46***	.22***	0.58	0.24	.24*	.08*	0.12	0.22	.06	.11**
Independent self	0.01	0.38	.00		-0.50	0.24	-.20*		0.01	0.25	.00	
Interdependent self	0.01	0.21	.01		-0.13	0.19	-.07		0.50	0.20	.29*	

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$.

Additional Scenarios

We had included two further scenarios measuring hostile and benevolent sexism. In the following, we use the terms hostile and benevolent sexism scenarios when referring to the scenarios described in the paper and use the more specific terms benevolent sexism (task distribution) and hostile sexism (joke) scenario, when we refer to the additional scenarios.

Benevolent sexism (task distribution) scenario. In this scenario, participants read that a work team consisting of two men and two women has to prepare a cultural program. One of the men says to the women: “You should organize the trip for our guests because as women, you are more caring and considerate.” We will refer to this scenario as the *benevolent (task distribution) scenario*.

Hostile sexism (joke) scenario. In this scenario, participants read that a group of colleagues is having a coffee break. One of the men present says: “How do you know that a woman is about to say something smart? When she starts her sentence with, ‘A man once told me...’”. We will refer to this scenario as the *hostile (joke) scenario*.

Items measuring collective action intentions, avoiding, outflanking, and unaccomplished desire for collective action were identical with the items for benevolent sexism. Items measuring support for sexism in the benevolent (task distribution) scenario were “Together with my female colleague, I would start thinking about the trip for the guests”, “I would give my best to fulfill the requirements of the task”, and “I would reject to take care of the trip” (reverse coded, all α s > .72). Items measuring support for sexism in the hostile (joke) scenario were “I would laugh”, “I would tell another joke about women”, and “I would not laugh” (reverse coded, all α s > .72).

Table 11.

Cronbach's α for task distribution and joke scenarios.

	Germany	Turkey	Japan
Positive perception			
Benevolent (task distribution)	.808	.842	.783
Hostile (joke)	.835	.891	.808
Negative perception			
Benevolent (task distribution)	.865	.868	.806
Hostile (joke)	.791	.866	.857
Collective action intentions			
Benevolent (task distribution)	.776	.969	.904
Hostile (joke)	.811	.930	.897
Support			
Benevolent (task distribution)	.850	.795	.733
Hostile (joke)	.806	.725	.723
Avoiding			
Benevolent (task distribution)	.887	.683	.963
Hostile (joke)	.917	.702	.952
Unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action			
Benevolent (task distribution)	.880	.672	.872
Hostile (joke)	.804	.686	.656
Outflanking			
Benevolent (task distribution)	.764	.777	.753
Hostile (joke)	.651	.650	.625

Table 12.

Percentage of sample who has experienced benevolent and hostile sexism.

	Germany	Turkey	Japan
Benevolent (task distribution)	77.1	63.1	70.5
Benevolent	53.3	49.5	87.4
Hostile (joke)	93.3	45.9	66.1
Hostile	51.9	38.7	30.0

Table 13a.

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for additional scenarios for the German sample.

Strategy	Means (standard deviations)		Correlations						
	Benevolent (task distribution)	Hostile (joke)	POS	NEG	CA	AV	OF	SU	UD
POS	4.42 (1.16)	2.20 (1.08)		-.71***	-.63***	-.36***	-.44***	.62***	-.31**
NEG	3.51 (1.41)	5.13 (1.25)	-.61***		.72***	.42***	.51***	-.59***	.37***
CA	2.78 (1.57)	3.68 (1.74)	-.52***	.53***		.60***	.63***	-.56***	.45***
AV	1.69*** (0.90)	2.59*** (1.44)	-.58***	.52***	.50***		.72***	-.23*	.44***
OF	2.08*** (1.18)	2.08*** (1.12)	-.46***	.44***	.43***	.68***		-.29*	.47***
SU	5.20*** (1.11)	3.32 (1.48)	.53***	-.60***	-.55***	-.57***	-.38***		-.21*
UD	2.13*** (1.09)	3.05** (1.41)	-.34***	.20*	.34***	.43***	.42***	-.28**	

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action. Correlations above the diagonal are for the benevolent sexist (task distribution) scenario, correlations below the diagonal are for the hostile (joke) sexist scenario.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed.

Table 13b.

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for additional scenarios for the Turkish sample.

Strategy	Means (standard deviations)		Correlations						
	Benevolent (task distribution)	Hostile (joke)	POS	NEG	CA	AV	OF	SU	UD
POS	4.62 (1.38)	2.50 (1.40)		-.48***	-.33**	-.43***	-.22*	.49***	-.23*
NEG	3.62 (1.54)	4.88 (1.64)	-.23*		.74***	.44***	.44***	-.49***	.39***
CA	3.54 (2.03)	4.72 (1.81)	-.18†	.44***		.42***	.49***	-.49***	.47***
AV	2.46*** (1.22)	3.33*** (1.45)	-.17†	.18†	.25**		.64***	-.44***	.65***
OF	2.68*** (1.29)	3.11*** (1.40)	.00	.18†	.32**	.46***		-.31**	.49***
SU	5.00*** (1.22)	3.19*** (1.57)	.30**	-.28**	-.28**	-.17†	-.27**		-.31**
UD	2.77*** (1.23)	3.66*** (1.37)	.01	.05	.15	.34***	.14	-.02	

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action. Correlations above the diagonal are for the benevolent sexist (task distribution) scenario, correlations below the diagonal are for the hostile (joke) sexist scenario.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed.

Table 13c.

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for additional scenarios for the Japanese sample.

Strategy	Means (standard deviations)		Correlations						
	Benevolent (task distribution)	Hostile (joke)	POS	NEG	CA	AV	OF	SU	UD
POS	3.38 (1.20)	2.88 (0.97)		-.52***	-.36***	-.45***	-.26**	.34***	-.34***
NEG	4.32 (1.21)	4.40 (1.11)			.54***	.42***	.28**	-.19*	.42***
				.36***					
CA	2.71 (1.47)	2.63 (1.44)	-.11	.33***		.34***	.30**	-.22*	.36***
AV	2.73 (1.36)	3.12** (1.52)	-.22*	.41***	.30**		.58***	-.36***	.61***
OF	2.79 (1.32)	2.45 (1.05)	-.02	.12	.26**	.35***		-.24**	.57***
SU	5.41*** (0.89)	3.78*** (1.32)	.15	-.10	-.14	-.21*	.12		-.24**
UD	3.28*** (1.41)	3.92*** (1.28)	-.14	.43***	.17†	.31**	.24*	-.16†	

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action. Correlations above the diagonal are for the benevolent sexist (task distribution) scenario, correlations below the diagonal are for the hostile (joke) sexist scenario.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed.

Table 14.

F-values and effects sizes for positive perception of sexist behaviors.

		Germany		Turkey		Japan	
		overall: $F(2.71, 282.02) = 369.46^{***}$		overall: $F(2.7, 296.97) = 149.72^{***}$		overall: $F(2.533, 281.15) = 238.80^{***}$	
		$F(1, 104)$	η^2	$F(1, 110)$	η^2	$F(1, 111)$	η^2
Benevolent (task distribution) vs. benevolent		1.672	.016	123.91 ^{***}	.530	41.84 ^{***}	.274
Benevolent vs. hostile (joke)		231.26 ^{***}	.690	0.57	.005	12.72 ^{**}	.103
Hostile (joke) vs. hostile		96.46 ^{***}	.481	90.43 ^{***}	.451	400.04 ^{***}	.783

Note. We tested for differences in the positive perception of sexist behaviors with a within-country repeated measures ANOVA with the factor ‘type of sexism’.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 15.

F-values and effects sizes for negative perception of sexist behaviors.

		Germany		Turkey		Japan	
		overall: $F(2.83, 294.61)=140.72^{***}$		overall: $F(2.90, 318.56)= 49.43^{***}$		$F(2.77, 307.21)= 40.02$	
		$F(1, 104)$	η^2	$F(1, 110)$	η^2	$F(1, 111)$	η^2
Benevolent (task distribution) vs. benevolent		33.95 ^{***}	.246	24.79 ^{***}	.184	0.59	.005
Benevolent (joke) vs. hostile		25.98 ^{***}	.200	5.326 [*]	.046	0.37	.003
Hostile (joke) vs. hostile		85.09 ^{***}	.450	28.31 ^{***}	.205	60.48 ^{***}	.353

Note. We tested for differences in the negative perception of sexist behaviors with a within-country repeated measures ANOVA with the factor ‘type of sexism’.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 16.

F-values and effect sizes of collective action intentions vs. other strategies.

	Germany N = 105		Turkey N = 111		Japan N = 112	
Collective action ...	F(1, 104)	η^2	F(1, 110)	η^2	F(1, 111)	η^2
	hostile (joke)					
vs. avoiding	47.77***	.315	51.96***	.321	9.13**	.076
vs. outflanking	104.04***	.500	79.38***	.419	1.48	.013
vs. support	1.62	.015	35.29***	.243	34.18***	.235
vs. unaccomplished desire	12.38**	.106	28.42***	.205	60.01***	.351
	benevolent (task distribution)					
vs. avoiding	80.59***	.437	36.80***	.251	0.02	.000
vs. outflanking	33.59***	.244	25.87***	.190	0.28	.003
vs. support	109.86***	.514	29.59***	.212	232.48***	.677
vs. unaccomplished desire	21.17***	.169	20.40***	.156	13.88***	.111

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Table 17.

Means and standard deviations for the item “I would slap my colleague in the face”.

Scenario	Germany		Turkey		Japan	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
benevolent (task distribution)	1.13	0.44	1.38	0.76	1.45	0.89
hostile (joke)	1.34	0.70	1.54	1.09	1.33	0.70

Note. We included the item „I would slap him in the face“ in our collective action intentions scale because it has been used in the literature before (e.g., Becker & Barreto, 2014). However, when we included it in the scale, Cronbach’s alpha in all countries decreased in all scenarios on average by .17. We assume that slapping someone is not seen as a normative, acceptable way of dealing with sexism. Thus, we assume that this item reflects a non-normative way of conflict management because it is a physically aggressive conflict management style.

Table 18.

Zero-order correlations of face, independent and interdependent self with perception of sexist behavior, collective action intentions, avoidance, outflanking, and unaccomplished wish for collective action in the benevolent (task distribution) scenario.

Strategy	Germany			Turkey			Japan		
	Face	Independent	Interde-	Face	Independent	Interde-	Face	Independent	Interde-
		Self	pendent		Self	pendent		Self	pendent
POS	.01	-.05	.07	.33***	.24**	-.04	-.04	.12†	-.04
NEG	-.05	.11	-.04	-.18†	.08	-.10	.20*	-.12	.17*
CA	-.02	.20*	-.04	-.08	.11	-.03	-.06	.11	-.02
AV	.07	.07	.06	.02	-.30**	.04	.17*	-.02	-.02
OF	.14†	.10	.07	-.00	-.19*	-.03	.21*	-.03	.13†
UD	.23*	-.02	.27**	.03	-.22*	.22*	.23**	-.14†	.02

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$, two-tailed for the correlation of face with perception, one-tailed for all other correlations.

Table 19.

Zero-order correlations of face, independent and interdependent self with perception of sexist behavior, collective action intentions, avoidance, outflanking, and unaccomplished wish for collective action in the hostile (joke) scenario.

Strategy	Germany			Turkey			Japan		
	Face	Independent	Interde-	Face	Independent	Interde-	Face	Independent	Interde-
		Self	pendent		Self	pendent		Self	pendent
POS	-.16 [†]	-.01	-.20*	.12	-.04	-.01	-.08	.06	-.10
NEG	.07	.07	.09	.01	.13 [†]	.12	.20*	-.11	.24**
CA	.01	.05	.05	.04	.26**	.03	-.08	.17*	-.13 [†]
AV	.24**	-.03	.26**	-.02	-.11	.08	.15 [†]	-.11	.05
OF	.21*	-.12	.09	.09	.07	.20*	.08	-.04	.12
UD	.31**	-.14 [†]	.18*	-.03	-.14 [†]	-.04	.35***	-.10	.27**

Note. POS = Positive Perception of the Behavior, NEG = Negative Perception of the Behavior, CA = Collective Action Intentions, AV = Avoiding, OF = Outflanking, SU = Support of Sexism, UD = Unaccomplished Desire for Collective Action.

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [†] $p < .10$, two-tailed for the correlation of face with perception, one-tailed for all other correlations.

Table 20.

Regression of collective action intentions on face, independent and interdependent self in the benevolent (task distribution) scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2
Constant	-0.68	1.88			3.08†	1.76			1.98	1.37		
Face	0.17	0.25	.09	.04	-0.29	0.35	-.09	.02	-0.07	0.21	-.04	.01
Independent self	0.81	0.39	.22*		0.39	0.34	.11		0.24	0.24	.11	
Interdependent self	-0.05	0.22	-.03		0.03	0.27	.01		0.08	0.19	.05	

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$.

Table 21.

Regression of unaccomplished desire for collective action on face, independent and interdependent self in the benevolent (task distribution) scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>R</i> ²
Constant	-0.22	1.28			3.86***	1.02			2.84*	1.27		
Face	0.18	0.17	.13		-0.09	0.20	-.05		0.48	0.19	.29*	
Independent self	0.25	0.27	.10	.09*	-0.42	0.20	-.20*	.09*	-0.20	0.22	-.10	.08*
Interdependent self	0.26	0.15	.21†		0.34	0.16	.22*		-0.29	0.18	-.19	

****p* < .001, ***p* < .01, **p* < .05, †*p* < .10.

Table 22.

Regression of collective action intentions on face, independent and interdependent self in the hostile (joke) scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2
Constant	2.40	2.13			1.16	1.53			1.83	1.33		
Face	-0.02	0.28	-.01	.01	0.04	0.30	.01	.07 [†]	0.04	0.20	.03	.03
Independent self	0.26	0.44	.06		0.82	0.30	.26**		0.32	0.23	.15	
Interdependent self	0.14	0.24	.07		0.10	0.23	.05		-0.11	0.19	-.07	

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, [†] $p < .10$.

Table 23.

Regression of unaccomplished desire for collective action on face, independent and interdependent self in the hostile (joke) scenario.

	Germany				Turkey				Japan			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	R^2
Constant	1.37	1.64			5.20***	1.18			0.59	1.11		
Face	0.56	0.22	.32*	.10*	0.00	0.23	.00	.02	0.48	0.17	.32**	.14**
Independent self	-0.07	0.34	-.02		-0.34	0.23	-.15		0.20	0.19	.10	
Interdependent self	-0.05	0.19	-.03		-0.09	0.18	-.05		0.18	0.16	.13	

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, † $p < .10$.

4. How Do Situations Influence the Perceived Likelihood and Acceptability of Sexism?

Researchers have not yet systematically compared the perceived likelihood of sexism in different situations. Research so far described targets of sexism and specified contexts in which sexism is expected. For example, hostile sexism is directed at status quo violating subtypes such as career women and feminists, benevolent sexism is directed at status quo maintaining subtypes such as housewives (Becker, 2010; Glick et al., 1997). Regarding contexts, women expect men to act benevolently sexist in romantic, but not work contexts (Sarlet, Dumont, Delacollette, & Dardenne, 2012). An approach describing the occurrence of sexism across targets, contexts, and other features that define a situation is still missing. Comparing the perceived likelihood of sexist behavior across situations could unify previous research on the occurrence of hostile and benevolent sexism and contribute to a better understanding of situations in which sexism is deemed likely. With a systematic approach, we could thus better understand when sexism occurs. Additionally, from an applied perspective, this research can inform activist women about where to expect sexism, and thus prepares them for confrontation. It can inform intervention programs about contexts that require tackling sexism. It can also inform women who want to avoid sexism about which situations to avoid. Avoiding sexism does nothing to change the status quo, but women can have good reasons not to engage in collective action (Radke et al., 2016) and avoiding sexism is one way to avoid its negative consequences (e.g., Swim et al., 2001). Finally, for therapy and counseling purposes, as well as for policy, this research can illustrate in what kind of contexts women perceive sexism and thus make the extent of the problem visible.

To better understand when sexism occurs, we aim at systematically comparing the perceived likelihood of sexism across situations. To describe systematically when sexism occurs, we will apply a taxonomy of situations.

4.1 Identifying a taxonomy of situations

Taxonomies about the influence of situations on behavior are less developed compared to taxonomies about the influence of personality on behavior (Endler, 1993; Hogan, 2009), although early scholars explicitly described an influence of personality and situation on behavior. Kurt Lewin (1936/2008) stated that behavior is a function of the person P and their environment E , $B = f(P, E)$, with mutual influences between the person and the environment. Lewin's defined situations as "life spaces", that is, physical, objectively observable environments such as being at work, at school, or with one's family. He argued that the subjective perception of these life spaces is relevant for a person's behavior. A similar distinction between objective and subjective environment is expressed by Henry Murray (1938) who distinguished "alpha press", the influence of the subjectively perceived environment on behavior from "beta press", the influence of the objective environment on behavior.

In contrast to well established measures of personality, such as the Big Five (McCrae & Costa Jr, 1997; McCrae & Costa, 1987; McCrae & John, 1992), research into situational taxonomies has been called a "mess" (Hogan, 2009, p. 249). Researchers do not even agree on necessary characteristics of situational taxonomies (for example, Parrigon, Woo, Tay, & Wang, 2017; Reis, 2018).

An objective categorization of situations is possible (e.g., Van Heck, 1984), but might be uninformative if it does not account for characteristics relevant to a phenomenon. We are specifically looking for a situational taxonomy that accounts for relevant, already

identified boundary conditions that influence the likelihood that hostile vs. benevolent sexist attitudes and behaviors emerge. These characteristics are: Who is a *target* of hostile/benevolent sexism? What is the *gender composition* of a group in which hostile/benevolent sexism occurs? *Where* does hostile/benevolent sexism occur? What *state* are perpetrators in?

4.1.1 Who is a target of hostile vs. benevolent sexism?

Hostile and benevolent sexism are directed at different subtypes of women because in the conceptualization of ambivalent sexism, hostile sexism is conceptualized as the stick, benevolent sexism as the carrot, that in combination maintain the status quo in gender relations (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001a). From a system justification perspective, women who challenge the status quo have to be put in their place, that is, treated with hostile sexism. Women who help maintain the status quo have to be rewarded, that is, treated with benevolent sexism. This is reflected in research on the targets of hostile and benevolent sexism. First, Glick and colleagues (Glick et al., 1997) showed that the more hostile sexist men are, the more negative affect they have towards career women and the less favorable are their stereotypes of career women. The more benevolent sexist men are, the more positive their stereotypes and affect directed at homemakers. Similarly, the more hostile sexist participants are, the more negatively they evaluate a woman applying for a masculine-typed job (Masser & Abrams, 2004). Second, women who answer the hostile sexism scale think about career women and feminists instead of women in general or housewives, and they think about housewives when answering the benevolent sexism scale (Becker, 2010). Third, women with masculine personalities report experiencing more sexual harassment compared to women with feminine personalities (Berdahl, 2007) and feminist women are harassed more than traditional women (Siebler, Sabelus, & Bohner, 2008). Benevolent

sexists' support for women in traditional roles is also reflected in the fact that they support gender-based employment equity policies, but only for women to be hired into female stereotyped, not male stereotyped positions (Hideg & Lance, 2016). Finally, pregnant women in a nontraditional role (job applicants in a store) were treated more hostilely compared to nonpregnant women (Hebl, King, Glick, Singletary, & Kazama, 2007). Pregnant women in a traditional role (customer in a store) were treated more benevolently sexist compared to nonpregnant women (Hebl et al., 2007). Thus, nontraditional women such as career women and feminists are treated hostilely sexist, while traditional women such as housewives are treated benevolently sexist.

This differential treatment of traditional vs. nontraditional subtypes also occurs in the relationship domain. Men are more hostilely and less benevolently sexist toward a promiscuous female stereotype but are less hostile toward a chaste female subtype (Sibley & Wilson, 2004). Women in relationships with sexist men experience both hostile and benevolent sexism (Hammond & Overall, 2017) depending on whether they display traditional or nontraditional behavior.

As a conclusion, we expect female subtypes whose status quo violating aspects are salient such as feminists and female colleagues at work to be targets of hostile sexism. We expect that hostile sexism is directed less at female subtypes whose status quo violating aspect is unclear, such as family members or romantic partners. To the contrary, we expect benevolent sexism to be directed at subtypes whose status quo maintaining aspect is salient (romantic partner) or unclear (family members), and less directed at status quo violating subtypes such as female colleagues or feminists. A situational taxonomy suitable for researching sexism should thus account for different subtypes of women.

4.1.2 Sex composition: What group compositions induce hostile and benevolent sexism?

Perpetrators direct sexism at different targets. Aside from targets being present, how does the presence of others influence perpetrators? Hostile sexist attitudes are more likely to occur when sex is a salient category for group distinction. In these situations, men attempt to increase their self-esteem by discriminating against out-group members, that is, women. In mixed-sex groups, sex is more salient than in same-sex groups (Abrams, Thomas, & Hogg, 1990), the sex of the numerical minority is more salient than that of the majority (Kanter, 1977; Pichevin & Hurtig, 1996), and individuals categorize other individuals according to their sex (Taylor, Fiske, Etcoff, & Ruderman, 1978). Applied to male-female compositions, sex will be more salient in mixed male-female groups compared to only male or only female groups. Women's sex will be most salient in groups with more men than women. As a consequence of sex salience, self-categorization processes and in-group – out-group distinctions emerge. Self-categorization processes can lead to discrimination. In intergroup situations, in-group differences are minimized, between-group differences are exaggerated, and subgroups are perceived stereotypically (Taylor et al., 1978). In-group and out-group members will attempt to increase their self-esteem by evaluating in-group members positively, out-group members negatively (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), and by discriminating against out-groups (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002; Lemyre & Smith, 1985; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). In sum, sex composition influences sex salience, and in groups with more men than women self-categorization processes lead to discrimination, thus, to hostile sexism.

Additionally, pluralistic ignorance encourages the expression of hostile sexism. (College) men overestimate their peers' level of hostile sexism (Kilmartin et al., 2008) and

then act accordingly (Berkowitz, 2003). We assume that the effects of pluralistic ignorance are most severe in male-only and mostly male groups and thus, that these groups express the highest level of hostile sexism. Specifically, people overestimate how often others engage in problematic behavior (Perkins, 2002; e.g, problematic drinking behavior, Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986; Prentice & Miller, 1993), and subsequently engage in more problematic behavior themselves. At the same time, they underestimate how often others engage in positive behavior, and thus engage in less positive behavior themselves. Thus, pluralistic ignorance describes a distorted perception of social norms. Social norms are “rules and standards that are understood by members of a group and that guide and/or constrain behavior” (Cialdini & Trost, 1998, p. 152). Pluralistic ignorance occurs when the majority of people publicly follow a social norm that no one privately endorses (Miller & McFarland, 1991; Toch & Kolfas, 1984). Pluralistic ignorance occurs because people adjust their behavior to perceived social norms. For example, participants’ perceived social norm of the appropriateness of prejudice and their reported level of prejudice correlate with $r = .96$ (Crandall, Eshleman, & O’Brien, 2002). The perceived acceptability of prejudice in turn correlates with the acceptability of discrimination, $r = .86$ (Crandall et al., 2002). A single confederate can act as a social norm indicator: When a confederate gives racist answers directly before a participant gives his/her answers, a decrease in antiracist attitudes can be observed (Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, & Vaughn, 1994). Similarly, experimentally manipulated higher norms of rape myth acceptance lead to higher reported rape proclivity in participants (Bohner, Siebler, & Schmelcher, 2006). Finally, influencing perceived norms causes the adjustment of negative stereotypes about African Americans to the social norm (Stangor, Sechrist, & Jost, 2001). One could argue that these are mere demand effects that change the expression of prejudicial attitudes only in the situation (Haines & Barker, 2003),

but the effects of social norm based interventions are effective in causing a decline in problematic behavior and are stable for a time period between one week (racial beliefs: Stangor et al., 2001), four weeks (rape prevention: Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Mauch, & Park, 2010), up to six months (alcohol use: Schroeder & Prentice, 1998).

In sum, when men show pluralistic ignorance (Miller & McFarland, 1991; Toch & Kolfas, 1984), they overestimate their peers' social norm of hostile sexism (Kilmartin et al., 2008), and thus are more likely to express hostile sexism (Berkowitz, 2003). We assume that men in male-only and mostly male groups overestimate the prevalence of hostile sexist attitudes in their peers, act accordingly, thus showing pluralistic ignorance. Pluralistic ignorance will thus induce men to express most hostile sexism in male-only groups, followed by groups with more men than women, followed by groups with equal numbers of men and women, followed by groups with less men than women. Finally, we expect the lowest level of expression of hostile sexism in women-only groups because in these groups gender is not salient and women's endorsement of hostile sexism is generally lower than men's (Glick et al., 2000). We expect that perceptions of the likelihood of sexism will reflect this hypothesized linear trend between male/female ratio and the expression of hostile sexism.

Benevolent sexism is superficially positive (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Bohner et al., 2010; Dardenne et al., 2007) and thus is not suitable for discriminating against a female out-group to enhance self-esteem. We argue that, regarding sex composition, the occurrence of benevolent sexism is mainly influenced by its functional role in romantic relationships (Hammond & Overall, 2017): Although it can occur at the workplace (King et al., 2012), it specifically targets romantic partners (Hammond & Overall, 2017; Sarlet et al., 2012). Thus, we expect benevolent sexism to occur more in settings that can be perceived as romantic.

Therefore, benevolent sexism should mainly occur when one man and one woman are present, compared to groups with other gender compositions.

4.1.3 Where do hostile and benevolent sexism occur?

Previous research investigated the occurrence of ambivalent sexism at work and in romantic contexts. Hostile sexism is directed at career women. Career women are most likely to be salient at work. Benevolent sexism is directed at housewives and romantic partners (Glick et al., 1997; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Sarlet et al., 2012). Housewives and romantic partners are most likely to be salient in a domestic setting. However, a traditional subtype can also be salient at the workplace, eliciting benevolent sexism (Hideg & Lance, 2016), and a nontraditional subtype can also be salient at home, e.g., when a woman gets promoted and tells her partner about it (Expósito et al., 2010). Hostile and benevolent sexism strongly influence dynamics in intimate relationships (Hammond & Overall, 2017). Thus, both can be present in private settings. We are not aware of direct comparisons between the perceived likelihood of hostile and benevolent behaviors across private, leisure, and work settings and aim for such a comparison.

Hostile sexism is perceived to be negative (e.g., Bohner et al., 2010; Dardenne et al., 2007; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998), and therefore is likely to be influenced by gender equity prescriptions at the workplace. For example, men and women expect men to support gender equity more in a work compared to a romantic context (Sarlet et al., 2012, Experiment 3). We assume that the same is true for a work compared to a leisure setting. Thus, norms should prevent the expression of hostile sexism at work and therefore we hypothesize that hostile sexism is less likely at the workplace compared to private or leisure settings.

Benevolent sexism is perceived to be positive (e.g., Bohner et al., 2010; Dardenne et al., 2007; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998) and women expect benevolent sexism in romantic

contexts more than in work contexts (Sarlet et al., 2012). Therefore, we expect that benevolent sexism occurs more in private and leisure compared to work settings.

4.1.4 When are men particularly likely to show hostile and benevolent sexist behavior?

People are more likely to behave negatively when they are drunk or stressed, and positively when they are relaxed. For example, people eat healthier and make more conscious decisions about consumption when they have self-regulation resources available compared to not having cognitive capacity available (Friese, Hofmann, & Wänke, 2008; Hofmann, Rauch, & Gawronski, 2007). This extends to sexism: When under stress, participants rate a sexist joke as funnier compared to a control condition (Eyssel & Bohner, 2007). These findings are predicted by dual-process models, models that “compare more automatic and more controlled modes” (Fiske & Taylor, 2013, p. 434). Dual-process models are popular in social psychology to explain thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. A 1999 volume on the topic included over thirty of these models (Chaiken & Trope, 1999) and new dual process models have been developed in the meantime (e.g., Strack & Deutsch, 2004). Common to all dual process models, be it for determining social behavior (e.g., Fazio & Towles-Schwen, 1999; Strack & Deutsch, 2004) or attitudes (e.g., Wilson, Lindsey, & Schooler, 2000), is the assumption that there are two processes at work that influence behavior. One process is a deliberative, effortful process. In this process, individuals apply their explicit knowledge and logic to decide about what to do. The second process is spontaneous and impulsive, can be influenced by heuristics, works associatively, and requires less effort. Behavioral differences between stressed and relaxed states can be explained with dual process models, for example with the MODE model of attitude-behavior processes (Fazio & Towles-Schwen, 1999). MODE is an acronym for motivation and

opportunity as determinants for behavior. According to this model, both motivation and opportunity are required for individuals to engage in deliberate behavior. Opportunity, for example, means having plenty of time and cognitive capacity to process information (Fazio & Towles-Schwen, 1999). When motivation and opportunity are high, individuals' behavior will follow processes described in the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) and in the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Low opportunity, for example when under time pressure, even when combined with high motivation, is enough to decrease the likelihood of deliberative processing of information and increase the likelihood for automatically activated and/or accessible attitudes to influence behavioral intentions (Sanbonmatsu & Fazio, 1990).

In sum, dual process models such as the MODE model predict that when people do not have the opportunity to carefully think about information, such as when under stress, they will be more likely to act in accordance with automatically activated attitudes.

If we assume that individuals high on hostile sexist attitudes know that they should not express their attitudes, this means that men will be more likely to express hostile sexist attitudes when they are not able to deliberately process information, that is, for example, when they are stressed, intoxicated, or threatened. Of course, to predict actual behavior, we would have to take into account how motivated people are to respond without prejudice (Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002), but because we are interested in the situational influence on the expression of sexism and not a trait/attitude influence, we ignore this aspect.

Consequently, we expect hostile sexism to occur when opportunity for deliberate processing of a situation is low, that is, when participants are stressed or drunk. Benevolent sexism, to the contrary, is perceived as positive and we expect benevolent sexism to occur

when opportunity and motivation to deliberately decide on behavior is high, that is, for example, when participants are relaxed.

In sum, research regarding the occurrence of sexism indicates that

- a) Hostile sexism is directed at women who violate the status quo, benevolent sexism is directed at women who help maintain the status quo.
- b) Hostile sexism is most likely to emerge in male-only groups, followed by groups with more men than women present, followed by groups with equal numbers of men and women present, followed by groups with more women than men present and least likely in female-only groups. Benevolent sexism is most likely in romantic settings, that is, when one man and one woman are present, compared to all other settings.
- c) Benevolent and hostile sexism are more likely in private compared to work settings.
- d) Hostile sexism is more likely when opportunity to deliberately decide on actions is low, benevolent sexism is more likely when the opportunity to deliberately decide on actions is high.

Consequently, we are looking for a situational taxonomy that describes these characteristics.

4.2 The situational taxonomy of Saucier and colleagues

The taxonomy of Gerard Saucier and his colleagues (Saucier, Bel-Bahar, & Fernandez, 2007) accounts for the influence of targets of sexism, sex composition, work vs. private context, and states (such as feeling stressed or being drunk) on behavior. Their taxonomy thus meets our criteria and can help to systematically investigate the influence of situations on sexism.

To develop their taxonomy, Saucier and colleagues first asked students to describe situations that modify the expression of personality traits. The first and second authors then categorized a subset of 1,000 of the resulting situation descriptions independently and intuitively. Comparing the two clusters resulted in sixteen common categories:

Physical Locales, Relational Contexts, Affective/Emotive States, Motivational (Goal-Seeking) States, Goal-Realization States, Cognitive States, Activities, Transaction-Dependent or Transactional Contexts, Sleep-related Contexts, Conditions of Crisis and Danger, Conditions of Time-Pressure, Conditions of Finance, Conditions of Dress, States of Identity-Realization, States of Expressing Another Trait, and Miscellaneous. (Saucier et al., 2007, p. 492)

The authors further reduced these categories by classifying a new subset of 1,000 situation descriptions into this system. This revealed three broader categories, *locations*, *interpersonal associates*, and *activities*. Applying linguistic analysis to the situation descriptions, the authors then reasoned that a distinction between activities and processes should be included, and thus introduced a fourth category, *passively experienced processes*, which reminds of Murray's "press of an external force" (Murray, 1938). The authors suggest linguistic markers for their categories: *at* (locations), *with* (interpersonal associates), *-ing* (gerund; any verb that describes an observable action), and *-ed* (passive, any verb that describes an external influence). Applied to sexism, a woman could perceive sexism at work with her colleagues, working, while the perpetrator is stressed. Although these linguistic markers have been derived post hoc, the fact that they can be derived suggests that laypersons naturally describe situations in terms of locations, interpersonal associates, activities, and passively experienced processes. Thus, these categories reflect how we subjectively experience our behavior to vary in different situations.

In sum, the situational taxonomy of Saucier and colleagues suggests that people describe situations in terms of locations, interpersonal associates, activities, and passively experienced processes. We will investigate in which *locations* sexism is most likely to occur, with whom (targets and perpetrators: *interpersonal associates*), and under which *passively experienced processes*. We decided not to include the activities category because, applied to the instances when sexism might occur, it is redundant. Specifically, we have the following hypotheses:

1. *Interpersonal associates*: Regarding *targets* of sexism, we expect that hostile sexism is perceived to be more likely directed at a female colleague and a feminist compared to family members (romantic partners, mothers, daughters). To the contrary, we expect that benevolent sexism is perceived to be more likely to be directed at family members compared to feminists or female colleagues. Regarding *gender composition*, we expect that there is a linear trend for hostile sexism, with most hostile sexism being perceived to be expressed in all-male groups, followed by groups consisting of more men than women, followed by equal men and women groups, less men than women groups, all female groups, and least likely when one man and one woman is present. We expect that benevolent sexism is most perceived most likely when with a romantic partner, followed by all other gender compositions.
2. *Locations*: We expect that hostile and benevolent sexism are more likely in leisure compared to work settings.
3. *Passively experienced processes*: Based on the fact that hostile sexism is clearly negative and socially sanctioned, we expect that it is more likely to emerge when control is diminished, such as when people are under threat, intoxicated, tense,

or stressed, compared to when people are relaxed and thus in a better position to control their behavior. Conversely, benevolent sexism is perceived as positive behavior, thus has to be controlled and therefore should be more likely to emerge and perceived to emerge when participants are relaxed compared to when they are under the influence of passively experienced processes.

4.3 Manuscript #2

Situational variables moderate the perceived likelihood and acceptability of benevolent and hostile sexist behavior: the impact of locations, interpersonal associates, and passively experienced processes

Becker, J. C. ¹, Swim, J. K. ², de Oliveira Laux, S. H. ¹, Radke, H. ¹, & Fischer, F. B. ¹

(*Under Review*). Situational variables moderate the perceived likelihood and acceptability of benevolent and hostile sexist behavior: the impact of locations, interpersonal associates, and passively experienced processes.

¹ Institute of Psychology, University of Osnabrueck, Seminarstrasse 20, 49074 Osnabrueck, Germany

² Pennsylvania State University, Old Main, State College, PA 16801, USA

Author note:

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia Becker, Department of Psychology, University of Osnabrueck, Seminarstraße 20, 49074 Osnabrueck, Germany, E-mail address: jula.becker.uni-osnabrueck.de, Tel: +49 (0)541/969-4870. This research was supported by a grant of the German research association awarded to Julia Becker (BE 4648/1).

Abstract

We examined how situations moderate the perceived likelihood and acceptability of sexist behavior. We distinguished locations, interpersonal associates (targets and gender composition) and passively experienced processes. In Study 1 ($N = 108$), we demonstrated that hostile sexism was deemed to be more likely in leisure than private or work settings, and benevolent sexism was deemed to be more likely in private and leisure than work settings. In Study 2 ($N = 76$), we illustrated that hostile sexism was deemed to be more likely directed at feminists and female colleagues than at family members (romantic partners, mothers, daughters), more likely when fewer women were present, and when men experienced passive processes (e.g., being drunk, feeling tension, or threat). Benevolent sexism was deemed to be more likely directed at family members and less likely when men experienced passive processes.

Keywords: hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, situations, taxonomy

There is great variability in women's experiences with sexism. We know that women are exposed to sexism in their daily lives (e.g., Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001; Becker & Swim, 2011). We also know that not everyone is sexist. Instead, there is a lot of intra-individual variation in endorsing sexist beliefs (e.g., Glick et al., 2000), in engaging in sexist behaviors (e.g., de Oliveira Laux, Ksenofontov, & Becker, 2015), and in the likelihood that women will be a target of sexism (e.g., Berdahl, 2007). However, despite findings in social psychology that indicate that situations are strong predictors of behavior, little is known about systematic situational variability in the expression of sexist beliefs and behaviors. For instance, some situations may provide norms that permit hostile sexism (a clearly blatant form of sexism) while others permit benevolent sexism (a subjectively positive form of sexism). Thus, a fuller understanding of the role of situations in experiences with sexism is needed. In the present research, we asked people to think about hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors and to evaluate how likely they occur depending on certain situation characteristics.

It is a truism in much of psychology that human behavior is guided by personality traits (dispositional factors) as well as the immediate situational context (environmental factors, e.g., Rauthmann et al., 2014). Yet, while there is a long history of asserting the importance of understanding situations, research is just beginning to explore this in much more detail (Meyer, 2015; Sherman, Rauthmann, Brown, Serfass, & Jones, 2015; Yang, Read & Miller, 2009). For instance, while we know a lot about taxonomies of personalities, we know relatively less about taxonomies of situations that influence the expression of personality traits (Meyer, 2015; Rauthmann et al., 2014). Personality researchers have noted that a taxonomy of situations is useful because situations are part of human experiences. Further, a taxonomy can uncover general principles as to how and why situations affect

people. For example, by revealing effects of different types of situations on people, by providing reasons for variability in the likelihood that individual differences will affect behaviors, and by pointing out the ways that individual differences manifest themselves (e.g., Funder, 2009; Meyer, 2015; Rauthmann et al., 2014; Sherman et al., 2015).

Research on sexism could benefit from taking a similar systematic look at the role of situations on the perceived likelihood of sexist behaviors. We know more about different types of sexism (e.g., Glick & Fiske, 1996; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995) than different types of situations that predict sexist behaviors. We know that some situations are important predictors of sexist behaviors but we lack a systematic examination of the awareness people have of situations that elicit different sexist behavior. A systematic study of situations can have many theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, a systematic study of situations can uncover general principles of how and why situations affect the likelihood of sexist behavior and when different types of sexist behaviors are particularly salient. Practically, it could help identify circumstances that enhance the likelihood that sexism will be expressed, the types of sexist behaviors that are salient in different settings, and when women may feel vulnerable or safe.

Situational variation of sexist behavior

Research demonstrates the influence of situations on women's experiences with sexism. This research on sexism illustrates that situations can: 1) have main effects on the likelihood that sexism emerges, 2) moderate whether certain individuals engage in or suppress sexism, and 3) influence the types of sexist behaviors that emerge in different situations.

First, situations can determine whether or not sexism occurs. Social norm theory of prejudice indicates that cultural and location specific norms influence whether prejudice is

tolerated (e.g., Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham & Vahon, 1994; Sechrist & Stangor, 1996). When local social norms permit sexual harassment, people report more sexual harassment (Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1993). Situations can also influence how people process information, altering their judgments about sexist behaviors. For example, time pressure (an example of passively experienced processes, see below) leads individuals to evaluate sexist jokes as being funnier than without time pressure (Eyssel & Bohner, 2007). Perceptions of the likelihood and acceptability of sexist behavior reflect these social norms and thus are an important predictor for expressing sexism.

Second, situations moderate the likelihood that sexist men behave in a sexist manner. For instance, situational cues, such as sexist humor, increase the perceived social norm of tolerance for sexism – but only among men high in hostile sexism (Ford, Wentzel, & Lorion, 2001). Moreover, because of this “relaxed” normative standard, men high (but not men low) in hostile sexism anticipate less self-directed negative affect upon imagining that they had behaved in a sexist way (Ford et al., 2001).

Third, the main effect and moderator predictors noted above do not capture the complexity of situational influences because situations not only increase the likelihood of sexism but also influence the types of sexism expressed. Two distinct types of sexist behaviors that might emerge in different situations are hostile and benevolent forms of sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Hostile sexism is clearly negative and socially disapproved (e.g., Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Swim, Mallet, Russo-Devosa, & Stangor, 2005). Benevolent sexism, in contrast, is – on the surface - positive but in practice undermines gender equality (e.g., Jost & Kay, 2005; Becker & Wright, 2011). Benevolent sexism is expressed via paternalism (the belief that women should be cherished and protected by men), a perception of women as being purer and the better sex (gender differentiation), as well as

the belief in heterosexual intimacy (e.g., that every man needs a woman at his side to be truly happy). Benevolent sexism is not necessarily seen as sexist (e.g., Bohner, Ahlborn, & Steiner, 2010) and is well integrated into societal norms (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Swim et al., 2005).

Although many women experience sexism at the workplace (e.g., McLaughlin, Uggen, & Blackstone, 2012), sexism occurs in a variety of locations. Different locations differentially influence the expression of men's hostile versus benevolent sexism based upon the different social acceptability of these different types of sexism. For instance, situations that convey lack of tolerance for sexism may be better able to discourage hostile than benevolent sexism. Indeed, in previous research women reported experiencing more hostile sexism from their husbands in private than public contexts, possibly because of greater social pressures on husbands to not appear blatantly sexist in public settings (Chisango, Mayekiso, & Thomae, 2015). Moreover, this same research indicated that women experienced more benevolent sexism from their husbands in public than private contexts, possibly because benevolent sexism is socially approved and presents men in a positive light. In a different study, women prescribed that men should engage in more protective paternalistic behavior toward women in a romantic than in a work context (Sarlet, Dumont, Delacollette, & Dardenne, 2012; Ciara, Lee, Fiske, & Glick, 2008).

Different subtypes of women differentially elicit hostile versus benevolent sexism, and situations can be defined in terms of the presence of different types of people. The theory of ambivalent sexism states that hostile and benevolent sexism are two sides of the same coin, but directed at different subtypes of women (Glick & Fiske, 1996, Glick et al., 1997). Gender-role consistent behavior (like being nice, maintaining beauty standards) is "rewarded" with benevolence, whereas gender-role inconsistent behavior (like being

agentic) is “punished” with hostility. In line with this, individuals are more likely to direct hostile sexism at negatively stereotyped female subtypes (promiscuous women, feminists, career women), and benevolent sexism at positively stereotyped female subtypes (e.g., “chaste” women, Sibley & Wilson, 2004, or housewives, Becker, 2010). Similarly, pregnant women are more likely to experience benevolent sexism than non-pregnant women (e.g., Sutton, Douglas, & McClellan, 2011; Hebl, King, Glick, Singletary, & Kazama, 2007). Furthermore, research on sexism in close relationships suggests that benevolent sexism is directed at female partners in particular (e.g., Cross, Overall, & Hammond, 2016; Hammond, Overall, & Cross, 2016).

Situational Taxonomies

Research demonstrating that situations can have different effects on eliciting or suppressing hostile versus benevolent sexism illustrates how studying situations can expand our understanding of different types of sexism and women’s experiences with sexism. The above research, however, does not provide a systematic understanding of how these different types of situations influence sexist behaviors. Research in personality psychology on identifying situational taxonomies provides insights into how general characteristics of situations could inform research on sexist behaviors.

Several researchers have distinguished critical dimensions among situations. Saucier, Bel-Bahar and Fernandez (2007) developed a multi-level taxonomy of situations and included parts of other taxonomies (e.g., from Block & Block, 1981; Cantor, Mischel, & Schwartz, 1982; Endsley, 1995; Magnusson, 1971; Pervin, 1978). Specifically, Saucier and colleagues (2007) asked laypersons what factors could modify the expression of their own traits. Based on their responses, they developed a four-cue classification system that modified expression of traits: *locations* (e.g., home, school, work), *interpersonal associates*

(whom one is with, e.g., male friends), *passively experienced processes*, and *activities* (e.g., doing homework, driving, shopping, cooking). Passively experienced processes are experiences that happen to a person that are uncontrolled by the agent (“the press of an external force”, Murray, 1938, e.g., being in trouble, stressed, drunk, under pressure). In the current work, we adapted this taxonomy of situations to sexist behavior, because it is a comprehensive but parsimonious model that can help to shed light into situational variables influencing the perception of sexist behaviors. Moreover, compared to other taxonomies (for an overview see Rauthmann et al., 2014), this taxonomy captures many important situational cues that likely influence sexist behaviors.

The Present Research

In the present work, we implement Saucier et al.’s (2007) broad taxonomy to test whether a taxonomy of situations can provide theoretical understanding of types of situations that increase the likelihood of different types of sexist behaviors. Thus, we focus on whether this taxonomy is able to differentially predict the perceived likelihood of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior. Three of the four categories provide clear predictions about when one expects these different types of sexist behaviors. These predictions are summarized in Table 1.

Locations. We examine the perceived likelihood that hostile and benevolent sexism occur in private locations (at home or when interacting with people in personal relationships), leisure spaces (defined as locations where leisure activities take place outside the home), and workplaces. We predict that hostile sexism is more likely perceived to occur in leisure than private and work settings because the latter will have more implicit and explicit norms indicating that blatant sexism is not acceptable. This is in line with research showing that more gender egalitarianism was prescribed for men in the workplace than in a

romantic context (Sarlet et al., 2012). In contrast, we predict that benevolent sexism will be less likely perceived to occur at the workplace relative to leisure and private settings, because benevolent sexism is more likely in flirting contexts and romantic relationships, which are more prevalent in leisure and private locations (i.e., when it can be directed at the romantic partner or female friend) than at work. Second, because women are expected to solve tasks at work on their own (which makes paternalistic behavior less likely). However, given that in previous research women reported experiencing more benevolent sexism from their husbands in public than in private (Chisango et al., 2014), it is further possible that benevolent sexism is deemed to be more likely in leisure settings compared to private settings because the former is likely to be more public than the latter.

Interpersonal associates. Two subsets of interpersonal associates influence the perceived likelihood for sexism: the presence of different potential targets of sexism and the gender composition of people present in a situation.

First, in terms of *targets*, we examine how likely hostile and benevolent sexism are perceived towards romantic partners, mothers, daughters, colleagues and feminists. As outlined above, prior work shows that hostile and benevolently sexist behaviors are directed toward certain subtypes of women (e.g., Becker, 2010; Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997; Masser & Abrams, 2004; Sibley & Wilson, 2004). However, prior work has not examined hostile and benevolent sexism directed at work colleagues, mothers, and daughters. Given that benevolent sexism is assumed to be directed at close others, it is a novel hypothesis to test that targets of benevolent sexism are not only romantic partners, but also mothers and daughters. Moreover, prior work has not quantitatively compared to which extent hostile sexism are perceived to be directed at romantic partners compared to feminists and female colleagues. Based on research showing that benevolent sexism is

directed at women who reinforce conventional gender relations and support men such as romantic partners and mothers (Glick et al., 1997, Glick & Fiske, 2001), we expect that benevolent but not hostile sexism will be directed at family members (romantic partners, mothers and daughters) more so than at women who represent subtypes who violate or challenge traditional gender roles (feminists and potentially work colleagues). Regarding hostile sexism, research shows that it is especially directed at women violating traditional gender roles, such as feminists and career women (Becker, 2010; Glick et al., 1997; Masser & Abrams, 2004). Therefore, hostile sexism should be perceived to be more likely directed at a feminist (and potentially at a female colleague) compared to romantic partners, mothers or daughters.

Second, we predict that gender composition of people present in a situation is relevant for understanding when hostile and benevolent sexism will occur. We expect that hostile sexism is perceived to be more likely expressed in male-only groups than in groups with greater representation of women, because women particularly disapprove of hostile sexism (Glick et al., 2000). Thus, in male-only groups, perceived social norms are favorable for the expression of sexism (e.g., men's locker room banter, Schnall, 2016). We therefore predict as a novel hypothesis the following linear trend: hostile sexism should be deemed to occur most likely (1) in male-only groups, followed by situations (2) in which more men than women are present, (3) in which an equal distribution of women and men are present; and should be least likely (4) in a situation where more women than men are present (or where (5) a woman is alone with a man). In contrast, we expect that benevolent sexism will be particularly perceived likely and acceptable when a man is alone with a woman because benevolent sexism is more likely to occur in romantic relationships and when flirting happens (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Sarlet et al., 2012).

Passively experienced processes. When individuals experience passive processes, they are less able to consciously control their behavior. Being under cognitive load (e.g., under time pressure, when memorizing a number, e.g., Wigboldus, Sherman, Franzese, & van Knippenberg, 2010) is an example of passively experienced processes, because unconscious or heuristic processes are more likely to occur in these circumstances. Other situations that make it difficult to process information may have similar effects on consciously controlled behaviors, such as when one is experiencing stress, tension from uncertainty or anxiety, or feeling threat (e.g., because of a verbal attack by a woman). Additionally, being under the influence of drugs (e.g., being drunk) may also result in less consciously controlled behaviors. Hostile sexist behaviors might be perceived to occur more often in such situations that prompt passively experienced processes relative to more neutral situations because social norms may have less of an attenuating effect on their behaviors. In contrast, given that benevolent sexism is socially accepted (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Bohner et al., 2010; Swim et al., 2005), often well-intended (e.g., paying for a woman, helping her with tasks) and needs conscious control (for behaving like a gentleman), people might believe that men are less likely to show benevolent behavior when they are stressed, under time pressure, threatened or anxious.

Activities. In contrast to Saucier and colleagues (2007), we did not include different types of activities in our coding of situations, because these were accounted for by locations and associates. For instance, typical situations noted in Saucier and colleagues (2007) were a) *working* which occurs at the workplace with a colleague, b) *dancing* which occurs in leisure settings such as parties with friends, c) *eating* which occurs at home with particular targets such as romantic partners, mothers, and daughters.

We conducted two studies to test the hypotheses described above and in Table 1. In Study 1, we focused on locations, and in Study 2, we examined all situational variables.

Study 1

In Study 1, we tested not only whether individuals believe that locations influence the perceived likelihood, but also the perceived acceptability of hostile and benevolent sexism in these locations as potential mediators. We predicted that hostile sexism would be perceived as being most likely and acceptable in leisure settings and benevolent sexism would be perceived as being most likely and acceptable in leisure and private settings. Further, we predicted that ratings of acceptability would mediate the relation between location and likelihood of the different types of sexism. Specifically, we expected that locations that were deemed more acceptable for hostile sexism would result in greater perceived occurrence of hostile sexism and locations deemed more acceptable for benevolent sexism would result in greater perceived occurrence of benevolent sexism.

Method

Participants. The sample size was based on a power analyses to find a medium-sized effect in a MANOVA with 80% power ($\alpha = .05$). The sample consisted of 108 psychology students (75% female), of which 89% were German, and 11% were from other countries who completed the survey after a lecture at the university. Participants' ages ranged from 19 to 44 years ($M = 22.99$, $SD = 4.70$).

Design and Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: to either a) the private (i.e., at home), b) the workplace, or c) the leisure location (i.e., a location where activities occur that were not related to work or household). In every location condition participants received the same ten behaviors (five benevolent, five hostile). Participants were asked to estimate how much the ten behaviors are accepted in

society at one of the three locations and how likely they would occur. The five hostile sexist behaviors were (1) tell a sexist joke, (2) laugh about a sexist joke, (3) exclude a woman from an activity because of her gender, (4) talk about women in derogatory terms (e.g., chick, bitch, slut), (5) be upset about women's demands for gender equality. The five benevolent sexist behaviors referred to paternalistic behaviors undermining women's competence and independence, and to gender differentiation (complimenting a woman but not a man for something, Glick & Fiske, 1996). We explained to participants that all these behaviors would not have been done for a man. Specifically, participants read the following benevolent behaviors: (1) do a task for a woman, which she could solve by herself (e.g., carrying a small suitcase, install a computer program); (2) behave like a gentleman and compliment a woman (e.g., for her good taste or her warmth); (3) behave like a gentleman and protect a woman because of her gender; (4) behave courteously towards a woman (e.g., let her go first, help her to wear a coat); (5) protect or defend a woman because of her gender when she was verbally attacked or insulted. Hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors were mixed in the survey. When finished, participants were thanked, debriefed and received course credit.

Dependent Measures.

Likelihood of Sexism. Participants were asked to estimate how likely the five hostile sexist behaviors ($\alpha = .76$) and five benevolent sexist behaviors ($\alpha = .68$) would occur in private spaces, at the workplace, or in leisure spaces (depending on the condition) on a seven-point rating scale (1= very unlikely, 7 = very likely).

Acceptability of Sexism. Participants were asked how acceptable the five hostile sexist behaviors ($\alpha = .76$) and five benevolent sexist behaviors ($\alpha = .77$) would be in private spaces, at the workplace, or in leisure spaces (depending on the condition) on a seven-point rating scale (1= not at all accepted, 7 = very accepted).

Results and Discussion

We conducted planned contrasts to compare the effect of the three locations on likelihood and acceptability of hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors.

Locations and Likelihood of Hostile Sexism. Consistent with predictions, hostile sexism was deemed more likely in leisure spaces ($M = 4.86$, $SD = .85$) than the workplace ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.19$), $p = .006$, 95% CI [-1.22; -.21]; and private settings ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.16$), $p = .003$, 95% CI [-1.27; -.27].

Locations and Likelihood of Benevolent Sexism. Consistent with predictions, benevolent sexism was deemed more likely in leisure spaces ($M = 5.08$, $SD = .87$) and in private ($M = 5.12$, $SD = .77$), compared to the workplace ($M = 4.66$, $SD = .67$), $p = .025$, 95% CI [.06; .79], $p = .013$, 95% CI [.10; .84], respectively.

Locations and Acceptance of Hostile Sexism. Hostile sexism was perceived to be more accepted in leisure spaces ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.00$) than at the workplace ($M = 2.94$, $SD = .93$), $p = .001$, 95% CI [-1.25; -.35], and in private settings ($M = 2.92$, $SD = .96$), $p < .001$, 95% CI [-1.26; -.37].

Locations and Acceptance of Benevolent Sexism. Benevolent sexism was perceived to be more accepted in leisure spaces ($M = 5.99$, $SD = .73$) and in private ($M = 5.67$, $SD = .94$), compared to at the workplace ($M = 5.21$, $SD = .97$), $p < .001$, 95% CI [.37; 1.19], $p = .031$, 95% CI [.04; .87], respectively.

Mediation analyses. In order to test that hostile sexism would be more likely to occur in leisure settings (compared to work and private settings), because it is deemed more accepted in leisure settings, we conducted a mediation analysis. We created a dummy variable (dummy: leisure = 1, private and work setting = 0). The dummy variable predicted acceptability ($B = .80$, $SE = .19$, $t = 4.14$, $p < .001$, 95%CI [.42, 1.19]), and acceptability

predicted the likelihood of hostile sexist behavior ($B = .67, SE = .09, t = 7.64, p < .001, 95\%CI [.50, .84]$). The total effect was reduced to a non-significant direct effect ($B = .21, SE = .19, t = 1.09, p = .28, 95\%CI [-.17, .58]$). The indirect effect of acceptability of hostile sexism was significant ($.54, SE = .17, 95\%CI [.25, .91]$). Thus, individuals rated the likelihood of hostile sexism occurring higher in the leisure setting compared to the work and private setting, because hostile sexism was more accepted in leisure settings compared to the two other locations.

We tested whether benevolent sexism would occur less likely in the workplace (compared to leisure and private settings), because it is deemed less acceptable in this environment. We created a dummy variable (workplace = 1, private and leisure setting = 0). The dummy variable predicted acceptability ($B = -.62, SE = .18, t = -3.41, p < .001, 95\%CI [-.99, -.26]$), and acceptability predicted the likelihood of benevolent sexist behavior ($B = .40, SE = .08, t = 5.20, p < .001, 95\%CI [.25, .55]$). The total effect was reduced to a non-significant direct effect ($B = -.20, SE = .15, t = -1.30, p = .20, 95\%CI [-.50, .10]$). The indirect effect of acceptability of benevolent sexism was significant ($.25, SE = .10, 95\%CI [-.50, -.09]$). Thus, individuals rated the likelihood of benevolent sexism lower at the workplace setting compared to the leisure and private setting, because benevolent sexism was less accepted in the workplace compared to the two other locations.

In sum, our hypotheses were supported: Hostile sexism was deemed to be more likely in leisure settings compared to the workplace and in private settings because it was perceived as more acceptable in this context. Benevolent sexism, on the other hand, was deemed to be more likely in leisure and private settings compared to the workplace, because it was perceived to be less acceptable at the workplace. However, although it makes sense that social norms direct the likelihood of behaviors, causal conclusions cannot

be drawn based, because we did not manipulate the mediating variables (for a discussion see Trafimow, 2015).

Study 2

We pursued two goals with Study 2. First, we aimed to replicate the findings in terms of locations from Study 1. Second, we tested the full taxonomy introduced above: In addition to locations, we assessed associates (targets, gender composition) and passively experienced processes (stressed, time pressure, tension, threat, drugs, relaxed) to test our remaining predictions and provide a more complete analysis of the effects of a taxonomy of situations on sexist behaviors. We did not test for perceived acceptability of behaviors in Study 2 because individuals completed a longer questionnaire in Study 2 with the addition of more situational variables.

Method

Participants. The sample size was based on a power analyses to find a medium-sized effect in repeated measures ANOVAs with 80% power ($\alpha = .05$). The sample consisted of $N = 76$ participants (63% female), of which 88% were German, 12% were from diverse European countries, one was from Brazil. Forty-one percent had a high school degree and further 55% a university degree. Participants' ages ranged from 20 to 58 years ($M = 27.33$, $SD = 6.49$). As a compensation, they could participate in a lottery (to win 4 prizes each worth 25 Euro).

Design and Procedure. Two research assistants approached participants in a medium-sized German city in public areas and via posters at the university. If they agreed to participate, they received a link to the online-study via email.

We used the same hostile and benevolent behaviors as in Study 1, but we reversed the design compared to Study 1: whereas in Study 1, participants were randomly assigned to one of three locations and asked to evaluate the likelihood of five hostile *and* five

benevolent behaviors; in Study 2, participants were randomly assigned to evaluate either five hostile *or* five benevolent behaviors, but for all situational characteristics (for all locations, all associates, and all passively experienced processes). Thus, type of sexism rating was a between-participant variable and different types of situations were distinct within-participant variables. Outcome variables were likelihood of hostile and benevolent sexism⁶. Moreover, as in Study 1, we stressed that we were not asking for what they would do, but how likely this behavior would occur in society. Finally, participants were thanked, and debriefed.

Measures. The first Cronbach's alpha refers to hostile sexism, the second to benevolent sexism.

Locations. Participants were asked how likely the five behaviors would be shown by a man at the following locations: (1) in private spaces (i.e., at home, $\alpha = .78/.79$); (2) at the workplace (e.g., workplace, university, $\alpha = .84/.64$), (3) in leisure spaces (e.g., at the cinema, at a park, on a meadow, in the streets, $\alpha = .79/.77$); (4) at a party location (e.g., in a pub, at a disco, at a party, $\alpha = .71/.76$). Thus, we expanded our test of Study 1 by adding in a fourth type of location (party location) in order to specify whether individuals primarily thought about parties when thinking about leisure activities. We predicted that parties, as a special location, would deem hostile sexist behaviors even more likely than other leisure settings.

Interpersonal Associates. 1) Female targets. Participants were asked how likely the five behaviors were directed at the following female subtypes: (1) the romantic partner (girlfriend, wife, $\alpha = .76/.65$), (2) mother ($\alpha = .75/.70$), (3) daughter ($\alpha = .81/.68$), (4)

⁶ We included two further scenarios on traditional gender roles and sexual harassment for exploratory purposes. . Interested readers can receive the results from the first author.

colleague (e.g., colleague at work, fellow student, $\alpha = .70/.69$), (5) feminist ($\alpha = .80/.86$). **2)**

Gender Composition. Participants were asked how likely the five behaviors would occur with the following people present: (1) men only ($\alpha = .81/.81$), (2) more men than women present ($\alpha = .84/.78$), (3) equal distribution of women and men present ($\alpha = .82/.74$), (4) more women than men present ($\alpha = .73/.69$), (5) only one woman and one man present ($\alpha = .86/.85$).

Passively experienced processes. Participants were asked how likely a man would show the five behaviors under the following circumstances: (1) when stressed, (2) under time pressure (these two stressful situations were combined, $\alpha = .91/.87$), (3) because of tension (e.g., experiencing tension, unrest, uncertainty, anxiety, $\alpha = .80/.82$), (4) under threat (e.g., after an insult, after he was rejected by a woman, $\alpha = .79/.85$), (5) under the influence of drugs (e.g., alcohol, medicaments, $\alpha = .86/.81$), and (6) in a neutral situation (relaxed on holidays, $\alpha = .77/.80$).

Results and Discussion

We conducted four mixed measures ANOVAs with location/target/gender composition/passively-experienced processes as repeated factors and type of sexism as a between-participant variable. We compared the means within each situational characteristic with post-hoc tests using Bonferroni correction to avoid an alpha-inflation for multiple comparisons. We also tested for main effects and interactions with gender but none were significant. Sphericity was indicated for none of the analyses, therefore, we report Greenhouse-Geisser corrected values.

Locations. The interaction locations x type of sexism approached significance, $F(2.57, 189.77) = 2.63, p = .06, \eta^2 = .03$. Therefore, we conducted separate analyses for hostile and benevolent sexism.

Locations and Likelihood of Hostile Sexism. The within subject effect indicated that the likelihood of hostile sexism differed by location, $F(2.10, 75.61) = 17.13, p < .001, \eta^2 = .32$. Replicating and extending results of Study 1, hostile sexism was most likely (1) at a party location ($M = 5.21, SD = .93$), followed by (2) in the leisure space ($M = 4.75, SD = 1.12$), (3) in private ($M = 4.31, SD = 1.11$), and at work ($M = 3.99, SD = 1.40$). All means differed significantly from each other (all $ps < .06$), except between the private and work settings (see Table 2).

Locations and Likelihood of Benevolent Sexism. The within subject effect indicated that the likelihood of benevolent sexism differed by location, $F(2.45, 93.19) = 7.46, p < .001, \eta^2 = .16$. Replicating and extending results of Study 1, benevolent sexism was equally likely in private spaces ($M = 5.11, SD = .99$), at leisure spaces ($M = 5.17, SD = .84$) and at party locations ($M = 5.44, SD = .85$), but less likely at the workplace ($M = 4.73, SD = .81$, see Table 2).

Interpersonal Associates. The interactions between targets x type of sexism ($F(2.57, 149.83) = 2.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$) and gender composition x type of sexism ($F(2.16, 155.16) = 49.26, p < .001, \eta^2 = .41$) were significant. Therefore, we conducted separate analyses for hostile and benevolent sexism.

Targets and Likelihood of Hostile Sexism. The within subject effect indicated that the likelihood of hostile sexism differed by target, $F(2.12, 76.31) = 37.12, p < .001, \eta^2 = .51$. As predicted, hostile sexism was deemed to be most likely directed at (1) the feminist ($M = 4.84, SD = 1.28$), and the female colleague ($M = 4.30, SD = 1.05$), followed by (2) the romantic partner ($M = 3.80, SD = 1.28$) and (3) least likely directed at the daughter ($M = 2.67, SD = 1.30$) and mother ($M = 2.79, SD = 1.25$, see Table 3).

Targets of Benevolent Sexism. The within subject effect indicated that the likelihood of benevolent sexism differed by target, $F(1.79, 67.91) = 116.25, p < .001, \eta^2 = .75$. As predicted, benevolent sexism was (1) most likely directed at the romantic partner ($M = 6.19, SD = .60$), followed by (2) the mother ($M = 5.76, SD = .79$) and daughter ($M = 5.63, SD = .80$), followed by (3) the female colleague ($M = 4.73, SD = .70$), and (4) the feminist ($M = 3.09, SD = 1.26$, see Table 3).

Gender Composition and Likelihood of Hostile Sexism. The within-subject effect indicated that likelihood of hostile sexism differed by gender composition, $F(2.17, 78.03) = 50.80, p < .001, \eta^2 = .59$. Findings for hostile sexism followed the predicted linear trend. As predicted, hostile sexism was deemed to be most likely (1) in male-only groups ($M = 5.84, SD = 1.10$), followed by (2) “more men than women present” ($M = 5.70, SD = 1.10$), followed by (3) “equal distribution of women and men” ($M = 4.60, SD = .98$), and lastly followed by (4) “more women than men present” ($M = 4.00, SD = 1.00$), and “one woman, one man present” ($M = 3.74, SD = 1.35$). All means significantly differed from each other ($ps < .001$) except between “more women than men present” and “one woman, one man present”(see Table 4).

Gender Composition and Likelihood of Benevolent Sexism. The within-subject effect indicated that likelihood of benevolent sexism differed by gender composition, $F(2.28, 77.26) = 9.45, p < .001, \eta^2 = .21$. As predicted, benevolent sexism was deemed to be more likely when “one man, one woman” are present ($M = 5.51, SD = 1.03$), compared to all other conditions. Means for male-only groups ($M = 4.53, SD = 1.15$), “more men than women” ($M = 4.77, SD = .87$), “equal distribution of women and men” ($M = 4.79, SD = .70$), and “more women than men” ($M = 4.91, SD = .88$), did not significantly differ from each other (see Table 4).

Passively Experienced Processes. The interaction between passive processes x type of sexism was significant, $F(3.20, 237.08) = 36.99, p < .001, \eta^2 = .33$. Therefore, we conducted separate analyses for hostile and benevolent sexism.

Passively Experienced Processes and Likelihood of Hostile Sexism. The within-subject effect indicated that the likelihood of hostile sexism differed by passively-experienced processes, $F(2.68, 96.29) = 15.65, p < .001, \eta^2 = .30$. As predicted, hostile sexism was deemed to be more likely when men experience threat ($M = 5.27, SD = 1.11$), use drugs ($M = 5.07, SD = 1.18$) and experience tension ($M = 4.72, SD = 1.22$) compared to being relaxed in holidays ($M = 4.10, SD = 1.15$, see Table 5). However, against expectations, the means between experiencing stressful situations ($M = 4.24, SD = 1.17$) and being relaxed in holidays did not differ. When considering the means, it is interesting to note that the mean for “relaxed in holidays” was around the scale midpoint. This finding could indicate that our comparison group (relaxed on holidays) was not a perfectly neutral control, because holidays are also leisure settings where we predicted hostile sexism to emerge.

Passively Experienced Processes and Likelihood of Benevolent Sexism. The within subject effect indicated that the likelihood of benevolent sexism differed depending on passively-experienced processes, $F(2.77, 105.20) = 73.21, p < .001, \eta^2 = .66$. As predicted, benevolent sexism was deemed to be less likely when men experience threat ($M = 2.44, SD = 1.14$), use drugs ($M = 3.41, SD = 1.32$), experience tension ($M = 3.09, SD = 1.02$), and are stressed, compared to being relaxed in holidays ($M = 5.35, SD = .79$, see Table 5).

General Discussion

While there is a long history of asserting the importance of understanding situations, research is just beginning to explore how situations shape behavior. The present work advances our understanding of situational characteristics that influence the likelihood of

sexist behavior. We tested whether situational cues developed from the taxonomy of situations proposed by Saucier and colleagues (2007) would influence people's evaluation of how likely women would experience different types of sexist behaviors. We distinguished three key elements: locations, associates (targets and gender composition) and passively experienced processes.

Our research makes a novel contribution by illustrating that situations influence the perceived likelihood of sexist behaviors: we demonstrate that hostile sexism is deemed to be more likely (1) in leisure settings (particularly at parties) compared to private or work-related settings, (2) directed at feminists and female colleagues compared to a romantic partner, mother or daughter, (3) the more men and the less women are present, and (4) when men experience passive processes (being threatened, using drugs, feeling tension) compared to when being relaxed on holidays. In contrast, benevolent sexism was deemed to be more likely (1) in leisure spaces and in private compared to the workplace, (2) directed at the romantic partner, daughter, and mother compared to a female colleague, and a feminist, (3) when only one man and one woman were present and (4) when men are relaxed in holidays compared to experiencing passive processes.

Thus, our findings suggest that the likelihood of hostile sexist behaviors increases depending on certain situations, whereas the likelihood of benevolent sexist behaviors increases depending on other situations. These results have important implications.

Implications

A systematic study of situations has many theoretical and practical benefits. In terms of the theoretical implications, a systematic study of situations uncovers general principles about how and why situations affect the expression of sexist behavior. We took disparate sets of situational predictors from the research on sexism and integrated them into one

taxonomy that was created based on general behaviors (Saucier et al., 2007). Moreover, we show that paying attention to situations can provide a better understanding of the social meaning of hostile and benevolent sexism but also for blind spots of recognizing sexism.

It seems that when a situation is lacking clear and consistent norms to direct behavior (such as experiencing passive processes and being in leisure settings), the likelihood for hostile sexist (but not benevolent sexist) behavior increases. Specifically, our study shows that hostile sexism is perceived to be particularly likely when men decrease the monitoring of their behaviors (i.e., passive processes, e.g., because they are drunk, feel threat or tension). The perception that romantic partners are perceived to be less likely the target of hostile sexism in private contexts might be particularly insidious for women who are subject to intimate partner violence (Forbes, Adams-Curtis, & White, 2004; Cross, Overall, Hammond, & Fletcher, 2016; Martinez-Pecino & Durán, 2016). In contrast, situations with clear and consistent social norms like workplace norms reduce the likelihood of hostile sexism. These findings underline that hostile sexism is a clearly negative and derogatory behavior, because it is perceived to be more likely in situations where men expect that their behavior is not socially sanctioned. In contrast, the presence of a feminist may signal that hostile sexism is permissible, as suggested by the negative stereotypes associated with feminists (Glick et al., 1997; Bashir et al., 2013). Future research could determine more directly the strength of situations on the actual experience of sexism, specifically with regard to the clarity and consistency of norms permitting and suppressing hostile and benevolent sexism (see also Foster & Fullager, 2018).

In terms of practical implications, this taxonomy helps to identify circumstances that enhance the perceived likelihood that sexism will be expressed, the types of sexist behaviors that will emerge in different settings, and when women may feel vulnerable or safe. This has

implications for women when protecting themselves from discrimination. It is useful to know when hostile versus benevolent sexist behaviors may emerge, because this could strengthen women's awareness that some situations can increase the likelihood of them being exposed to hostile sexism, whereas other situations can increase the likelihood of them being exposed to benevolent sexism. Particularly problematic is the low awareness of hostile sexism in private and directed at romantic partners. Beliefs that hostile sexism is not targeted at women close to men might contribute to underreporting and missing out on help in cases of intimate partner violence.

Moreover, this research has practical implications particularly in terms of locations and gender composition: although women report experiencing sexism in the workplace (McLaughlin et al., 2012), our findings show that people perceive the likelihood of women becoming a target of hostile or benevolent sexism even higher at other locations, namely in leisure settings (and in private settings for benevolent sexism). Workplace settings, therefore, in women's and men's views seem to reduce the likelihood of hostile and benevolent sexism – at least compared to leisure settings. Results of Study 1 show that this goes back to different perceived social norms in these locations. This points to the pervasive nature of prejudice, namely, that especially in leisure settings, that are a source for recreation, women are perceived to be more likely confronted with hostile sexism. The acceptability of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior at the workplace was not only deemed to be lower compared to leisure settings but also mediated the relation between locations and the perceived likelihood of this behavior occurring. The fact that benevolent sexism and its paternalistic helping behavior is perceived to be associated with relationships makes it particularly insidious, because its subtle occurrence in work settings, such as in the selection of challenges for promotional candidates, might be obscured (King, Botsford, Hebl,

Kazama, Dawson, & Perkins, 2012). Further, the gender composition of individuals present in a situation is an important predictor of hostile sexism, but a less relevant predictor of benevolent sexism. The more men and the less women are present in a situation, the more likely individuals believed that hostile sexism emerges. The present work also shows that men and women are aware of the idea of men's locker room banter (Schnall, 2016), that is, that hostile sexism occurs more likely in men-only groups, and systematically reflects women's experiences with hostile sexism in the face of increasing male presence. When women are not present, men do not need to be considerate, they do not need to fear confrontation and, thus, social norms do not prevent the open expression of sexism. This might be also relevant for vocational choices. Women, as we show, are aware of the disinhibiting effect of male-only or mainly male environments on the expression of hostile sexism. If women want to avoid hostile sexism, they in turn might be likely to avoid male-only or mainly male environments. Aside from stereotypes and stereotype threat, this might be one reason why highly talented women do not choose STEM subjects.

In line with close relationships research (e.g., Hammond et al., 2016), benevolent sexism is perceived to be particularly likely when only two individuals (one woman, one man) are present. Our study is the first to systematically compare the perceived targets of benevolent sexism and to examine whether other close relatives (mothers and daughters) are targets of benevolent sexism. In line with the conceptualization of benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996), it is foremost directed at romantic partners. But we also show that mothers and daughters are in roles that make benevolent sexist treatment more likely. This means that benevolent sexism not only supports the status quo in heterosexual relationships, but also in the wider family network.

Finally, while research has investigated some influences of passively experienced processes such as being drunk on hostile sexism (Govorun & Payne, 2006), influences on the expression benevolent sexism have not been researched so far. Our study shows that, in line with the superficial desirability of benevolent sexist behavior, it is perceived to be most likely when men are relaxed, and thus in conscious control of their behavior.

Limitations

One important limitation of our studies is that we did not measure actual behavior. A daily-diary study including ecological momentary assessment that prompts men and women several times a day to indicate whether they perceived specific behaviors, and also asks for situational characteristics, would be a good way to sample actual occurrence of hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors and compare it to the perceived likelihood of these behaviors.

Another limitation of the current taxonomy of sexist behaviors is that we neglected the situational category “activities”. This category was, however, accounted for by locations and associates. Moreover, although passively-experienced processes and gender composition are likely independent of situational categories, locations and targets are likely to overlap to some extent. For instance, while one can meet a romantic partner and a colleague everywhere, it is still more likely to meet a romantic partner in a private setting and to meet a colleague in a work-related setting. Thus, while the situational taxonomy proved useful, there may be meaningful overlaps among these situations. Further, while the taxonomy of situations proposed by Saucier and colleagues (2007) proved to be valid predictors for the occurrence of sexist behaviors, there are other general situational taxonomies we could have used. One might even be able to devise a novel taxonomy that is specific for sexism. Therefore, future research would be beneficial to test alternative taxonomies, which could provide additional insights into the emergence of sexist behaviors.

However, when using other taxonomies the possibility of similar overlaps in situational variables across taxonomies that could lead to similar conclusions to ours should be taken into account. For instance, the recent situational Eight DIAMONDS taxonomy includes eight situational characteristics (Duty, Intellect, Adversity, Mating, pOsitivity, Negativity, Deception, and Sociality, Rauthmann et al., 2014), would also produce overlaps, because, for instance, the positive and negative dimensions (e.g., the situation is potentially enjoyable; the situation entails frustration) modulate how other dimensions are evaluated (e.g., sociality: members of the opposite sex are present).

In the present work, we used three categories (including four characteristics) as independent categories and did not examine possible interactive effects. It would be a promising approach for future research to examine interactions between the different situational characteristics. It seems reasonable to assume that hostile sexism (but not benevolent sexism) might be most likely when certain situational characteristics occur in combination; for instance, in leisure spaces (locations), when only men are present (gender composition), talking about gender role-inconsistent women (targets), and while drinking beer (passively experienced processes). In contrast, hostile sexism might be unlikely (but benevolent sexism more likely) to occur in a male-female dyad (gender composition), when a man talks to his wife, mother or daughter (target) in private (locations) without experiencing passive processes. It would be interesting to examine these combined situations in future work to investigate whether there are additive or even interaction effects when different characteristics are combined.

A further limitation refers to the hypothetical scenarios. Female and male participants were asked to think about benevolent and hostile sexist behaviors and to evaluate how likely they occur depending on certain situational characteristics. Thus, rather

than measuring the likelihood that these behaviors occur, the present research may have measured perceived behavioral social norms. Yet, even as behavioral norms, reported likelihood of behaviors may be tied to actual frequencies of behaviors. This could be verified by future research examining real behavior. For instance, a longitudinal study in which men's expression of sexist behaviors are recorded during a whole day (e.g., at different locations, with different associates, experiencing different passive processes) could be coded for types of comments made. Or if the recordings modified behaviors, women's observations of behaviors as they enter different situations could be recorded in daily diaries.

Although we have measured a mediator in Study 1, we did not include mediators in Study 2. Future research could examine whether the effects found in Study 2 occur because of different social norms. Moreover, alternative explanations are possible in terms of passively experienced processes. Hostile sexism might be elicited when men experience passive processes, because their masculinity is threatened or because they have an excuse for their behavior. Similarly, it would be helpful to test whether our explanation for the different effects of situations can explain the impact of other situations.

Conclusion

The present work presents a novel contribution to the sexism literature by examining the role of different types of situational cues in the occurrence of different types of sexist behaviors. We demonstrated that certain situational characteristics (locations, interpersonal associates, passively-experienced processes) not only guide behavior in general, but also systematically influence the occurrence of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior. Thus, the present research provides a starting point for a theoretical understanding of situational predictors of sexist behaviors and, by incorporating contextual predictors of sexist behaviors, provides insights into the social meaning of hostile and benevolent sexism.

References

- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 633-642. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.270
- Becker, J. C. (2010). Why do women endorse hostile and benevolent sexism? The role of salient female subtypes and personalization of sexist contents. *Sex Roles, 62*, 453-467. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9707-4
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as a way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*, 227-242. doi: 10.1177/0361684310397509
- Becker, J.C. & Wright, S.C. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 62-77
- Benokraitis, N. V., & Feagin, J. R. (1995). *Modern sexism: Blatant, subtle, and covert discrimination* (2nd ed.). Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 425-437. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.425
- Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 993-997. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993
- Block, J., & Block, J. (1981). Studying situational dimensions: A grand perspective and some limited empiricism. In D. Magnusson (Ed.), *Toward a psychology of situations: An interactional perspective* (pp. 85-106). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Bohner, G., Ahlborn, K., & Steiner, R. (2010). How sexy are sexist men? Women's perception of male response profiles in the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. *Sex Roles, 62*, 568-582. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9665-x
- Cantor, N., Mischel, W., & Schwartz, J. (1982). A prototype analysis of psychological situations. *Cognitive Psychology, 14*, 45-77. doi: 10.1016/0010-0285(82)90004-4
- Chisango, T., Mayekiso, T., & Thomaes, M. (2015). The social nature of benevolent sexism and the antisocial nature of hostile sexism: Is benevolent sexism more likely to manifest in public contexts and hostile sexism in private contexts? *International Journal of Psychology, 50*, 363-371. doi: 10.1002/ijop.12106
- Cikara, M., Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2009). Ambivalent sexism at home and at work: How attitudes toward women in relationships foster exclusion in the public sphere. In J. T. Jost, A. C. Kay, & H. Thorisdottir (Eds.), *Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification* (pp. 444-462). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Crocket, E. (2016, November 15). Why misogyny won. Retrieved from <http://www.vox.com/identities/2016/11/15/13571478/trump-president-sexual-assault-sexism-misogyny-won>.
- Cross, E. J., Overall, N. C., & Hammond, M. D. (2016). Perceiving partners to endorse benevolent sexism attenuates highly anxious women's negative reactions to conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*, 923-940. doi: 10.1177/0146167216647933
- De Oliveira Laux, S. H., Ksenofontov, I., & Becker, J. C. (2015). Explicit but not implicit sexist beliefs predict benevolent and hostile sexist behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 702-715. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2128

- Endsley, M. R. (1995). Toward a theory of situation awareness. *Human Factors*, 37, 32–64.
doi: 10.1518/001872095779049543
- Eyssel, F., & Bohner, G. (2007). The rating of sexist humor under time pressure as an indicator of spontaneous sexist attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 57, 651-660. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9302-5
- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., White, & White, K. B. (2004). First- and Second-Generation Measures of Sexism, Rape Myths and Related Beliefs, and Hostility Toward Women: Their Interrelationships and Association with College Students' Experiences with Dating Aggression and Sexual Coercion. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 236-261. doi: 10.1177/1077801203256002
- Ford, T. E., Wentzel, E. R., & Lorion, J. (2001). Effects of exposure to sexist humor on perceptions of normative tolerance of sexism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 677-691. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.56
- Foster, P.J., & Fullagar, C.J. (2018) Why Don't We Report Sexual Harassment? An Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 40, 148-160, doi: 10.1080/01973533.2018.1449747
- Funder, D. C. (2009). Persons, behaviors and situations: An agenda for personality psychology in the postwar era. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 120-126. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.041
- Glick, P., & Fiske S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent Sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 1323-1334. doi: 10.1177/01461672972312009
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B. et al. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and Benevolent Sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 763-775. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763
- Govorun, O., & Payne, B. K. (2006). Ego-Depletion and Prejudice: Separating Automatic and Controlled Components. *Social Cognition, 24*, 111-136. doi: 10.1521/soco.2006.24.2.111
- Hammond, M. D., Overall, N. C., & Cross, E. J. (2016). Internalizing sexism within close relationships: Perceptions of romantic partners' benevolent sexism promote women's endorsement of benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*, 214-238.
- Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2017). Dynamics Within Intimate Relationships and the Causes, Consequences, and Functions of Sexist Attitudes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 2*, 120-125. doi: 10.1177/0963721416686213
- Hebl, M. R., King, E. B., Glick, P., Singletary, S. L., & Kazama, S. (2007). Hostile and benevolent reactions toward pregnant women: complementary interpersonal punishments and rewards that maintain traditional roles. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1499. doi: <http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/apl/92/6/1499/>
- Jost, J.T., & Kay, A.C. (2005). Exposure to Benevolent Sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 498-509. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498

- King, E. B., Botsford, W., Hebl, M. R., Kazama, S., Dawson, J. F., Perkins, A. (2012). Benevolent Sexism at Work: Gender Differences in the Distribution of Challenging Developmental Experiences. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1835-1866. doi: 10.1177/0149206310365902
- Magnusson, D. (1971). An analysis of situational dimensions. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 32, 851-867. doi: 10.2466/pms.1971.32.3.851
- Martinez-Pecino, R., & Durán, M. (2016). I Love You but I Cyberbully You: The Role of Hostile Sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-14. doi: 10.1177/0886260516645817
- Masser, B. M., & Abrams, D. (2004). Reinforcing the glass ceiling: The consequences of hostile sexism for female managerial candidates. *Sex Roles*, 51, 609-615. doi: 10.1007/s11199-004-5470-8
- McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review*, 77, 625-647. doi: 10.1177/0003122412451728
- Meyer, R. (2015-11-12). Taxonomy of Situations and Their Measurement. *Oxford Handbooks Online*. Retrieved 1 Mar. 2017, from <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935291.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935291-e-22>.
- Pervin, L. A. (1978). Definitions, measurements, and classifications of stimuli, situations, and environments. *Human Ecology*, 6, 71-105.
- Pryor, J. B., LaVite, C. M., & Stoller, L. M. (1993). A social psychological analysis of sexual harassment: The person/situation interaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 68-83. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1993.1005

- Rauthmann, J. F., Gallardo-Pujol, D., Guillaume, E. M., Todd, E., Nave, C. S., Sherman, R. A., ... & Funder, D. C. (2014). The Situational Eight DIAMONDS: A taxonomy of major dimensions of situation characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*, 677. doi: 10.1037/a0037250
- Sarlet, M., Dumont, M., Delacollette, N., & Dardenne, B. (2012). Prescription of protective paternalism for men in romantic and work contexts. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *36*, 444-457. doi: 10.1177/0361684312454842
- Saucier, G., Bel-Bahar, T., & Fernandez, C. (2007). What modifies the expression of personality tendencies? Defining basic domains of situation variables. *Journal of Personality*, *75*, 479-504. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00446.x
- Schnall, M. (2016, October 4). Activist men react to “locker room talk”. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/marianne-schnall/activist-men-react-to-locker-room-talk_b_12490254.html
- Sechrist, G. B., & Stangor, C. 1996. Prejudice as norms. In C. S. Cranall, M. Schaller (Eds.) *Social psychology of prejudice: Historical and contemporary* (pp. 167-186). Lewinian Press.
- Sherman, R. A., Rauthmann, J. F., Brown, N. A., Serfass, D. G., & Jones, A. B. (2015). The independent effects of personality and situations on real-time expressions of behavior and emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*, 872-888. doi: 10.1037/pspp0000036
- Sibley, C. G., & Wilson, M. S. (2004). Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes toward positive and negative sexual female subtypes. *Sex Roles*, *51*, 687-696. doi: 10.1007/s11199-004-0718-x

- Sutton, R. M., Douglas, K. M., & McClellan, L. M. (2011). Benevolent sexism, perceived health risks, and the inclination to restrict pregnant women's freedoms. *Sex Roles, 65*, 596-605. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9869-0
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 199-214. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 31-53. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00200
- Swim, J. K., Mallett, R., Russo-Devosa, Y., & Stangor, C. (2005). Judgments of sexism. A comparison of the subtlety of sexism measures and sources of variability in judgments of sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 406-411. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00240.x
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A.M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ca change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 842-849. doi: 10.1177/0146167295218007
- Trafimow, D. (2015) Introduction to the Special Issue on Mediation Analyses: What If Planetary Scientists Used Mediation Analysis to Infer Causation?, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 37*, 197-201, DOI: 10.1080/01973533.2015.1064290
- Wigboldus, D. H., Sherman, J. W., Franzese, H. L., & Knippenberg, A. V. (2004). Capacity and comprehension: Spontaneous stereotyping under cognitive load. *Social Cognition, 22*, 292-309. doi: 10.1521/soco.22.3.292.35967
- Yang, Y., Read, S. J., & Miller, L. C. (2009). The concept of situations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3*, 1018-1037. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00236.x

Table 1:

Summary of hypotheses

Situation	Predictions for Hostile Sexism	Predictions for Benevolent Sexism
Location	Leisure > workplace, private	Leisure, private > workplace
Associates:	Gender-role inconsistent women	Romantic partner > mother, daughter
Targets	(feminists, female colleague) > romantic partner, mother, daughter	> gender-role inconsistent women (feminists, female colleague)
Associates:	Only men > more men than women > equal distribution of women and men > more women than men = one woman and one man	One woman and one man > all other gender compositions
Gender Composition		
Passively experienced processes	Presence of passive processes (e.g., drunk, stressed, threats from women) > being relaxed	Being relaxed > presence of passive processes (e.g., drunk, stressed, threats from women)

Table 2: Mean differences in the estimated likelihood of hostile and benevolent sexism depending on locations, Study 2

		Hostile Sexism			Benevolent Sexism		
	Comparison	Mean			Mean		
	group	Difference	SE	<i>p</i> -level	Difference	SE	<i>p</i> -level
Party (1)	2	.46*	.10	<.001	.26	.12	.22
	3	.90*	.16	<.001	.33	.18	.46
	4	1.22*	.22	<.001	.71*	.13	<.001
Leisure setting (2)	1	-.46*	.10	<.001	-.26	.12	.22
	3	.44	.16	.06	.07	.18	1.00
	4	.76*	.18	.001	.44*	.13	.01
Private setting (3)	1	-.90*	.16	<.001	-.33	.18	.46
	2	-.44	.16	.06	-.07	.18	1.00
	4	.32	.23	1.00	.38	.15	.09
Workplace (4)	1	-1.22*	.22	<.001	-.71*	.13	<.001
	2	-.76*	.18	.001	-.44*	.13	.01
	3	-.32	.23	1.00	-.38	.15	.09

Note: Analyses based on estimated marginal means, Bonferroni adjustments for multiple comparisons

Table 3: Mean differences in the estimated likelihood of hostile and benevolent sexism depending on targets, Study 2

		Hostile Sexism			Benevolent Sexism		
	Comparison	Mean			Mean		
	group	Difference	SE	<i>p</i> -level	Difference	SE	<i>p</i> -level
Feminist (1)	2	.53	.24	.298	-1.65*	.20	<.001
	3	2.04*	.30	<.001	-2.67*	.23	<.001
	4	2.16*	.30	<.001	-2.55*	.24	<.001
	5	1.03*	.29	.009	-3.11*	.22	<.001
Colleague (2)	1	-.53	.24	.298	1.65*	.20	<.001
	3	1.51*	.20	<.001	-1.03*	.10	<.001
	4	1.63*	.19	<.001	-.90*	.11	<.001
	5	.50	.18	.079	-1.46*	.12	<.001
Mother (3)	1	-2.04*	.30	<.001	2.67*	.23	<.001
	2	-1.51*	.20	<.001	1.03*	.10	<.001
	4	.12	.09	1	.13	.09	1
	5	-1.01*	.13	<.001	-.43*	.09	<.001
Daughter (4)	1	-2.16*	.30	<.001	2.55*	.24	<.001
	2	-1.63*	.19	<.001	.90*	.11	<.001
	3	-.12	.09	1	-.13	.09	1
	5	-1.13*	.17	<.001	-.56*	.11	<.001
Partner (5)	1	-1.03*	.29	.009	3.11*	.22	<.001
	2	-.50	.18	.079	1.46*	.12	<.001

	3	1.01*	.13	<.001	.43*	.09	<.001
	4	1.13*	.17	<.001	.56*	.11	<.001

Note: Analyses based on estimated marginal means, Bonferroni adjustments for multiple comparisons

Table 4: Mean differences in the estimated likelihood of hostile and benevolent sexism depending on gender composition, Study 2

		Hostile Sexism			Benevolent Sexism		
Comparison		Mean			Mean		
group		Difference	SE	<i>p</i> -level	Difference	SE	<i>p</i> -level
Men only (1)	2	.47*	.10	<.001	-.24	.12	.554
	3	1.24*	.16	<.001	-.26	.14	.614
	4	1.84*	.22	<.001	-.39	.20	.654
	5	2.10*	.23	<.001	-.99*	.26	.006
More men than women (2)	1	-.47*	.10	<.001	.24	.12	.554
	3	.77*	.13	<.001	-.02	.10	1.000
	4	1.37*	.20	<.001	-.15	.18	1.000
	5	1.64*	.23	<.001	-.75*	.20	.005
Equal distribution of women and men (3)	1	-1.24*	.16	<.001	.26	.14	.614
	2	-.77*	.13	<.001	.02	.10	1.000
	4	.60*	.11	<.001	-.12	.10	1.000
	5	.87*	.17	<.001	-.73*	.17	.001
More women than men (4)	1	-1.84*	.22	<.001	.39	.20	.654
	2	-1.37*	.20	<.001	.15	.18	1.000

	4	.49 [*]	.11	<.001	.07	.08	1
	5	.63 [*]	.21	.042	-2.19 [*]	.20	<.001
Stressful situation (4)	1	-1.03 [*]	.17	<.001	.64 [*]	.12	<.001
	2	-.84 [*]	.18	<.001	-.32	.20	1
	3	-.49 [*]	.11	<.001	-.07	.08	1
	5	.14	.19	1	-2.26 [*]	.18	<.001
Relaxed on 1 holidays (5)	1	-1.17 [*]	.20	<.001	2.90	.20	<.001
	2	-.98 [*]	.21	.001	1.94 [*]	.20	<.001
	3	-.63 [*]	.21	.042	2.19 [*]	.20	<.001
	4	-.14	.19	1	2.26 [*]	.18	<.001

Note: Analyses based on estimated marginal means, Bonferroni adjustments for multiple comparisons.

5. Can Inconsistencies in Stereotype Priming Effects Be Explained with Participants' Self-Concept Content?

Sexism can be prevalent in many areas, one of them language. Sexism is associated with the use of the generic masculine compared to attitudes towards the use of gender-fair language: The higher people's hostile sexism, the less likely they are to support gender-fair language and to recognize sexist language (Sarrasin, Gabriel, & Gygax, 2012). The more modern sexist people are, the less likely they are to detect sexist language use, the more likely they are to use sexist language, and the less likely they are to use nonsexist language (Swim, Mallett, & Stangor, 2004). Language, to some extent, thus reflects sexist attitudes.

Language is also used for priming procedures. Priming is a technique where stimuli such as words and pictures influence subsequent perception and/or behavior. The perception of the stimulus can be conscious or unconscious (Fiske & Taylor, 2013). For example, Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998) asked their participants "to imagine a typical professor (or secretary) for 5 min and to list the behaviors, lifestyle, and appearance attributes of this typical professor (or secretary)" (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998, p. 868). The professor description task supposedly activates the concept of "intelligence" in participants, which then supposedly influences their behavior. The behavior in this case is the test score on Trivial Pursuit® questions. Participants primed with professor answered correctly more often compared to the participants primed with secretary (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998). This is supposedly due to the fact that the professor prime increases the availability of the concept of "intelligence", and participants assimilate their behavior to this concept, that is, they give more correct answers. The process through which this behavioral assimilation occurs is still unclear: "According to some not yet specified process, the increase in the cognitive

accessibility of the cognitive representations of these concepts will improve their performance on a knowledge test” (Stroebe & Strack, 2014, p. 64). This “not yet specified process” (Stroebe & Strack, 2014, p. 64) might involve activating specific parts of the self-concept that then lead to behavioral assimilation. Assumptions about this process are put forward in the theory of the active-self account (Wheeler, DeMarree, & Petty, 2007, 2014).

5.1 The active-self account

One attempt to explain priming effects is formulated in the active-self account: Wheeler and colleagues (Wheeler et al., 2007, 2014) suggest that priming changes the active parts of the self-concept. The self-concept is “all of an individual’s knowledge about his or her personal qualities” (Smith & Mackie, 2007). Wheeler and colleagues, in their active-self account theory, postulate that our self is manifold and that priming activates specific parts of our self-concept (comparable with the idea of salient, culture-specific self-concepts, see Oyserman, 2015). According to the active-self account, when a manipulation primes the concept of intelligence, all aspects of our self-concept related to the notion of being intelligent should be activated, too. These notions then activate their behavioral representations (Wheeler et al., 2007), in this case, the retrieval of stored knowledge. Thus, priming improves test performance because participants assimilate their behavior to the stereotype. According to the active-self account, the greater the overlap between the content of the prime (e.g., intelligence) and the corresponding self-concept content (e.g., regarding oneself as being intelligent), the greater the behavioral assimilation effect.

Now consider the findings on gender-fair language and the cognitive availability of men vs. women. What do participants have in mind when they think about a ‘typical professor’? Use of the generic masculine in languages with grammatical gender such as German and Dutch decreases the cognitive representation of women (Stahlberg & Sczesny,

2001). Therefore, thinking about a 'typical professor' probably conjures images of a male, not a female professor. This might be vital for the occurrence of a priming effect because the overlap between a female participant's self-concept and a male professor stereotype might be less compared to the overlap between a female participant's self-concept and a female professor stereotype.

To sum up, we suggest that trying to manipulate a concept using the generic masculine instead of gender-fair language effects the cognitive representation of women and thus influences the effectiveness of stereotype priming. We will detail implications of this assumption below.

5.2 Implications of the active-self account on stereotype priming effects

Consistent with the active-self account, we suggest that we have to consider the overlap between participants' self-concept and the primed stereotype to explain previous inconsistencies in priming research. Therefore, we will investigate whether the sex of the primed stereotype, participants' gender and its cognitive representation, and specific self-concept content regarding similarity to professors influence how strong the priming effect is. A female professor provides greater overlap with women's self-concept than a male professor, at least if gender is momentarily salient in the self-concept. Previous priming experiments used the generic masculine in experimental manipulation in languages with grammatical gender (such as Dutch (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998) and German (Hansen & Wänke, 2009)), and thus diminished the salience of women in that particular role (Stahlberg, Braun, Irmen, & Sczesny, 2011). This could have decreased the overlap between the prime and the self-concept of female participants. We would expect greater priming effects for female participants when they are being primed with a female vs. male professor stereotype.

We might be able to explain why previous replications failed when we take into account that sexist language might influence priming effects: Some researchers have unsuccessfully attempted to replicate Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg's findings in exact replications (Eder, Leipert, Musch, & Klauer, 2012; Roberts et al., 2013; Shanks et al., 2013). This includes an exact multilab replication project (O'Donnell, Nelson, McLatchie, & Lynott, 2017). "Exact replications are replications of an experiment that operationalize both the independent and the dependent variable in exactly the same way as the original study" (Stroebe & Strack, 2014, p. 60). "In contrast, conceptual replications try to operationalize the underlying theoretical variables using different manipulations and/or different measures" (Stroebe & Strack, 2014, p. 60). Conceptual replications of Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg's study were more successful compared to the exact replication attempts: Hansen and Wänke (2009) successfully replicated the findings and identified a mediation process, and other researchers also conceptually replicated the study and identified moderators of the priming effect (Bry, Follenfant, & Meyer, 2008; Galinsky, Wang, & Ku, 2008; Haddock, Macrae, & Fleck, 2002; LeBoeuf & Estes, 2004; Lowery, Eisenberger, Hardin, & Sinclair, 2007; Nussinson, Seibt, Häfner, & Strack, 2010). Two unpublished replications by the original authors found an effect and a moderating influence of gender with men showing the effect and women not showing the effect (O'Donnell et al., 2017).

In sum, some exact replications, including a multilab replication project, were unsuccessful while some conceptual replications were successful. Two unpublished replications indicate a moderating influence of gender (O'Donnell et al., 2017).

The benefits and costs of exact replications and conceptual replications for the advance of science have been discussed extensively in light of the recent replication crisis in (social) psychology (Cesario, 2014; Dijksterhuis, 2014; Dijksterhuis, van Knippenberg, &

Holland, 2014; Pashler & Harris, 2012; Pashler & Wagenmakers, 2012; Schmidt, 2009; Simons, 2014). The value of exact replications lies in identifying false-positive findings, fraud, questionable research practices (Simmons, Nelson, & Simonsohn, 2011) and previously disregarded moderators and mediators. We will attempt an exact replication and additionally investigate theoretically deduced hypotheses to explain previous inconsistent findings. We used the theory of the active-self account (Wheeler et al., 2007, 2014) to derive hypotheses about moderators and mediators of the professor stereotype prime-to-behavior process: The sex of a role model is especially important for women (Lockwood, 2006), and women relate better to a female than a male scientist (Pietri, Johnson, Ozgumus, & Young, 2018). Consequently, women might also be more susceptible to the sex of stereotype primes. Unfortunately, the percentage of females among participants in previous replications and studies that used the (male) professor prime varied from 47% to 70% and is unknown for the original experiments. The fact that the percentage of female participants was not controlled and the fact that it is not yet clear why priming effects appear only inconsistently leads us to suspect that gendered self-concepts and the sex of the primed stereotype might be moderating variables. We suggest that this explains the moderating effect of gender reported in unpublished studies (O'Donnell et al., 2017). We will therefore vary the sex of the stereotype using a male and female professor stereotype prime but with female participants. We are the first to hold this participant characteristic constant.

However, being a woman does not define one's self-concept (e.g., Becker & Wagner, 2009) and gender is not always a salient aspect. Therefore, in Experiment 1, we will test for the influence of gender salience on priming effects.

In Experiments 1b and 2, we suggest moderators that should influence the amount of overlap between the male vs. female professor stereotype prime and the self-concept (such

as the perception of oneself as being intelligent or identifying with intelligent women). In Experiment 2 we replicate a mediation study (Hansen & Wänke, 2009) and suggest additional mediators that may help to indicate why the effects occur. Additionally, we find the use of Trivial Pursuit® questions, albeit pre-tested, a questionable practice for showing an effect on intelligence. Psychometrically valid, standardized intelligence tests are readily available and we improve the measurement of the dependent variable by using them.

Also, previous studies have been inconsistently used or omitted a neutral control group. Sometimes, professor priming effects were compared to a secretary (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998), sometimes to a cleaning lady stereotype (Hansen & Wänke, 2009). We consistently include a no-priming control group and include the cleaning lady stereotype in two out of three experiments to identify whether effects were due to an increase in the professor priming and a decrease in the cleaning lady group or a combination of both.

To summarize, we will compare priming effects of male vs. female professor stereotypes with a control group, taking gender salience into account (Experiment 1). We will then compare male vs. female professor stereotypes to a no priming control group and a cleaning lady priming group (Experiments 1b and 2). We suggest moderators for the priming effect in Experiment 1b, and examine more moderators in Experiment 2, and additionally investigate a mediation model.

5.3 Manuscript #3

Are women getting smarter when primed with a female professor (compared to male professor)? Replication and extension of the professor stereotype priming effect on general knowledge

Fischer, F. B. ¹, & Becker, J. C. ¹, (*Under Review*). Are women getting smarter when primed with a female professor (compared to male professor)? Replication and extension of the professor stereotype priming effect on general knowledge

¹ Institute of Psychology, University of Osnabrueck, Seminarstrasse 20, 49074 Osnabrueck, Germany

Key Words: priming, stereotype priming, generic masculine, self-concept, active-self account

Abstract: 120 words, Main text: 2.484 words, References: 299 words, Tables: 460 words, 3 tables

Author note: We would like to thank Erika Ermisch, Laura Gravemeier, Lisa Michel and Laura Mommertz for their help in data collection and Sabine Sczesny for kindly providing her scale of attitudes towards gender-fair language.

Abstract

A recent meta-analysis could not replicate the professor stereotype priming effect on knowledge. However, in unpublished studies, researchers found an effect for men but not for women. We build on these contradictory findings and test whether priming increases women's performance when they are primed with a female (instead of male) professor, because a female professor overlaps more with female students' self-concept than a male professor. We included moderators to extend prior work. Across three experiments ($N = 86$, $N = 194$, $N = 187$), we did not find priming main effects. However, in Experiment 2, female students primed with the female professor and identifying with their university performed better compared to the control group on a subscale of the knowledge test.

Prior work illustrated that participants primed with a stereotype implying intelligence (“professor”) performed better on Trivial Pursuit questions than participants in a control condition (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998). This effect was recently critically discussed (see Table 1). In a meta-analysis of multi-lab replications of this effect, O’Donell and colleagues (2017) found no evidence for this priming effect. In their meta-analysis, they refer to two unpublished studies from Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg illustrating a priming effect for men, but not for women. Based on this, we test the idea that a priming effect might occur more likely for women when they are primed with a female, instead of male professor stereotype.

The Priming Mechanism

Why should a professor prime increase participants’ cognitive performance? The original findings of Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (1998) can be explained with active-self account theory (Wheeler et al., 2007, 2014). Priming causes an assimilation effect: our self-concept and behavior become more similar to that of the prime. Thinking about the characteristics of a stereotypical professor triggers beliefs about being clever, knowledgeable, and intelligent. These traits, in turn, are associated with and can activate their behavioral representations (Wheeler et al., 2007). In this case, they help retrieve stored knowledge. According to the active-self account, the greater the overlap between the content of the prime (e.g., intelligence) and our self-concept (i.e., the more we perceive ourselves to be intelligent), the greater the behavioral assimilation effect. Building on this assumption, we aim at varying the degree of overlap between the prime and participants’ self-concept. The sex of the stereotype prime and participants’ gender might influence the overlap between self-concept and prime.

Why Should Priming Effects Depend On The Sex Of The Prime?

Women might profit more from a female prime that is related to intelligence because it provides more content that overlaps with their self-concept, just as they profit more from female than male role models (Lockwood, 2006). The stereotypes that have been used in priming so far, professors, soccer hooligans, secretaries, and cleaning ladies (see Table 1), are gendered. A male professor stereotype might not provide enough overlap with female participants' self-concept to induce an assimilation effect. Additionally, in languages with grammatical gender such as Dutch (Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg, 1998) and German (Hansen & Wänke, 2009), the default setting for people is male. That is, when imagining a "typical professor", as participants are instructed to do in the experiment, participants probably imagine a male professor (Stahlberg, Braun, Irmen, & Sczesny, 2011). This might lead to less overlap between the prime and the self-concept of female participants because female participants, who made up the majority of participants in almost all experiments (see Table 1), might not perceive many similarities with a male professor.

We will also investigate moderators that should influence the amount of overlap between the male and female professor stereotype prime and the self-concept (such as the perception of oneself as being intelligent or identifying with intelligent women) and mediators that may help to indicate why the effects occur.

The Present Study

In three experiments, we manipulate perceived overlap between prime and participants' self-concept. For this purpose, we examined the influence of male versus female professor primes on women. We expect performance increases for the female professor group because women should perceive more similarity with a female professor compared to a male professor.

The original studies and replication attempts have not (Hansen & Wänke, 2009) or only inconsistently (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998; Shanks et al., 2013) used a no priming control group (see Table 1). Therefore, we do not know whether a) the professor stereotype increases performance, or b) other stereotypes used (soccer hooligan, secretary, cleaning lady) decrease performance, or c) both. We included a no priming control group in all experiments. We test the moderators intelligence, ambitiousness, identification with intelligent and ambitious women, inclusions of others in the self, identification with the university, identification with female graduates, and gender-fair language and the mediators self-efficacy, test ambition, effort, and perceived intelligence. Thus, we extend prior work and contribute to theory building. Finally, we improved the dependent measure by using a psychometrically validated general knowledge test instead of Trivial Pursuit® questions (for a justification see SOM).

Experiment 1

A pilot study confirmed the underlying assumptions that female and male professors are associated with intelligence, whereas cleaning *ladies* are not (see SOM). A conceptual replication of Experiment 1 (Study 1b) is reported in the SOM.

Method

Participants. Required sample size for detecting a main effect of priming with $\eta^2 = .125$ (Hansen & Wänke, 2009), α error probability of 5% , 85% power, and three groups, is $N = 81$ (G*Power, Erdfelder, Faul, & Buchner, 1996).The final sample consists of 86 female students aged 18 – 57 ($M = 23.50$, $SD = 6.83$) the majority of whom were first-year undergraduates. For recruitment see SOM.

Procedure. In this online experiment, participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions [priming: male professor, female professor, no priming]. Additionally, we

tested for potential effects of gender role salience by asking half of the participants for the identification with women. We did not find any effects and therefore do not discuss gender salience here. Instructions were identical to those of Dijksterhuis and Van Knippenberg (1998): participants were asked to imagine a typical male professor or a typical female professor and to describe his [her] behaviors, traits, looks, and lifestyle. Participants were asked to take their time with this task and the continue-button was only displayed after 5 minutes. The control group received no manipulation. All participants completed the general knowledge test, were thanked and debriefed.

Measures

General knowledge test. We used the knowledge test module from an intelligence test, the Intelligenz-Struktur-Test 2000R (Liepmann, Beauducel, Brocke, & Amthauer, 2007). The test consists of 84 items with five multiple-choice answer options. Three subscales are combined into an overall score; verbal (e.g., identify a non-mammal from a list of animals), numeric (e.g., solve calculations, how many bits are in a byte), and figural (identify a space shuttle from a selection of five aircrafts). Reliability estimates for large samples are between .82 and .93, in our sample $\alpha = .88$ for all items, $\alpha = .73$ for the verbal subscale, $\alpha = .72$ for the numeric subscale, and $\alpha = .68$ for the figural subscale. The general knowledge test has excellent psychometric properties (see test manual for more details). Average item difficulty for all items was 60.95 (meaning that on average 61% of participants in the control group answered the items correctly). Item difficulty ranged from 7 to 100 with many items of a moderate difficulty between 40 and 60.

Results and Discussion

Main analyses. Table 2 shows means and standard deviations of the overall test score. We examined the overall general knowledge test score as well as each of the

subscales with an ANOVA with the between-subjects factor priming [male, female, control group]. No significant main effects occurred, $F_s < 0.981$, $p_s > .379$, $\eta^2 < .023$.

Item difficulty. Analyses for different levels of item difficulty for this and all subsequent experiments are displayed in the Supplementary Online Material.

We did not find a main effect of stereotype priming on general knowledge test performance in this experiment nor in its conceptual replication, Experiment 1b (see SOM). In Experiment 2, we assessed more closely whether priming effects occur when female participants' self-concept overlaps with the female professor stereotype.

Experiment 2

We conducted Experiment 2 in the laboratory under more controlled conditions and included new potential moderators: intelligence, ambition, identification with intelligent women, identification with ambitious women, identification with female graduates, inclusion of professors in the self, and gender-fair language. Given that we found effects only for university identification, we focus on university identification in the paper and present the results of the other tested moderators and mediators in the SOM. We reasoned that self-concept content of female students that overlaps with the content of professor stereotypes might be the association with a university. If highly identified students think about professors, their self-concept content regarding identification with the university (e.g., their own continued education, development of their intelligence) should be activated.

Method

Participants. Two female and one male student recruited participants on campus. Incentives were course credit, the possibility to win vouchers, a monetary reward, and the possibility to compare own test scores with average scores. We sampled 221 female students (see Endnote 6 for power analysis). We excluded those who guessed the hypothesis

correctly (14) and those who described a female professor when asked to describe a male professor and who refused to negatively stereotype the cleaning lady (20). There were no more than 5% missing values per participant and no multiple outliers. The final sample consisted of 187 women aged 18 – 33 years ($M = 22.26$, $SD = 2.96$). Regarding their occupation, almost all were students.

Procedure. Participants were welcomed in the lab by a female experimenter and placed at computers in individual cubicles. All instructions for the experiment were displayed on the computer screen. Participants started with the moderators, were then randomly assigned to one of four conditions (male professor, female professor, cleaning lady, control group), took the general knowledge test, answered questions about their attitude towards gender-fair language, answered demographic questions and were debriefed. They had the opportunity to compare their results on the general knowledge test with average scores.

Measures. The general knowledge test items were identical to Experiment 1 (for the overall test score: $\alpha = .77$, numeric: $\alpha = .54$, verbal: $\alpha = .58$; figural: $\alpha = .54$). Average item difficulty was 56.28. All participants answered the following moderators: IOS scale, ambition ($\alpha = .75$), identification with ambitious women ($\alpha = .89$), identification with intelligent women ($\alpha = .85$), identification with the university, identification with female graduates, and attitudes towards gender-fair language. The first four moderators are described in Experiment 2.

Identification with the university. We measured participants' identification with their university using three items: "I identify with my university", "Being a student of my university reflects an important aspect of my personality", "I feel that I am strongly connected with other students of my university", $\alpha = .64$.

Results and Discussion

Means, standard deviations, and correlations of moderators are displayed in Table 3.

Main analyses. We examined the overall general knowledge test score as well as each of the subscales with a one-way ANOVA. There were no significant main effects, $F_s < 0.25$, $p_s > .861$, $\eta^2 < .004$.

Moderators. To assess whether priming effects depended on our moderators, we subjected the dependent measures (overall test score, numeric, verbal, and figural test score) to moderation analyses using the SPSS macro PROCESS 2.16 (Hayes, 2013; model 1). Including identification with the university and the respective interactions in the regression model led to a significant increase in explained variance on the *figural subscale*; $\Delta R^2 = .05$, $F(3, 179) = 3.23$, $p = .024$. Those low on identification with the university (mean $- 1$ SD) performed worse on the figural subscale after the female professor prime ($M = 15.48$) compared to the control group ($M = 17.27$), $b = -1.79$, $SE = 0.85$, $t(179) = -2.10$, $p = .037$. At this level of the moderator, there were no differences between the control group and the male professor or cleaning lady group, $p_s \geq .640$. Those high on identification with the university (mean $+ 1$ SD) performed better when primed with the female professor stereotype ($M = 16.57$) compared to the control group ($M = 14.74$). The male professor and cleaning lady group did not differ from the control group, $p_s \geq .310$.

Additionally, including identification with the university and the respective interactions in the regression model led to a marginally significant increase in explained variance on the *overall* test score, $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $F = 2.60$, $p = .054$. However, the priming groups did not differ significantly at different levels of the moderator, $p_s \geq .136$. Other than that, there was no evidence for a moderation, $\Delta R^2_s \leq .03$, $F_s \leq 2.06$, $p_s \geq .107$, see the SOM for details on these and additional analyses

General Discussion

We aimed at testing whether priming effects depend on the overlap between self-concept and stereotype content. We reasoned that previous inconsistencies in replications might have been due to a reduced overlap between female participants' self-concept and the male professor stereotype. Therefore, we systematically added a "female professor" priming condition. First and foremost, across three experiments we did not find any priming main effects, which is in line with previous failed replication attempts (Eder et al., 2012; O'Donnell et al., 2017; Shanks et al., 2013). Other variables deduced from the active-self account (Wheeler et al., 2007, 2014) did not moderate the effect, with one exception: we found that female participants primed with the female professor stereotype and identifying with their university performed better than the control group on the figural subscale, whereas participants primed with the female professor stereotype and not identifying with their university performed worse than the control group. Identification with the university thus influences the effectiveness of the female professor prime. When participants identify with their university, an assimilation effect to the female professor stereotype occurs and the prime is effective. In contrast, when participants do not identify with their university, a contrast effect occurs. That is, participants perceive themselves to be different from a female professor and consequently their performance suffers. This finding indicates that the overlap in self-concept content, or perceived similarity to the prime indeed influences the effectiveness of the priming procedure, as the same effect did not occur for the male professor stereotype.

Thus, our research is not only a replication but goes beyond prior work. We added a female professor stereotype priming group, derived moderators (intelligence, ambitiousness, identification with intelligent and ambitious women, inclusions of others in

the self, identification with the university, identification with female graduates, and gender-fair language) and mediators (self-efficacy, test ambition, effort, and perceived intelligence, see SOM) from active-self account theory, improved the original measure (Trivial Pursuit) with a psychometrically sound measure (general knowledge test), consistently used a control group and implemented the intervention as described in Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (1998), conducted extensive analyses on different levels of item difficulty, and had high test power.

We focused on female participants because they constitute the majority of participants of previous (successful and failed) priming studies (see Table 1). Our findings regarding the importance of overlap between the self-concept and the prime should generalize to male participants and could be tested by future work.

To summarize, we tested hypotheses derived from the active-self account and found that female students who identify strongly with their university perform better after a female professor stereotype prime than female students who identify weakly with their university. The overlap between participants' self-concept and the stereotype prime moderates priming effectiveness. This could help explain previous inconsistencies and further our understanding of the priming process.

Tables

Table 1.

Overview of characteristics of the original study and subsequent replication attempts.

Article	Exp. No.	Percentage of female participants	Stereotype	Control Group	Dependent Variable	Item Difficulty (measured in control group)	Country	Successful?
Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (1998)	1	unknown	professors, secretaries	yes (no priming)	42 Trivial Pursuit questions	50	Netherlands?*	yes
	2	unknown	professors	yes (no priming)	60 Trivial Pursuit questions	45	Netherlands?*	yes
	3	unknown	soccer hooligan	yes (no priming)	60 Trivial Pursuit questions	51	Netherlands?*	yes
	4	unknown	professors, soccer	no	20 Trivial Pursuit	n/a	Netherlands?*	yes

			hooligan, intelligence, stupidity		questions			
Hansen and Wänke (2009)	2	60	professor, cleaning ladies	no (cleaning lady intended as control group)	42 trivia questions	30-60 (in pretest)	Switzerland?*	yes
Shanks et al. (2013)	1	70	professor, soccer hooligan	no	Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices	n/a	Sweden?*	no
	2	62.5		no	Raven's Advanced Progressive	n/a	Sweden?*	no

Matrices

3	77.3		no	42 Trivial Pursuit questions	50	United Kingdom	no
4	66		no	40 general knowledge questions (various sources)	n/a	Australia	no
5	57.1	professor	no	20 questions (adapted from Trivial Pursuit)	51	United Kingdom	no
6	47	professor	no	20 questions (adapted from Trivial Pursuit)	51	United Kingdom	no
7	52.1	professor, soccer	no	15 Trivial Pursuit	n/a	United Kingdom	no

		hooligan		questions			
8	58.8	professor, soccer	yes (no	40 general	not reported	United Kingdom	no
		hooligan	priming)	knowledge			
				questions			
				(various sources)			
9	not reported	professor	yes (no	20 questions (no	4 levels:	United Kindom,	no
			priming)	source given)	47	Greece	
					61		
					79		
					92		

*Note. Countries not identified in the methods section, thus derived from the university of authors.

Table 2.

Means and standard deviations of overall (Experiments 1, 1b, and 2) and figural (Experiment 2) test score in all experiments.

	Male Professor	Female Professor	Cleaning Lady	Control Group
Experiment 1				
<i>N</i>	28	26	-	32
<i>M (SD)</i>	49.43 (10.32)	50.85 (11.25)	-	48.91 (11.08)
Experiment 1b				
<i>N</i>	40	50	43	61
<i>M (SD)</i>	17.33 (4.46)	17.94 (3.87)	16.95 (4.54)	16.87 (3.90)
Experiment 2				
<i>N</i>	36	51	45	55
<i>M (SD)</i>	50.22 (7.75)	49.14 (6.48)	50.13 (9.59)	49.51 (8.48)

Note. Maximum possible test score: 84 (Experiment 1), 35 (Experiment 1b), 84 (Experiment 2).

Table 3.

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations of moderators in Experiment 2.

Moderator	2	3	4	5	6	7	<i>M (SD)</i>
1. IOS-Scale	.23**	.21**	.14†	.15*	.19**	.05	2.34 (1.02)
2. Ambition		.35***	.21**	.17*	.28***	-.15*	4.05 (0.88)
3. Identification with ambitious women			.71***	.19**	.48***	.05	3.23 (0.88)
4. Identification with intelligent women				.17*	.46***	.07	3.41 (0.95)
5. Identification with the university					.33***	-.11	3.27 (0.70)
6. Identification with female graduates						.13†	3.12 (0.94)
7. Genderfair language							2.47 (0.80)

† $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

References

- Dijksterhuis, A., & Van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior, or how to win a game of trivial pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(4), 865–877.
- Eder, A., Leipert, C., Musch, J., & Klauer, K.-C. (2012, August 10). Failed replication to prime intelligent behavior. Retrieved May 18, 2017, from <http://www.PsychFileDrawer.org/replication.php?attempt=MT10>
- Erdfelder, E., Faul, F., & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 28*(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03203630>
- Hansen, J., & Wänke, M. (2009). Think of capable others and you can make it! Self-efficacy mediates the effect of stereotype activation on behavior. *Social Cognition, 27*(1), 76–88.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: Methodology in the Social Sciences* (1st ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Liepmann, D., Beauducel, A., Brocke, B., & Amthauer, R. (2007). *Intelligenz-Struktur-Test 2000 R*. Göttingen: Hogrefe. Retrieved from <https://www.testzentrale.de/shop/intelligenz-struktur-test-2000-r.html>
- Lockwood, P. (2006). "SOMEONE LIKE ME CAN BE SUCCESSFUL": DO COLLEGE STUDENTS NEED SAME-GENDER ROLE MODELS? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00260.x>
- O'Donnell, M., Nelson, L., McLatchie, N. M., & Lynott, D. J. (2017). Registered Replication Report: Dijksterhuis & van Knippenberg (1998):Multilab direct replication of: A

variant of study 4 from Dijksterhuis, A., & van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior, or how to win a game of trivial pursuit. *Journal of personality and social psychology. Perspectives on Psychological Science*. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/88629/>

Shanks, D. R., Newell, B. R., Lee, E. H., Balakrishnan, D., Ekelund, L., Cenac, Z., ... Moore, C. (2013). Priming Intelligent Behavior: An Elusive Phenomenon. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(4), e56515. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056515>

Stahlberg, D., Braun, F., Irmen, L., & Sczesny, S. (2011). Representation of the Sexes in Language. In K. Fiedler (Ed.), *Social Communication*. Psychology Press.

Wheeler, S. C., DeMarree, K. G., & Petty, R. E. (2007). Understanding the role of the self in prime-to-behavior effects: The active-self account. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*(3), 234–261.

Wheeler, S. C., DeMarree, K. G., & Petty, R. E. (2014). Understanding prime-to-behavior effects: Insights from the active-self account. *Understanding Priming Effects in Social Psychology*, 114.

Supplementary Online Material

Measuring Intelligence

Stereotype priming causes a behavioral assimilation effect. In the original studies participants became more “intelligent”. Previous studies measured both crystallized and fluid intelligence (see Table 1, main article). Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (1998) describe how priming might influence *fluid* intelligence:

“...the activation of the trait *intelligent* (either by directly priming the trait or by priming a stereotype that contains this trait) may lead to the activation of a set of concrete behavioral representations stored under it (e.g., to concentrate on a problem, to adopt an analytical approach, to think systematically about possible solutions).” (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998, p. 867)

However, in their original study, they use Trivial Pursuit questions to measure intelligence, that is, they measure knowledge or *crystallized* intelligence. Trivial Pursuit® questions have been used in successful and unsuccessful replications (see Table 1, main article). Similarly, measures of fluid intelligence have been used in successful and unsuccessful replications (see Table 1, main article). We decided to measure crystallized intelligence (i.e., general knowledge) in order to be close to the original experiment, but we decided to improve the measurement of the dependent variable by using a validated intelligence test.

Trivial Pursuit® or similar trivia questions pose two serious problems: content and psychometric properties. Regarding content, they test an arbitrary, entertainment-related choice of knowledge rather than general knowledge. Regarding psychometric properties, they are not as carefully selected as the questions of, for example, an intelligence test.

We improve both aspects by using a standardized, psychometrically validated general knowledge test. This approach has numerous advantages. First, questions are carefully chosen to include a wide range of knowledge areas. Second, questions are standardized to match the knowledge of specific groups, such as students. Third, general knowledge is crystalline intelligence and the measurement is the same form of measurement as in the original studies. Fourth, the test is permanently available for other researchers who wish to replicate our findings. Fifth, the test contains items of a wide range of item difficulties. Item difficulty might influence the occurrence of the priming effect: Knowledge has to be present to be primed. Stereotypes (e.g., professor) activate traits related to that stereotype (e.g., knowing much) which in turn leads to the activation of behavioral representations (e.g., remembering facts; Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998). A priming effect is most likely to occur on moderately difficult questions; questions that are too easy do not require the retrieval of knowledge that might be “just out of reach”. For questions that are too difficult the answer might simply be unknown and priming cannot help in their retrieval. Thus, in previous studies, moderately difficult questions were chosen (see Table 1, main article). In contrast, questions in a psychometrically validated test contain a wide range of item difficulties. Using these questions allows us to test for priming effects at different levels of item difficulty.

In sum, we regard a general knowledge test as a better measurement of crystalline intelligence compared to arbitrarily chosen trivia or Trivial Pursuit® questions. An intelligence test contains carefully chosen questions from many knowledge areas, is standardized for students, measures crystalline intelligence, is permanently available, and allows us to test for a priming effect at different levels of item difficulty.

Pilot Study

Similar to previous research (Hansen & Wänke, 2009), we intended to use the stereotype of professors to prime intelligence and the stereotype of cleaning ladies as a priming control group. We conducted a pilot study to ascertain the underlying assumptions that professors are associated with intelligence whereas cleaning *ladies* (note the asymmetrical language use instead of cleaning people in the stereotype) are not.

Method

Participants. We recruited participants in the hallways of a German university or online¹ to take part in a “2 min survey for a doctoral thesis”. As our target population was female students, we recruited 141 female participants aged between 18 and 57 years ($M = 24.73$, $SD = 6.74$). Participants were mainly students ($n = 116$) in undergraduate degrees, psychology being the most prevalent subject ($n = 30$).

Materials and Procedure. Our between-subjects factor was stereotype target [male professor (in German: Professor), female professor (in German: “Professorin”), cleaning lady]. Participants in each condition answered two items: “Please estimate: How [intelligent/stupid] is an average [male professor/female professor/cleaning lady]?” Answer options were provided on a 9-point Likert-scale from 1 to 9 with the end and mid-points of the scale labelled (not a bit, averagely, exceptionally [intelligent/stupid]). Afterwards, participants were thanked and debriefed.

¹ Meta-analyses and studies with large sample sizes showed that paper-and-pencil and online questionnaires are measurement equivalent (Cole et al., 2006; Davidov & Depner, 2011; Gwaltney et al., 2008; Meade et al., 2007).

Results and Discussion

Table 1 displays means and standard deviations for both dependent variables. We conducted two ANOVAs with the between-subject factor stereotype target [male professor, female professor, cleaning lady] and the dependent variables intelligence and stupidity.

Intelligence. Significant differences in the estimated intelligence of the stereotype targets emerged, $F(2, 138) = 71.25, p < .001, \eta^2 = .508$. Post hoc comparisons using Bonferroni's test revealed that the male and female professor were perceived similarly intelligent, $p = 1.000$, but the male and female professor were perceived as more intelligent than the cleaning lady, $ps < .001$.

Stupidity. Significant differences in the estimated stupidity of the stereotype targets emerged, $F(2, 138) = 6.55, p = .002, \eta^2 = .087$. Post hoc comparisons using Bonferroni's test revealed that the male and female professor were perceived similarly low on stupidity, $p = .827$, but the male and female professor were perceived as less stupid than the cleaning lady, $p = .048; p = .002$, respectively.

Stereotypes are still present in the target population. Thus, we used male and female professor stereotypes to prime intelligence.

Experiment 1

Method

Participants. Female psychology students at a German university were invited via e-mail to participate in an online study that "develops a new scale in social psychology". Participants received course credit for participation and additionally could opt in for a lottery for one of two amazon or Google Play vouchers, each worth 15 Euros. Ninety-four female students participated; we excluded three participants because they guessed the hypotheses correctly and five participants because they did not complete the priming procedure. The

final sample consists of 86 female students aged 18 – 57 ($M = 23.50$, $SD = 6.83$) the majority of whom were first-year undergraduates.

Experiment 1b

We reasoned that the female professor prime might have effects only on those women who perceive themselves as intelligent, ambitious, and identify with intelligent and ambitious women because women who perceive themselves in this way probably perceive more similarities with a female professor compared to those who do not perceive themselves in this way. Therefore, we added measures for these constructs.

We also shortened the survey and included only the figural subscale of our general knowledge test in this experiment. We chose the figural subscale because coding of the general knowledge questions by three independent coders showed that it is the subscale with the lowest number of stereotypically male knowledge items. Stereotypically male knowledge might lead to a stereotype threat effect counteracting the priming effect. We aimed at avoiding such a stereotype threat effect for this experiment. Finally, we added the cleaning lady condition.

Method

Participants. Required sample size for detecting a main effect of priming with $\eta^2 = .125$ (Hansen & Wänke, 2009), α error probability of 5% , 95% power, and four groups is $N = 124$ (*G*Power*, Erdfelder et al., 1996). Participants were recruited through a snowball system, an institutional mailing list, and an online participant-sourcing platform (surveycircle.de). We sampled 268 women. We excluded those with more than 5% missing values (35), those who described a female professor when asked to describe a male professor and who refused to stereotype the cleaning lady (27), those who guessed the hypothesis correctly (11), and one multiple outlier. The final sample consisted of 194 highly

educated women (62 with A-levels, 101 with completed university degree) aged 16 – 67 ($M=31.18$, $SD=11.56$). Sixty-one said they were working, 58 studying or studying for a PhD. The remaining sample did not indicate their main occupation. Results did not depend on student status in any of our analyses; therefore we collapsed analyses across student/non-student samples.

Procedure. Participants answered items on the moderators intelligence, ambition, identification with intelligent women, and identification with ambitious women. Then, they were randomly assigned to one of four conditions (male professor, female professor, cleaning lady, control group). The priming procedure was identical to that described in Experiment 1. Finally, they answered the figural subscale of the same general knowledge test used in Experiment 1.

Measures. The general knowledge test was a subset of items from Experiment 1, the figural subscale, $\alpha = .66$. Average item difficulty was 51.49.

Intelligence. We developed three items to measure how intelligent participants perceived themselves: “I am clever”, “I know a lot”, and “I am intelligent”, $\alpha = .78$. Ratings were given on 5-point Likert scales for these and all other moderator items in this and the following experiments.

Ambition. We developed four items to measure how ambitious participants perceived themselves: “I am ambitious”, “I am aspiring”, “I can achieve a lot”, and “I am successful”, $\alpha = .76$.

Identification with intelligent women. We used three items to measure identification with intelligent women: “I feel that I am strongly connected with other intelligent women”, “Being part of the group of intelligent women is generally an important

part of my self-perception” (both adapted from Cameron, 2004), and “It is important for me to be part of the group of intelligent women” , , $\alpha = .88$.

Identification with ambitious women. We used four items to measure identification with ambitious women: “I identify with the group of ambitious women” (adapted from Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, & Williams, 1986), “I feel that I am strongly connected with other ambitious women”, “Being part of the group of ambitious women is generally an important part of my self-perception” (both adapted from Cameron, 2004), and “It is important for me to be part of the group of ambitious women” (adapted from Haslam et al., 1999), $\alpha = .88$.

Results and Discussion

Table 2 in the main article shows descriptive statistics.

Main analyses. We examined the score on the figural subscale of the general knowledge test with a one-way ANOVA. There was no significant main effect of priming, $F(3, 190) = 0.71$, $p = .549$, $\eta^2 = .011$.

Moderators. To check for the influence of ambition, intelligence, identification with ambitious women, and identification with intelligent women, we subjected the dependent measure to four moderated multiple regressions using PROCESS 2.16 (Hayes, 2013, model 1). Including the interactions into the model did not increase the proportion of variance explained significantly; ΔR^2 s = .01, F s(3, 186) ≤ 0.60 , p s > .614. For ambition, p s > .417, for intelligence, p s > .184, for identification with ambitious women p s > .241, for identification with intelligent women p s > .337. Therefore, we did not find main effects or interactions.

Experiment 2

Justification of Moderators

Additionally to the moderators described in Experiment 1b, we added the moderator identification with female graduates/academics (German: Akademikerinnen). We hypothesized that students who identify with female academics perceive themselves as highly educated, and expect to continue their education. They should perceive more similarities with a female professor, a highly educated woman. Therefore, we tested whether identification with female graduates moderates the priming effect.

Our second moderator is identification with the university. Self-concept content of female students that overlaps with the content of professor stereotypes might be the association with a university. If highly identified students think about professors, their self-concept content regarding identification with the university (e.g., their own continued education, development of their intelligence, appreciation of this education and the people who provide it) should be activated. In contrast, in someone who does not identify with the university, thinking about professors might not activate that much self-concept content or might activate it in a way that rejects aspects of university life (e.g., unsatisfactory education, rejection of this education and the people who provide it). Effectiveness of priming might thus be moderated by identification with the university or inclusion of professors in the self.

Our third moderator is inclusions of professors in the self (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992). Participants who include professors in their self should of course have more content in their self-concept that overlaps with the professor stereotype.

The fourth moderator we added is gender-fair language. Gender-fair language aims at reducing misrepresentations of women and men in language through neutralization

(replacing gendered terms (e.g., mankind) with a neutral form (e.g., humanity)) and feminization (including feminine forms to make women visible (e.g., the researcher... he/she instead of the researcher... he; Sczesny, Formanowicz, & Moser, 2016)). We hypothesize that female students who embrace gender-fair language profit more from the female professor stereotype. They might put special emphasis on the visibility of women and concentrate on the fact that the stereotype prime was female, not male, and hence perceive greater overlap between themselves and the stereotype.

Method

Measures. The general knowledge test items were identical to Experiment 1 (for the overall test score: $\alpha = .77$, numeric: $\alpha = .54$, verbal: $\alpha = .58$; figural: $\alpha = .54$). Average item difficulty was 56.28. All participants answered the following moderators: IOS scale, ambition ($\alpha = .75$), identification with ambitious women ($\alpha = .89$), identification with intelligent women ($\alpha = .85$), identification with the university, identification with female graduates, and attitudes towards gender-fair language. The first four moderators are described in Experiment 1b.

Identification with female graduates. We measured participants' identification with female graduates using three items: "I identify with female graduates", "Being a female graduate reflects an important aspect of my personality", "I feel that I am strongly connected with other female graduates", $\alpha = .86$.

Attitudes towards gender-fair language. We used 16 items from Rothmund and Christmann (2002). Sample items are "I think male forms for both men and women (such as pupils, teachers...) are annoying", "... are misogynic", "... are all right because women are always meant to be included" (reverse coded), $\alpha = .94$. We decided to sample these after the general knowledge test because drawing attention to gender-fair language before the

manipulation might influence participants to think about female professors when asked to describe a male professor and it should be a fairly stable construct not influenced by the priming manipulation.

Results

Table 2 shows results of moderation analyses on all general knowledge test scales. Except for identification with the university, no moderator significantly increased the amount of explained variance.

Experiment 2: Mediators

Ninety-four participants from Experiment 2 additionally answered questions on mediators (see Method section below), allowing us to investigate whether our participants' self-efficacy increases after the professor primes (replication of Hansen & Wänke, 2009), and whether any indirect effects exist through self-efficacy, test ambition, effort, and perceived intelligence. Identical to Hansen and Wänke (2009), we hypothesized that priming with the male professor stereotype increases self-efficacy. Additionally, we hypothesized that priming with the female professor stereotype increases self-efficacy more than priming with the male professor stereotype because there is more overlap between the female professor stereotype and female students' self-concept compared to the male professor stereotype and female students' self-concept.

Furthermore, we expected that in both professor priming groups perceived intelligence increases. Priming with the professor stereotype supposedly increases content in the self-concept related to the notion that one is intelligent. Therefore, we hypothesized that priming with the professor stereotypes not only increases self-efficacy, but also perceived intelligence, and that indirect effects might exist through perceived intelligence.

Additionally, given that our participants described professors as ambitious, we expect indirect effects through effort and test ambition. Again, for all these indirect effects, we would expect stronger effects in the female professor group compared to the male professor group.

Method

Participants. Participants were a subsample of participants of Experiment 2 who additionally answered questions regarding potential mediators. We did not display mediator items to all participants because we were afraid that including these mediators in the questionnaire might prime these exact constructs in all participants, thus diluting priming effects. The sample for these additional analyses consists of 94 women (mostly students) aged 18 – 31 ($M = 22.59$, $SD = 3.07$) from Experiment 3, who additionally answered questions on mediators. .

Experimental Manipulation. The experimental manipulation was identical to Experiment 2.

Procedure. The procedure for participants in this subsample was identical to the procedure for Experiment 2 with one exception: Before and after the general knowledge test, participants answered questions on mediators.

Measures. All mediators were answered on 5-point Likert scales.

Mediators before general knowledge test. Participants answered the following items before taking the general knowledge test.

Effort. We developed three items to measure participants' intended effort before the general knowledge test. These items were "I will make an effort to answer the questions correctly", "I will try hard to answer the questions correctly", and "I will make every effort to ensure that I answer the questions correctly", $\alpha = .84$.

Test ambition. We developed three items to measure participants' test ambition. These items were "I absolutely want to answer the questions correctly.", "I am ambitious to do well in this test", and "I want to show in this test how good I am", $\alpha = .78$.

Intelligence. We developed four items to measure participants' self-perceived intelligence. Items are "I am very clever.", "I know very much", "I am very intelligent", and "I know very much in many areas of knowledge.", $\alpha = .76$.

Self-efficacy. We used three items to measure intellectual self-efficacy, based on a short scale for measurement of general self-efficacy (Beierlein, Kovaleva, Kemper, & Rammstedt, 2012). Items are "Regarding intellectually challenging exercises, I can rely on my own abilities.", "I am able to solve most intellectual problems on my own.", and "I can usually solve even challenging and complex tasks well.", $\alpha = .76$.

Mediators after general knowledge test. Participants answered items on effort ($\alpha = .87$) and test ambition ($\alpha = .85$) again. Items were identical to these before the general knowledge test, except that they were in past tense.

Results and Discussion

Table 3 shows descriptive statistics for the subgroup of this experiment.

Main analyses. To check whether a main effect occurred in this subsample, we examined the overall general knowledge test score as well as each of the subscales with a one-way ANOVA. There were no significant main effects, $F_s < 0.19$, $p_s \geq .908$, $\eta^2 \leq .006$.

Mediation analyses. To assess whether an indirect mediating effect exists, we subjected the dependent measures (overall test score, numeric, verbal, and figural test score) to mediation analyses using the SPSS macro PROCESS 2.16 (Hayes, 2013; model 4). There were no indications of an indirect effect of any of the mediators or any combination of the mediators on the dependent variables; $R^2_s < .007$, $F_s < 0.20$, $p > .901$. There were no

priming effects on the mediators and thus no mediations. We could not replicate the findings of Hansen and Wänke (2009).

All Experiments: Additional Analyses At Different Levels Of Item Difficulty

The Trivial Pursuit® questions Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg (1998) used were answered correctly by 45-51% of participants (see Table 1, main article). The trivia questions Hansen and Wänke (2009) used were pretested and in that pretest were answered correctly by 30-60% of participants and thus consist of moderately difficult items. To investigate whether priming effects occur at specific levels of item difficulty only, we summarized items of a specific difficulty. In order to compare our results with Hansen and Wänke's, we additionally divided items in thirds in terms of item difficulty, that is in easy (answered correctly by 0 - < 33.33% of participants), medium (33.33 - <66.67%), and difficult (66.67 - 100%) items. The medium difficult items are comparable to Hansen and Wänke's (2009) choice of items with difficulty of 30-60%.

Experiment 1

We sorted all items according to the percentage of participants in the control group who answered them correctly, then summarized items of a similar difficulty (0-10% correct answers, 10-20% correct answers, 20-30% correct answers, etc.) into new dependent variables. Reliabilities for only two of these new dependent variables were acceptable ($\alpha > .60$); those summarizing item difficulties of 40-50% (i.e., all those items answered correctly by 40-50% of participants) and those summarizing item difficulties of 100% (i.e., those answered correctly by all participants). On these two variables, no significant main effects of priming emerged, $ps \geq .480$.

A main effect of gender salience qualified by an interaction emerged for the variable summarizing very easy items answered correctly by all participants, $\alpha = .77$, $p = .038$.

Participants who received the gender salience priming ($M = 10.64$, $SD = 2.11$) performed worse than those who did not receive gender salience priming ($M = 11.49$, $SD = 1.05$), $F(1, 80) = 4.43$, $p = .038$, $\eta^2 = .052$. This effect was qualified by a stereotype prime X gender salience interaction, $F(2, 80) = 2.41$, $p = .096$, $\eta^2 = .057$. Simple effects analysis revealed that participants who received neither the gender salience manipulation nor a stereotype priming ($M = 12.00$, $SD = 0.43$) performed better than participants primed with gender salience but not with a stereotype ($M = 10.18$, $SD = 0.41$), $p = .003$. This could reflect a stereotype threat effect. No main effect of stereotype priming emerged at this level of item difficulty, $p = .488$. No other significant main effects or interactions emerged, $ps \geq .961$.

Hansen and Wänke (2009) report having chosen items that were answered correctly by 30-60% of participants. Therefore, additionally, we divided our items in difficulty levels easy (answered correctly by 0 - < 33.33% of participants), medium (33.33 - <66.67%), and difficult (66.67 - 100%).

For Experiment 1, the scale summarizing easy items was not reliable, $\alpha = .52$. The scale summarizing items with a medium item difficulty was reliable, $\alpha = .68$, but no significant main effects or interactions emerged, $ps \geq .633$. The scale summarizing the most difficult items was reliable, $\alpha = .83$. On these items, a main effect of gender salience priming emerged, $F(1, 86) = 3.91$, $p = .052$. Participants who received the gender salience priming ($M = 31.49$, $SD = 0.83$) performed worse on the general intelligence test compared to those participants who did not receive the gender salience priming ($M = 33.85$, $SD = 0.87$). Similar to the easiest items, this seems to reflect a stereotype threat effect. It is puzzling that this stereotype threat effect emerges only for very easy and very difficult items. The main effect of priming and the interaction were not significant, $ps \geq .457$.

Experiment 1b

We computed new variables with specific item difficulty ranges as described in Experiment 1. These new dependent variables were not reliable, $\alpha < .39$.

Again, we additionally divided the items in thirds. None of the scales was reliable, $\alpha \leq .51$.

Experiment 2

We computed new variables with specific item difficulty ranges as described in Experiment 1. Reliabilities were too low for additional analyses, $\alpha < .44$,

Scales for the third easiest and third most difficult items were not reliable, $\alpha \leq .52$. The medium difficulty scale was reliable, $\alpha = .63$. No main effects of priming emerged, nor were there significant moderations, $ps \geq .260$.

Tables

Table 1.

Means and standard deviations of perceived intelligence and stupidity of stereotypes in Pilot Study.

	Male Professor <i>n</i> = 47	Female Professor <i>n</i> = 46	Cleaning Lady <i>n</i> = 48
	<i>M (SD)</i>		
Intelligence	7.00 (1.08)	6.91 (1.15)	4.63 (1.06)
Stupidity	3.11 (1.49)	2.74 (1.32)	3.92 (1.96)

Table 2.

Change in explained variance due to interaction involving the respective moderator (ΔR), F-values, and significance level on all dependent variables.

Moderator	Overall Score			Numeric Subscale			Verbal Subscale			Figural Subscale		
	ΔR	$F(3, 179)$	p	ΔR	$F(3, 179)$	p	ΔR	$F(3, 179)$	p	ΔR	$F(3, 179)$	p
Ambition	.014	0.862	.462	.022	1.345	.260	.006	0.358	.784	.028	1.787	.151
Identification with ambitious women	.006	0.380	.767	.013	0.791	.500	.002	.089	.966	.005	0.328	.805
Identification with intelligent women	.024	1.468	.225	.033	2.062	.107	.010	0.593	.620	.018	1.062	.366
Identification with university graduates	.041	2.597	.054	.022	1.318	.270	.025	1.526	.210	.049	3.232	.024
Identification with female graduates	.007	0.391	.760	.013	0.756	.520	.014	0.828	.480	.003	0.164	.920
Inclusion of other in self scale	.005	0.285	.836	.007	0.399	.754	.007	0.431	.731	.006	0.373	.772
Gender fair language	.027	1.657	.178	.019	1.134	.337	.031	1.937	.125	.015	0.897	.444

Table 3.

Means and standard deviations of the overall test score in the subgroup of participants of Experiment 2 who answered questions regarding mediators.

	Male Professor	Female Professor	Cleaning Lady	Control Group
<i>N</i>	18	24	25	27
<i>M (SD)</i>	49.94 (8.61)	48.42 (6.02)	48.88 (9.84)	48.93 (9.08)

Note. Maximum possible test score: 84.

General Discussion

6. Summary of Study-Specific Results and Implications

In three empirical manuscripts, this dissertation explains how culture influences women's collective action intentions, how situations influence the perceived likelihood and acceptability of sexism, and indicates new avenues for stereotype priming research. Manuscript #1 shows that the stronger women's independent self-concept (i.e., the more they follow the ideal of expressing their opinion), the stronger their collective action intentions against sexism. Manuscript #2 shows that women expect to encounter sexism in all areas of life, and men and women sometimes find this acceptable. Manuscript #3, in line with other replication attempts, could not replicate the originally reported priming effect, but could produce a priming effect with a female professor stereotype and showed that identification with one's university moderated this effect.

In short, the three studies presented in this dissertation show that women who want to express their opinions engage in collective action against sexism, that women experience sexism in different situations, and that women profit from a female, but not a male prime when they identify with their university. A more detailed summary is provided below.

6.1 How do collective action intentions vary across cultures?

In collective action research, previous studies were limited to the U.S. and Western Europe, that is, to WEIRD countries (Henrich et al., 2010). We expand research on collective action intentions to non-WEIRD countries by studying intentions in Turkey and Japan. Specifically, we derived hypotheses from research on conflict management styles to predict collective action intentions. Conflict management styles have been formulated for individualistic and collectivistic cultures, independent and interdependent self-concepts, and in relation to the concept of face. We found that in line with assumptions in cross-cultural

psychology, German female students value the expression of their opinion and aim at establishing themselves as independent from others. As predicted and in line with prior research on collective action against sexism (Becker & Barreto, 2014), German female students perceived hostile sexism as more negative and less positive than benevolent sexism, and consequently had higher intentions to engage in collective action against hostile sexism. In line with their more positive regard of benevolent sexism, they were more likely to support benevolent sexism rather than engage in collective action against it. German students preferred collective action to avoiding and outflanking for both types of sexism, and their independent self-concept correlated positively with their collective action intentions. This means that German students intended to confront a sexist comment rather than let it slide. They also intended to confront rather than avoid the person who made the comment or try to engage a third party to reign the sexist in. Furthermore, the more they valued the expression of their opinion, the stronger their intentions to confront a sexist comment were.

Turkish female students had a stronger independent than interdependent self-concept, meaning that they value the expression of their opinion more strongly than fitting in with others. We did not expect this. Turkish female students' strong independent self-concept might reflect the social change that occurred in Turkey during the last few years in the educated middle class (for a summary, see Kandiyoti, 2015). In line with their independent self-concept, Turkish students endorsed collective action intentions more than indirect conflict management styles, and their independent self-concept correlated positively with their collective action intentions. This means that just like German students, Turkish students preferred to confront a sexist comment to avoiding the perpetrator or to involving a third party. Turkish female students intended to confront benevolent sexist

comments, which sets them apart from female students in other countries who are more likely to see benevolent sexism positively and support it (Bohner et al., 2010; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998).

Japanese female students were high on face, that is, they value role appropriate performance. This finding is in line with the fact that the concept of face is conceptualized within East Asian culture, mostly China (Ho, 1976; Mak et al., 2008) or Japan (Lin & Yamaguchi, 2011b). Japanese students had an interdependent rather than independent self-concept, meaning they prefer feeling connected to establishing themselves as independent from others and avoid being rejected. In line with our predictions based on the conflict management style of participants with an interdependent self-concept and high on face concern, Japanese female students preferred to engage a third party to confronting a sexist comment themselves. At the same time, this does not reflect their “true feelings” (*honne* vs. *kokoro*; see Henry, 2013), as they had an unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action. Face correlated positively with this unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action, but negatively with collective action intentions. This means that the more concerned Japanese female students were for performing appropriately in social roles, the more they privately wished to be able to do something about the sexist comment but at the same time intended to confront less.

This study shows that the cross-cultural constructs self-concept and face predict behavioral intentions, gives unprecedented insights into Turkish students’ self-concept and collective action intentions, and describes a new concept, the unaccomplished desire for collective action. More specifically, our findings contribute to cross-cultural and collective action research in six ways: First, we show that cultural norms influence the endorsement of collective action intentions. Collective action is an effective strategy to reduce sexism.

However, proximal and distal factors hinder women from engaging in collective action (Radke et al., 2016). We show that endorsement of an independent self-concept contributes to collective action intentions while endorsement of the concept of face impedes collective action intentions. Second, we add to the growing literature that shows the influence of self-concepts on behavioral intentions (e.g., Holland, Roeder, B.van, Brandt, & Hannover, 2004; Kim et al., 2001; Lalwani & Shavitt, 2009; Van Baaren, Maddux, Chartrand, De Bouter, & van Knippenberg, 2003). Thus, we contribute to the literature aiming at formulating cultural differences along the lines of self-concept (Cross et al., 2011; Markus & Kitayama, 1991), and thus the cross-cultural literature itself. Moreover, we provide specific information about the self-concept of Turkish female students. Our study is the only recent study on the self-concept of Turkish students and thus reflects recent societal movements and informs about Turkish students' self-concept. The self-concept has far reaching implications for cognition, emotion, and behavior (Cross et al., 2011; Markus & Kitayama, 1991) and therefore possessing accurate and current information about the kind of self-concept in a population is a vital basis for future research in Turkey. Fourth, we showed that Turkish female students had high intentions to engage in collective action, which we did not expect. These confrontation tendencies might reflect social change in Turkey (Kagitcibasi & Ataca, 2005; Kandiyoti, 2015) or simply give a voice to the women in Turkey who support a democracy. Fifth, we introduce a new concept, the unaccomplished desire to confront. This concept is in line with previous research on women's reactions to sexism (e.g., Brinkman et al., 2011) and the fact that the internalization of sexism and the female gender role prevent the expression of disagreement with sexism (Radke et al., 2016). It is a promising avenue for future research because it suggests that women recognize sexism, and could probably be encouraged to confront sexist behavior if addressed in the right way by intervention programs. Sixth, our

study is the first to show that face correlates positively with the avoiding conflict management style. This direct link shows that the concept of face indeed influences behavior intentions and suggests that further research into its effects could contribute to understanding confrontation behavior and other constructs related to face not only in Japan, but also in Germany, Turkey, and possibly other countries. By no means do we want to condemn women who do not confront sexism and we hope that our focus on women's collective action intentions does not harm women who decide not to confront due to imminent costs of confronting (Diekmann et al., 2012; Glick, 2014; Shelton & Stewart, 2004; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001).

In a nutshell, Manuscript #1 shows that cultural variables such as the independent self-concept and face influence collective action intentions and provides valuable background information about Turkish female students for future cross-cultural studies.

6.2 How do situations influence the perceived likelihood and acceptability of sexism?

Sexism researchers unveil ways to reduce sexism. For this purpose, we need to know when sexism occurs. Different threads of research on ambivalent sexism have investigated who targets of benevolent and hostile sexism are (Becker, 2010; Glick et al., 1997; King et al., 2012), how group situations influence the expression of prejudice (Hewstone et al., 2002; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998; Tajfel, 2010; Tajfel et al., 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), where benevolent sexism is expected, where norms of gender equity prevail (Sarlet et al., 2012), and when individuals are likely to express or accept sexism (Eysel & Bohner, 2007). However, no study so far has combined these findings and investigated systematically which objectively observable differences between situations influence the perceived likelihood of the occurrence of sexism. This study closes this gap. We find that hostile sexism is perceived

to be more likely (1) directed at feminists and female colleagues compared to a romantic partner, mother or daughter, (2) the more men and the less women are present, (3) in leisure settings (particularly at parties) compared to private or work-related settings, and (4) when men experience passive processes (are drunk, feel threatened, feel tense) compared to when being relaxed.

This study contributes to the scientific literature in four ways: First, by directly comparing the level of hostile sexism towards female colleagues with other targets. Although they do not challenge the status quo as clearly as feminists, female colleagues are perceived to be targeted as much with hostile sexism as feminists are. Second, we systematically compared how sex ratios influence the perceived likelihood of sexism. Men and women's estimates mirrored our predictions based on pluralistic ignorance and social identity theory; the more men are present in a situation, the more participants expected sexism to occur. Third, regarding sexism at different locations, our findings showed that people perceive social norms to effectively prevent the expression of sexism in work compared to leisure settings. This is in line with research findings on the influence of perceived social norms on the expression of hostile sexism (Akrami, Ekehammar, Bergh, Dahlstrand, & Malmsten, 2009; Kilmartin et al., 2008). However, it might also reflect an ignorance of hostile sexism in relationships. Men's hostile sexism does influence their relationships (Hammond & Overall, 2013, 2017) and women might have a blind spot in its perception due to romantic ideals or benevolent sexism. Fourth, regarding passively experienced processes and the occurrence of sexism, participants' perceptions reflect the predictions of dual-process models on the occurrence of sexism.

In summary, our study on the perceived likelihood of hostile sexism is the first to systematically compare the perceived likelihood and acceptability of sexism across

interpersonal associates (targets, ratio of men/women present), locations, and passively experienced processes. Hostile sexism was perceived to be less likely in relationships and directed at family members. Benevolent sexism was perceived to be more likely (1) in leisure settings and in private compared to the workplace, (2) directed at the romantic partner, daughter, and mother compared to a female colleague, and a feminist, (3) when only one man and one woman were present and (4) when men are relaxed in holidays compared to experiencing passive processes. The perceived likelihood of sexism thus reflects the conceptualization of hostile and benevolent sexism regarding their role of keeping status quo violating women in check and importance for romantic relationships and relationships within the family, respectively. It also accurately reflects the predictions of dual-process models.

In the light of recent scandals about sexual harassment and rape, this work encourages sensibility not only to sexual harassment, but also to hostile and benevolent sexism. We hope that the finding that men and women perceive it likely that hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors occur in leisure settings encourages trainers, volunteers, and other personnel in leisure organizations to establish norms of gender equality there, too, so that women can use recreational spaces for their original purpose and do not have to expect to be treated with sexism.

6.3 Can inconsistencies in stereotype priming effects be explained with participants' self-concept content?

Our research on priming is linked to the broader field of research on sexism by language and research on role models. Specifically, it is informed by the fact that the more sexist someone's attitudes are, the less likely they are to use gender-fair language (Sarrasin, Gabriel, & Gygax, 2012) and that women, in contrast to men, profit more from same-sex role

models (Lockwood, 2006). We used these findings and the active-self account (Wheeler & DeMarree, 2009; Wheeler et al., 2007) to explain failed replications of Dijksterhuis and van Knippenberg's (1998) study on the effects of stereotype priming on test performance. We introduced a female professor stereotype and tested a number of moderators and mediators in order to explain mixed results regarding the replicability of the original study. Despite extensive analyses at different levels of item difficulty, we found no priming effect of the original professor stereotype and no moderators and mediators of the original effect. However, we found that female students who identified with their university outperformed the control group when primed with the female professor stereotype. To the contrary, female students who did not identify with their university performed worse than the control group when primed with the female professor stereotype.

The control group in Experiment 1 presented a direct replication of the original study and should have produced effects. This failed replication is in line with other researchers' failed replications and a failed multilab replication project of the original studies (Eder et al., 2012; O'Donnell et al., 2017; Shanks et al., 2013). The accumulated evidence regarding the influence of stereotype priming effects and test performance thus indicates null results.

Moreover, our data suggest that the failed replication is due to the fact that the stereotype prime does not reliably activate the concept of intelligence in participants. We conducted a pretest to identify the extent to which the male and female professor and cleaning lady stereotype primes are associated with intelligence in our sample population. We found that when explicitly asked about the intelligence of a male or female professor, both were perceived to be high on intelligence and significantly more intelligent than the cleaning lady stereotype. This pretest exceeds attempts of other replication studies in terms of establishing whether the stereotype prime activates the concept of intelligence. However,

when we analyzed the stereotype descriptions in Experiment 1, we found that the traits “intelligence” or “intelligent” were explicitly stated only by 36% (male professor stereotype) and 46% (female professor stereotype) of participants. Thus, when participants are not explicitly asked to evaluate a professor’s intelligence, only a third to half mention it. Male professors were also described as having tremendous expertise (46% vs. 15% for the female professor), and female professors were described as competent (46% vs. 18% for the male professor). Intelligence thus does not seem to be a trait that is strongly linked to the stereotype of professors in our sample. Moreover, there does not seem to be one overarching professor stereotype in our sample, and the traditional stereotype of a theoretically brilliant but slightly chaotic professor was very rarely described. Students in different universities, with different subjects, and in different cultures might have different professor stereotypes, depending on the exemplars available to them. The image that is activated when participants are asked for a professor might be the reason for inconsistent replication results.

Our failed replication is in line with other researchers’ failed replications and a failed multilab replication project of the original studies (Eder et al., 2012; O’Donnell et al., 2017; Shanks et al., 2013). However, this does not imply that prime-to-behavior effects more generally are nonexistent or that the original findings were false. A recent meta-analysis shows that small perception-to-behavior effects exist (Weingarten et al., 2016) when words directly related to the intended concept are used (e.g., priming of rudeness through the word ‘rudeness’ or rudeness-related words).

In conclusion, our work indicates that an insufficient association between the professor stereotype and intelligence might cause inconsistent priming effects. Critics of exact replication argued that priming is highly context sensitive (Cesario, 2014) and that

some psychological processes are too malleable to be reproducible in any other sample (Dijksterhuis, 2014). We enrich this debate by identifying a possible reason for the context-sensitivity of priming that researchers could investigate in future studies.

7. General Implications

The current research has broad implications regarding the reduction of sexism. Sexism can be reduced through collective action (Boysen, 2013; Czopp et al., 2006; Hillard, 2011) but interventions have to be adjusted to the culture and situation women find themselves in.

Manuscript #1 shows that collective action intentions depend on self-concept and face. Therefore, interventions to reduce sexism have to take these constructs into account. The independent self-concept positively correlated with collective action intentions against hostile sexism in Germany, Turkey, and Japan. Thus, women with a stronger independent self-concept have stronger collective action intentions, and strengthening women's independent self-concept could increase collective action. Although correlation is not equivalent to causation and a third factor that is positively correlated with the independent self-concept and collective action intentions might be at work here, the self-concept is a broad factor that influences many psychological processes such as emotions, motivations, and attention (Cross et al., 2011; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). It is thus not unlikely that it influences collective action intentions. Indeed, previous research suggests that gender role prescriptions for women prevent collective action (Hyers, 2007; Radke et al., 2016). These gender role prescriptions for women oppose the ideal of an independent self-concept. It might thus be possible to strengthen collective action intentions by strengthening the independent self-concept, so that women feel encouraged by the broader cultural ideal rather than restricted by limits imposed on them on the basis of their sex. This strategy

would be more appropriate in cultures where an independent self-concept prevails as a cultural ideal and where being independent is generally supported.

Manuscript #1 also shows that the face concept with its emphasis on not disrupting harmony and on not standing out, reduces collective action intentions. The more women in Germany, Japan, and Turkey endorsed this concept, the less they intended to confront sexism. Moreover, Manuscript #1 showed that women who are high on face and thus expected not to confront sexism still do not agree with sexist treatment. The higher women were on face, the higher their unaccomplished desire to engage in collective action against sexism. Regarding the reduction of sexism, the more a population endorses the face concept, the more appropriate it would be to tackle the understanding of appropriate role performance instead of strengthening the independent self-concept. Face reflects the performance in a social role. If individuals high on face concern were expected to perform in an unbiased manner, they would feel obliged to reduce sexism.

Consequently, Manuscript #1 shows that interventions for reducing sexism have to be informed by research on self-concept and face and reflect individuals' culturally varying responsibilities in daily life.

Manuscript #2 shows that attempts to reduce sexism also have to be adapted to different situations. It shows that women and men perceive sexism as likely and acceptable in leisure settings and as likely directed against feminists, female colleagues, and when men are stressed. When individuals perceive sexism to be acceptable, collective action intentions collapse because the perception of inequality, of sexism as unfair and not normal, is vital for collective action (van Zomeren, 2013; Van Zomeren et al., 2008). Thus, interventions that address sexism have to emphasize that sexism is not normal, no matter the setting.

Interventions such as that of Kilmartin and colleagues should thus especially tackle settings where sexism is perceived to be normal.

Additionally, Manuscript #2 shows that studies on sexism and collective action intentions should carefully and explicitly describe the situation in which sexism occurs. Variations in the presence of possible targets of sexism, gender composition of people present, location, and state that those present are in influence the perceived likelihood and acceptability of sexism and thus might distort research findings.

Finally, this research shows that women do not expect hostile or benevolent sexism at work and do not expect hostile sexism in relationships. Both might have severe consequences for women: If women do not expect to be treated with benevolent sexism at work, and additionally are tricked by the superficially positive tone of this kind of sexism, they might especially suffer from a severe impact on their performance and career (Dardenne et al., 2007; Dumont et al., 2010; King et al., 2012). Similarly, if women do not expect to be treated with hostile sexism in relationships, its impact might be even worse when it occurs.

To sum up, Manuscript #2 shows that men and women perceive sexism as likely and acceptable in some settings, which hinders collective action. It also implies that studies researching how women react to sexism have to carefully describe situations to prevent participants from constructing different locations, interpersonal associates, or passively experienced processes for the same given situation. Finally, should women misrepresent the frequency of hostile and benevolent sexism in atypical domains (in relationships for hostile sexism, at work for benevolent sexism) its impact might become worse.

Manuscript #3 implies that stereotype priming effects are highly volatile. Analysis of the stereotypes in Manuscript #3 suggests that stereotype priming effects depend on the

association between the stereotype and the underlying concept, in this case specifically on the association between professors and intelligence. This association probably varies across student populations, more specifically across university culture and the situations students find themselves in on a daily basis. University culture, for example the extent to which students are expected to work hard vs. be smart, could influence the perception of professors. Situational influences such as the kind of subjects taught and the professors available as exemplars might also influence the perception of professors. Problematically, neither the original study (Dijksterhuis & Van Knippenberg, 1998) nor other replications (Hansen & Wänke, 2009; O'Donnell et al., 2017) included a manipulation check to identify whether the construct of intelligence was activated by the priming manipulation. Future research on stereotype priming effects should thus attempt to measure and compare the association strength between the stereotype professor and the concept intelligence (see also below, limitations). Although these possible explanations have not yet been empirically tested, it seems reasonable to conclude from other failed replication attempts (Eder et al., 2012; O'Donnell et al., 2017; Shanks et al., 2013), a meta-analysis on perception-to-behavior effects (Weingarten et al., 2016), and the findings of Manuscript #3 that stereotype priming effects are more volatile than priming effects with concept words such as intelligence.

To summarize, this work shows that women's intentions to engage in collective action are motivated by cultural concepts such as expression of own values vs. role appropriate performance. Moreover, the expected level of sexism varies across situations. This implies that successful interventions for the reduction of sexism have to be culture and situation specific. Additionally, this work in conjunction with others suggests that stereotype effects are highly volatile and that participants' self-concept influences results.

8. General Limitations

Despite their strengths, all studies introduced above have limitations. They are limited by the use of student samples (except Experiment 1b in Manuscript #3), self-report measures, the nature of the self-concept.

The use of student samples in psychology has been widely criticized (e.g., Henrich et al., 2010), but is economic and functional, and to demand that researchers reduce the amount of student samples they use is unrealistic given the financial and temporal restrictions researchers face. Still, the use of student samples might distort this work's findings in specific ways. First, students in all countries are highly likely to have a more independent self-concept compared to the general population (Henrich et al., 2010; Ma & Schoeneman, 1997). Consequently, we might overestimate the extent of collective action intentions in the general population because the independent self-concept correlates positively with collective action intentions (Manuscript #1). Second, most students know little or nothing about workplace settings. They might thus over- or underestimate how likely and acceptable sexist behavior is at work (Manuscript #2) and this might distort their collective action intentions in such a setting (Manuscript #3). Third, students see many professors every day. This high exposure to many exemplars of the stereotype category 'professors' could influence their associations with the professor stereotype and they might have other associations as members of the public. However, we found no obvious differences between associations of students and members of the public with the professor stereotype in Manuscript #3. To sum up, care should be taken when generalizing these findings to the general population.

We used self-report measures to capture collective action intentions (Manuscript #1), and the perceived likelihood of sexism (Manuscript #2). These studies would have

higher external validity had we used behavioral measures. Future studies could address this potential criticism by introducing behavioral measures for collective action against sexism (Manuscript #1) and sexist behavior (Manuscript #2). Regarding collective action intentions, women are known to misrepresent the emotional impact sexist events have on them (Bosson et al., 2009; Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001). In a questionnaire self-report, they are especially likely to overestimate their anger (Woodzicka & LaFrance, 2001), but anger strongly predicts collective action (van Zomeren, 2013). Again, this implies that we might overestimate collective action intentions. Measuring behavior would also improve the literature on self-concepts, as researchers rarely address how self-concepts influence behavior (for an exception see Holland et al., 2004). In Manuscript #2 we tried to limit the distorting influence of interpretation on what is sexist and what is not by giving specific descriptions of sexist behaviors. However, had we measured how often specific sexist behaviors occur in situ, we would be able to describe social norms more precisely.

Measuring how the self-concept influences behavior, behavioral intentions, or a stereotype priming effect is challenging, because everything the person is exposed to could influence their self-concept (Kanagawa et al., 2001; Wheeler et al., 2014). For this reason we measured self-concept at the end of our studies. Still, we cannot guarantee that the self-concept we measured explicitly at the end of our studies was active throughout the questionnaire. To complicate matters further, the active self-concept can be influenced by aspects that usually are not captured in a questionnaire such as the company or surroundings one is in when answering the questionnaire (Kanagawa et al., 2001). Future research could account for these influences. Also, it is not clear whether the self-concept can be measured explicitly. However, implicit measurements of independent and

interdependent self-concept are not yet available. Ultimately, as with priming research, only theory development will be able to clarify these issues.

In sum, despite contributing to the cross-cultural and sexism literature, this work is limited by the use of student samples and self-report measures, which might result in participants indicating stronger collective action intentions compared to their actual behavior in sexist situations, and by the evasive nature of the self-concept.

9. Future Studies

The current work inspires further research on the reduction of sexism, in cross-cultural and priming research.

9.1 Reduction of sexism

Future research on how to reduce sexism can build on this work in five ways. First, researchers could assess the prevalence of sexism more precisely using mobile phone based experience sampling (e.g., Bryson & MacKerron, 2016; MacKerron & Mourato, 2013). This approach would assure high external validity and could measure the influence of participant characteristics on the perception of sexism. It might even be possible to encourage working women to participate in such a study because questions can be kept short and it is not necessary to answer a lengthy questionnaire or be present at the laboratory.

Second, regarding interventions for the reduction of sexism, a meta-analysis suggests that priming specific words can influence behavior (Weingarten et al., 2016). Thus, it may be possible to reduce sexism by priming equality norms. However, reactance effects can occur when priming is too obvious (Clee & Wicklund, 1980). Priming could be used especially in situations where sexism is perceived to be likely to occur, e.g., at parties or when many men are present. It might also be possible to influence the perception of role appropriate performance using priming and thus influence individuals who value face. Compared to

previously suggested interventions such as those based on social norms (Berkowitz, 2003), or giving information about the pervasiveness of sexism (Becker & Swim, 2011, 2012) and especially compared to collective action, priming equality norms might be an easy, innocuous way of reducing sexism.

Third, regarding the reduction of sexism in Japan through collective action, a follow-up study could explore what ways of confronting sexism are acceptable there. Specifically, researchers could investigate whether a collective effort such as a demonstration is more acceptable than an individual effort such as interpersonal confrontation. Successful action against sexism in Japan would probably have to account for face concerns.

Fourth, this work combined with previous research (Brinkman et al., 2011) shows that women worldwide have an unaccomplished desire to confront. Future research could investigate whether it is possible to engage women with this desire in collective action. For example, face correlates positively with an unaccomplished desire to confront. Therefore, removing factors that make confronting a face issue, such as public visibility, should increase collective action and decrease the unaccomplished desire to confront. For example, researchers could compare an online protest that is visible to friends with an online protest that is not visible to friends and see whether face correlates negatively with collective action intentions in the public visibility but not in the private condition. Additionally, the social identity model of collective action (van Zomeren, 2013; Van Zomeren et al., 2008) specifies four motivators to engage in collective action: social identity, morality, emotion, and efficacy. It would be interesting to identify among these four the factor that is most effective in encouraging women with an unaccomplished desire to confront to confronting.

Finally, integrating our research into self-concepts with research on the four motivators of collective action identified in the social identity model of collective action, it

would be interesting to see whether the independent self-concept and face predict collective action intentions beyond the four motivators of collective action (van Zomeren, 2013), and whether this could explain the high amount of collective action in Turkey.

In conclusion, future research building on this work could assess the prevalence of sexism more precisely, investigate ways to reduce sexism in Western countries and specifically in Japan, could show how individuals with an unaccomplished desire can be encouraged to engage in collective action, and could assess whether self-concept and face predict collective actions beyond the four motivators of collective action.

9.2 Cross-cultural research

The independent and interdependent self-concept (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) is a vital part of cross-cultural research. However, researchers could improve how these constructs are measured: Singelis (1994) and Hashimoto and Yamagishi (2013) suggested scales to measure the self-concepts, but evidence for the scales' structural equivalence across cultures is missing. Future studies should attempt to develop a scale with invariant (factor) structure that is valid worldwide, just as is the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick et al., 2000). It would then be possible to map the world on self-concept scales as was done with values (Inglehart, 1997; Schwartz, 1992). Researchers could then assess country-differences in self-concept and differences between urban and rural areas. Researchers could also try to improve how the concept of face is measured. This concept has previously been mainly conceptualized in an East Asian context (Lin & Yamaguchi, 2007, 2011b; Mak et al., 2008; Zane & Yeh, 2002). However, Manuscript #1 shows that it has predictive power in Germany and Turkey, too. Future research should aim at developing a cross-culturally valid, measurement equivalent scale for assessing face concern.

Researchers should not only improve explicit measures for self-concept and face, but also develop implicit measures for both constructs. However, regarding face, more research on its nature and content is needed first. Regarding the self-concept, previous research shows that the self-concept can be primed (Gardner, Gabriel, & Dean, 2004; Kühnen & Hannover, 2000; Kühnen & Oyserman, 2002; Oyserman, 2015). When participants think about both independent and interdependent self-concept content because they answer question on both, this might unintentionally prime a self-concept that was not previously activated (Schwarz, 1999). Therefore, researchers should develop an implicit measure for the independent and interdependent self-concept. For example, researchers could use the go/no go association task (Nosek & Banaji, 2001). Nosek and Banaji developed this task in addition to the Implicit Association Test (IAT). Compared to the IAT, it has the advantage that it measures associations between a target category and its evaluation without introducing a contrasting target category. In the case of measuring self-concepts, the target category could be words related to the self, such as I, me, my, own. The associated dimension could be words related to the independent vs. interdependent self-concept. For example, for the independent self-concept, words that emphasize uniqueness and dissimilarity from others such as unique, exceptional, and extraordinary. For the interdependent self-concept, words that emphasize relationships and similarity with others, such as connect, relate, social, fit in. In the first condition, participants have to give a “go” response (pressing the space bar) when they see words of the target category (e.g., “I”) and words relating to the independent self-concept (e.g., “unique”), and give a “no go” response (not press the spacebar) when they see distractor items. In the second condition, participants have to give the “go” response for words of the target category (e.g., “I”) and words relating to the interdependent self-concept (e.g., “connected”). The association

between the self-concept and independence or interdependence measures the automatic attitude toward the self. The stronger the association, the faster and more accurate the “go” responses. In this way, participants’ automatically activated self-concept can be assessed. If researchers measure the self-concept with the go/no go association task separately from the actual task or questions they are interested in, it indicates which self-concept is automatically activated in participants.

In short, the development of explicit and implicit, cross-culturally valid measures for self-concepts and of an explicit (in the longer term also implicit) measure for face would immensely contribute to cross-cultural research.

9.3 Priming

Regarding the priming effect of stereotypes, future studies should assess whether the professor stereotype (male or female) activates the concept of intelligence, or, more ideally, assess whether the strength of the association between the professor stereotype and intelligence influences the effectiveness of the stereotype prime. I suggest a qualitative and a quantitative approach to assess these associations. First, researchers could analyze descriptions of professors in previous priming studies. This qualitative analysis could reveal the content of the professor stereotype and compare it across previous priming studies. Such a thorough qualitative analysis of the contents of stereotype descriptions in successful and unsuccessful priming experiments might reveal differences in stereotype content that could have caused the inconsistent priming effects. This analysis would count how often the words “intelligent” or “intelligence” were mentioned and summarize how participants described the professor stereotype. For example, some participants might describe the genius-in-the-ivory-tower stereotype while others might describe the successful, manager-like professor. Based on the descriptions participants gave in Manuscript #3, which did not

include the genius professor stereotype, I would expect that stereotype priming is more successful for participants with the genius compared to manager professor stereotype. Second, researchers could quantitatively measure the associative strength between the professor stereotype and intelligence with a lexical decision task. Researchers could ask participants to distinguish between words and non-words. Before making their decision, they would subliminally see the word professor. All words presented for the decision task would be related to intelligence. The assumption behind this set up is that participants that quickly decide that an intelligence-related word is a word have a strong association between professors and intelligence, and those that take longer have a weak association between professors and intelligence. The same participants could then (preferably a few days later) take part in a stereotype priming experiment. For participants with strong associations between professors and intelligence the priming effect should emerge, for those with weak associations between those concepts, the priming effect should not emerge. In the strong associations group our moderators from Manuscript #3 could then be used to test our hypotheses derived from the active-self account.

In summary, we suggest a qualitative and a quantitative approach to enlighten the controversy around stereotype priming effects. Both aim at measuring the association strength between the professor stereotype and the concept of intelligence. This association could be measured qualitatively by analyzing participants' descriptions of a typical professor in previous experiments. It could also be measured quantitatively by using a lexical decision task. These approaches could finally resolve the controversy around stereotype priming effects.

In conclusion, all future studies inspired by this work would diversify psychological research, adapt research to more specific aspects of life, and would thus allow more precise predictions that account for individuals' lived experiences.

10. Conclusion

Sexism is a worldwide phenomenon; women in every country in the world, compared to men, participate less in the economy, are less educated, less healthy, and/or have less political influence (World Economic Forum, 2017). This dissertation shows that sexism is omnipresent in women's life (Manuscript #2), shows how women deal with sexism in interpersonal encounters (Manuscript #1), and suggests that taking into account participants' gendered self-concept could advance priming research (Manuscript #3), as soon as more basic problems in this area are addressed. Taking into account the influence of culture, situations, and participant characteristics on collective action, the occurrence of sexism, and priming, it also describes the relativity of psychological research and its dependency on less inconspicuous factors. This work thus enriches psychological research with a cross-cultural perspective (Manuscript #1), a cross-situational perspective (Manuscript #2), and suggestions for future priming research (Manuscript #3) and hopefully inspires future collective action against sexism.

References

- Abrams, D., Thomas, J., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). Numerical distinctiveness, social identity and gender salience. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 29*(1), 87–92.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1990.tb00889.x>
- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: the role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 111.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour.
- Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., Bergh, R., Dahlstrand, E., & Malmsten, S. (2009). Prejudice: The Person in the situation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(5), 890–897.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.04.007>
- Alesina, A., Giuliano, P., & Nunn, N. (2013). On the origins of gender roles: Women and the plough. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 128*(2), 469–530.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjt005>
- Ashburn-Nardo, L., Blanchar, J. C., Petersson, J., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2014). Do you say something when it's your boss? The role of perpetrator power in prejudice confrontation. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 615–636.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12082>
- Ayres, M. M., Friedman, C. K., & Leaper, C. (2009). Individual and Situational Factors Related to Young Women's Likelihood of Confronting Sexism in Their Everyday Lives - Springer. *Sex Roles, 61*, 449–460. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9635-3>

- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(5), 633–642. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.270>
- Becker, J. C. (2010). Why Do Women Endorse Hostile and Benevolent Sexism? The Role of Salient Female Subtypes and Internalization of Sexist Contents. *Sex Roles, 62*(7–8), 453–467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9707-4>
- Becker, J. C., & Barreto, M. (2014). Ways to Go: Men’s and Women’s Support for Aggressive and Non-aggressive Confrontation of Sexism as a Function of Gender Identification. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12085>
- Becker, J. C., Barreto, M., Kahn, K. B., & de Oliveira Laux, S. H. (2015). The Collective Value of “Me” (and its Limitations): Towards a More Nuanced Understanding of Individual and Collective Coping with Prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 71*(3), 497–516. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12125>
- Becker, J. C., Glick, P., Ilic, M., & Bohner, G. (2011). Damned if she does, damned if she doesn’t: Consequences of accepting versus confronting patronizing help for the female target and male actor. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*(6), 761–773. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.823>
- Becker, J. C., & Sibley, C. G. (2016). Sexism. In *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination* (pp. 315–336). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the Unseen Attention to Daily Encounters With Sexism as Way to Reduce Sexist Beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684310397509>
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2012). Reducing Endorsement of Benevolent and Modern Sexist Beliefs. *Social Psychology, 43*(3), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864->

9335/a000091

- Becker, J. C., & Wagner, U. (2009). Doing gender differently—The interplay of strength of gender identification and content of gender identity in predicting women's endorsement of sexist beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(4), 487–508. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.551>
- Becker, J. C., Zawadzki, M. J., & Shields, S. A. (2014). Confronting and Reducing Sexism: A Call for Research on Intervention. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 603–614. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12081>
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 425–437. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.425>
- Berkowitz, A. D. (2003). Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues. In H. W. Perkins (Ed.), *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: a handbook for educators, counselors, and clinicians* (pp. 259–279). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(6), 993. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993>
- Bohner, G., Ahlborn, K., & Steiner, R. (2010). How Sexy are Sexist Men? Women's Perception of Male Response Profiles in the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. *Sex Roles, 62*(7–8), 568–582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9665-x>
- Bohner, G., Siebler, F., & Schmelcher, J. (2006). Social norms and the likelihood of raping: Perceived rape myth acceptance of others affects men's rape proclivity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(3), 286–297.

- Borrell, C., Artazcoz, L., Gil-González, D., Perez, K., Perez, G., Vives-Cases, C., & Rohlfs, I. (2011). Determinants of perceived sexism and their role on the association of sexism with mental health. *Women & Health, 51*(6), 583–603.
- Bosson, J. K., Pinel, E. C., & Vandello, J. A. (2009). The Emotional Impact of Ambivalent Sexism: Forecasts Versus Real Experiences. *Sex Roles, 62*(7–8), 520–531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9664-y>
- Boysen, G. A. (2013). Confronting Math Stereotypes in the Classroom: Its Effect on Female College Students' Sexism and Perceptions of Confronters. *Sex Roles, 69*(5–6), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0287-y>
- Brinkman, B. G., Garcia, K., & Rickard, K. M. (2011). “What I wanted to do was...” Discrepancies Between College Women’s Desired and Reported Responses to Gender Prejudice. *Sex Roles, 65*(5–6), 344–355. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0020-7>
- Bry, C., Follenfant, A., & Meyer, T. (2008). Blonde like me: When self-construals moderate stereotype priming effects on intellectual performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*(3), 751–757. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2007.06.005>
- Bryson, A., & MacKerron, G. (2016). Are you happy while you work? *Economic Journal, 127*(599), 106–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/econj.12269>
- Cesario, J. (2014). Priming, replication, and the hardest science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9*(1), 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613513470>
- Chaiken, S., & Trope, Y. (1999). *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology* (New). New York: Guilford Pubn.
- Choi, S.-C., & Lee, S.-J. (2002). Two-Component Model of Chemyon-Oriented Behaviors in Korea Constructive and Defensive Chemyon. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(3), 332–345. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033003008>

- Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 151–192). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Clee, M. A., & Wicklund, R. A. (1980). Consumer Behavior and Psychological Reactance. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 6(4), 389–405. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208782>
- Cochran, C. C., Frazier, P. A., & Olson, A. M. (1997). Predictors of responses to unwanted sexual attention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(2), 207–226. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00109.x>
- Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist*, 59(8), 676. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.676>
- Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, M. T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 25–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.25>
- Cooney, S. (2018, January 26). Here Are All the Public Figures Who've Been Accused of Sexual Misconduct After Harvey Weinstein. *Time*.
- Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(3), 359–378. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.3.359>
- Cronholm, P. F., Fogarty, C. T., Ambuel, B., & Harrison, S. L. (2011). Intimate partner violence. *American Family Physician*, 83(10), 1165–1172.
- Cross, S. E., Hardin, E. E., & Gercek-Swing, B. (2011). The what, how, why, and where of self-construal. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(2), 142–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868310373752>
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to

- confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(4), 532–544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 784. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784>
- Dardenne, B., Dumont, M., & Bollier, T. (2007). Insidious dangers of benevolent sexism: consequences for women's performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(5), 764. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.764>
- Delacollette, N., Dumont, M., Sarlet, M., & Dardenne, B. (2013). Benevolent sexism, men's advantages and the prescription of warmth to women. *Sex Roles*, 68(5–6), 296–310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0232-5>
- Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Vance, S. L. (2002). The regulation of explicit and implicit race bias: The role of motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 835. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.835>
- Diekmann, K. A., Walker, S. D. S., Galinsky, A. D., & Tenbrunsel, A. E. (2012). Double Victimization in the Workplace: Why Observers Condemn Passive Victims of Sexual Harassment. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 614–628. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0753>
- Dijksterhuis, A. (2014). Welcome Back Theory! *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(1), 72–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613513472>
- Dijksterhuis, A., & Van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior, or how to win a game of trivial pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(4), 865–877. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0058458>

- Dijksterhuis, A., van Knippenberg, A., & Holland, R. W. (2014). Evaluating Behavior Priming Research: Three Observations and a Recommendation. *Social Cognition*, 32(Supplement), 196–208. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2014.32.suppl.196>
- Dodd, E. H., Giuliano, T. A., Boutell, J. M., & Moran, B. E. (2001). Respected or rejected: Perceptions of women who confront sexist remarks. *Sex Roles*, 45(7–8), 567–577. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014866915741>
- Doi, T. (1986). *The Anatomy of the Self: The Individual Versus Society*. (M. Harbison, Trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Dumont, M., Sarlet, M., & Dardenne, B. (2010). Be too kind to a woman, she'll feel incompetent: Benevolent sexism shifts self-construal and autobiographical memories toward incompetence. *Sex Roles*, 62(7–8), 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9582-4>
- Durán, M., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2014). Benevolent Sexist Ideology Attributed to an Abusive Partner Decreases Women's Active Coping Responses to Acts of Sexual Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(8), 1380–1401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513507134>
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender Stereotypes and Attitudes Toward Women and Men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15(4), 543–558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167289154008>
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(4), 735. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.4.735>
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54(6), 408–423.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.6.408>

Eder, A., Leipert, C., Musch, J., & Klauer, K.-C. (2012, August 10). Failed replication to prime intelligent behavior. Retrieved May 18, 2017, from <http://www.PsychFileDrawer.org/replication.php?attempt=MTIO>

Elsayed-Ekjiouly, S. M., & Buda, R. (1996). Organizational conflict: A comparative analysis of conflict styles across cultures. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 7(1), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022776>

Endler, N. S. (1993). Personality: an interactional perspective. In J. Hettema & I. J. Deary (Eds.), *Foundations of Personality* (pp. 251–268). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Expósito, F., Herrera, M. C., Moya, M., & Glick, P. (2010). Don't Rock the Boat: Women's Benevolent Sexism Predicts Fears of Marital Violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34(1), 36–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01539.x>

Eysel, F., & Bohner, G. (2007). The Rating of Sexist Humor Under Time Pressure as an Indicator of Spontaneous Sexist Attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 57(9–10), 651–660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9302-5>

Fazio, R. H., & Towles-Schwen, T. (1999). The MODE Model of Attitude-Behavior Processes. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process Theories in Social Psychology*. Guilford Press.

Fiske, S., & Taylor, S. E. (2013). *Social Cognition: From Brains To Culture* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications Ltd.

Friese, M., Hofmann, W., & Wänke, M. (2008). When impulses take over: Moderated predictive validity of explicit and implicit attitude measures in predicting food choice and consumption behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(3), 397–419. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466607X241540>

Gabrielidis, C., Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Pearson, V. M. D. S., & Villareal, L. (1997). Preferred

- Styles of Conflict Resolution: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(6), 661–677. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022197286002>
- Galinsky, A. D., Wang, C. S., & Ku, G. (2008). Perspective-takers behave more stereotypically. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(2), 404–419. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.2.404>
- Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Dean, K. K. (2004). The individual as “melting pot”: The flexibility of bicultural self-construals. *Cahiers de Psychologie Cognitive*, 22(2), 181–201.
- Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting Sexism: The Role of Relationship Orientation and Gender. *Sex Roles*, 63(7–8), 463–474. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7>
- Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. Yale University Press.
- Glick, P. (2014). Commentary: Encouraging Confrontation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70(4), 779–791. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12091>
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The Two Faces of Adam: Ambivalent Sexism and Polarized Attitudes Toward Women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(12), 1323–1334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672972312009>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001a). Ambivalent sexism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 115–188. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(01\)80005-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(01)80005-8)
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001b). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109>

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... López, W. L. (2000).

Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79(5), 763–775.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763>

Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & de Souza, M. A. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and

attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*,

26(4), 292–297.

Goffman, E. (1955). On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction.

Psychiatry, 18, 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1955.11023008>

Good, J. J., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Sanchez, D. T. (2012). When Do We Confront? Perceptions

of Costs and Benefits Predict Confronting Discrimination on Behalf of the Self and

Others. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(2), 210–226.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312440958>

Guttentag, M., & Secord, P. F. (1983). *Too many women?* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Haddock, G., Macrae, C. N., & Fleck, S. (2002). Syrian Science and Smart Supermodels: On the

When and How of Perception-Behavior Effects. *Social Cognition*, 20(6), 461–479.

<https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.20.6.461.22976>

Haines, M. P., & Barker, G. P. (2003). The Northern Illinois University experiment: A

longitudinal case study of the social norms approach. In H. W. Perkins (Ed.), *The social*

norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for educators, counselors, and clinicians (pp. 21–34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2013). Men's Hostile Sexism and Biased Perceptions of

Intimate Partners Fostering Dissatisfaction and Negative Behavior in Close

- Relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(12), 1585–1599.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213499026>
- Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2015). Benevolent Sexism and Support of Romantic Partner's Goals: Undermining Women's Competence While Fulfilling Men's Intimacy Needs. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(9), 1180–1194.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215593492>
- Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2017). Dynamics Within Intimate Relationships and the Causes, Consequences, and Functions of Sexist Attitudes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26(2), 120–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416686213>
- Hansen, J., & Wänke, M. (2009). Think of capable others and you can make it! Self-efficacy mediates the effect of stereotype activation on behavior. *Social Cognition*, 27(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2009.27.1.76>
- Hashimoto, H., & Yamagishi, T. (2013). Two faces of interdependence: Harmony seeking and rejection avoidance. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 16(2), 142–151.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12022>
- Hebl, M. R., King, E. B., Glick, P., Singletary, S. L., & Kazama, S. (2007). Hostile and benevolent reactions toward pregnant women: complementary interpersonal punishments and rewards that maintain traditional roles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1499.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1499>
- Heine, S. J. (2011). *Cultural Psychology*. W W Norton & Company Incorporated.
- Hendry, J. (2013). *Understanding Japanese Society* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup Bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*,

- 53(1), 575–604. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135109>
- Hideg, I., & Lance, D. (2016). The compassionate sexist? How benevolent sexism promotes and undermines gender equality in the workplace. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 111*(5), 706–727. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000072>
- Hillard, A. (2011). Why Confronting Sexism Works: Applying Persuasion Theories to Confronting Sexism. *Theses, Dissertations, and Student Research: Department of Psychology*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychdiss/35>
- Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., Heppner, M. J., Mauch, P. A., & Park, H.-J. (2010). Men as allies: The efficacy of a high school rape prevention intervention. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*(1), 43–51. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00149.x>
- Ho, D. Y. (1976). On the Concept of Face. *American Journal of Sociology, 81*(4), 867–884.
- Hofmann, W., Rauch, W., & Gawronski, B. (2007). And deplete us not into temptation: Automatic attitudes, dietary restraint, and self-regulatory resources as determinants of eating behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43*(3), 497–504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2006.05.004>
- Hogan, R. (2009). Much ado about nothing: The person–situation debate. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(2), 249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.022>
- Holland, R. W., Roeder, U.-R., B.van, B. R., Brandt, A. C., & Hannover, B. (2004). Don't Stand So Close to Me: The Effects of Self-Construal on Interpersonal Closeness. *Psychological Science, 15*(4), 237–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00658.x>
- Holt, J. L., & DeVore, C. J. (2005). Culture, gender, organizational role, and styles of conflict resolution: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*(2), 165–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.06.002>
- Hyers, L. L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to

- anti-Black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles*, 56(1), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8>
- Impett, E. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2003). Sexual compliance: Gender, motivational, and relationship perspectives. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 40(1), 87–100.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490309552169>
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton University Press.
- Jankowiak, W., & Ramsey, A. (2000). Femme Fatale and Status Fatale: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 34(1), 57–69.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/106939710003400104>
- Jones, K., Stewart, K., King, E., Botsford Morgan, W., Gilrane, V., & Hylton, K. (2014). Negative consequence of benevolent sexism on efficacy and performance. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 29(3), 171–189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2013-0086>
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 498. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498>
- Kagitcibasi, C., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of Children and Family Change: A Three-Decade Portrait From Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(3), 317–337.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00213.x>
- Kaiser, C. R., Hagiwara, N., Malahy, L. W., & Wilkins, C. L. (2009). Group identification moderates attitudes toward ingroup members who confront discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(4), 770–777.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.027>

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop Complaining! The Social Costs of Making Attributions to Discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(2), 254–263.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010>

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2003). Derogating the victim: The interpersonal consequences of blaming events on discrimination. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(3), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302030063001>

Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2004). A Stress and Coping Perspective on Confronting Sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(2), 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00133.x>

Kanagawa, C., Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (2001). “Who am I?” The cultural psychology of the conceptual self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(1), 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201271008>

Kandiyoti, D. (2015). The Gender Wars in Turkey: A Litmus Test of Democracy? *LSE Middle East Centre Collected Papers*, 4, 8–14.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965–990. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226425>

Kantor, J., & Twohey, M. (2017, October 5). Harvey Weinstein Paid Off Sexual Harassment Accusers for Decades. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/05/us/harvey-weinstein-harassment-allegations.html>

Kilianski, S. E., & Rudman, L. A. (1998). Wanting it both ways: Do women approve of benevolent sexism? *Sex Roles*, 39(5–6), 333–352.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018814924402>

Kilmartin, C., Smith, T., Green, A., Heinzen, H., Kuchler, M., & Kolar, D. (2008). A Real Time Social Norms Intervention to Reduce Male Sexism. *Sex Roles, 59*(3–4), 264–273.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9446-y>

Kim, M.-S., Aune, K. S., Hunter, J. E., Kim, H.-J., & Kim, J.-S. (2001). The effect of culture and self-construals on predispositions toward verbal communication. *Human Communication Research, 27*(3), 382–408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2001.tb00786.x>

Kim, M.-S., Hunter, J. E., Miyahara, A., Horvath, A.-M., Bresnahan, M., & Yoon, H.-J. (1996). Individual-vs. culture-level dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Effects on preferred conversational styles. *Communication Monographs, 63*(1), 29–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759609376373>

Kim, M.-S., Lee, H., Kim, I. D., & Hunter, J. E. (2004). A test of a cultural model of conflict styles. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 14*(2), 197–222. <https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.14.2.02kim>

King, E. B., Botsford, W., Hebl, M. R., Kazama, S., Dawson, J. F., & Perkins, A. (2012). Benevolent Sexism at Work Gender Differences in the Distribution of Challenging Developmental Experiences. *Journal of Management, 38*(6), 1835–1866. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310365902>

Kitayama, S., & Uchida, Y. (2005). Interdependent agency: An alternative system for action. In *Cultural and social behavior: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 10, pp. 137–164). Lawrence Erlbaum Mahwah, NJ.

Komarraju, M., Dollinger, S. J., & Lovell, J. L. (2008). Individualism-collectivism in horizontal and vertical directions as predictors of conflict management styles. *International*

Journal of Conflict Management, 19(1), 20–35.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/10444060810849164>

Kozan, K., & Ergin, C. (1999). The influence of intra-cultural value differences on conflict management practices. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 10(3). Retrieved from

<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authType=crawler&jrnl=10444068&AN=2784784&h=jZvMbTA67%2BNnYsxusKCE3cBzRYRx5aNjbNRq%2FY7c01mGuTKilkLoEbK3PXxmiYlIEM0yCTX%2FBtFOdkXanCFyCg%3D%3D&ctrl=c>

Kühnen, U., & Hannover, B. (2000). Assimilation and contrast in social comparisons as a consequence of self-construal activation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(6), 799–811. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0992\(200011/12\)30:6<799::AID-EJSP16>3.0.CO;2-2](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0992(200011/12)30:6<799::AID-EJSP16>3.0.CO;2-2)

Kühnen, U., & Oyserman, D. (2002). Thinking about the self influences thinking in general: cognitive consequences of salient self-concept. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38(5), 492–499. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031\(02\)00011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00011-2)

Lalwani, A. K., & Shavitt, S. (2009). The “me” I claim to be: Cultural self-construal elicits self-presentational goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(1), 88–102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014100>

LeBoeuf, R. A., & Estes, Z. (2004). “Fortunately, I’m no Einstein”: Comparison relevance as a determinant of behavioral assimilation and contrast. *Social Cognition*, 22(6), 607–636. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.22.6.607.54817>

Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., Glick, P., & Chen, Z. (2010). Ambivalent Sexism in Close Relationships: (Hostile) Power and (Benevolent) Romance Shape Relationship Ideals. *Sex Roles*, 62(7–

- 8), 583–601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9770-x>
- Lemyre, L., & Smith, P. M. (1985). Intergroup discrimination and self-esteem in the minimal group paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*(3), 660–670. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.3.660>
- Leung, A. K.-Y., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within-and between-culture variation: individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(3), 507–526. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022151>
- Levine, T. R., Bresnahan, M. J., Park, H. S., Lapinski, M. K., Wittenbaum, G. M., Shearman, S. M., ... Ohashi, R. (2003). Self-Construal Scales Lack Validity. *Human Communication Research*, *29*(2), 210–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2003.tb00837.x>
- Lewin, K. (2008). *Principles of Topological Psychology*. New York: Munshi Press.
- Liao, Y., & Bond, M. H. (2011). The dynamics of face loss following interpersonal harm for Chinese and Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *42*(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110361774>
- Lin, C.-C., & Yamaguchi, S. (2007). Japanese folk concept of *mentsu*: An indigenous approach from psychological perspectives. In G. Zheng, K. Leung, & J. Adair (Eds.), *Perspectives and progress in contemporary cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 343–357). Beijing: The International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology Press.
- Lin, C.-C., & Yamaguchi, S. (2011a). Effects of face experience on emotions and self-esteem in Japanese culture. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*(4), 446–455. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.817>
- Lin, C.-C., & Yamaguchi, S. (2011b). Under What Conditions Do People Feel Face-Loss? Effects of the Presence of Others and Social Roles on the Perception of Losing Face in Japanese Culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *42*(1), 120–124.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110383423>

Lockwood, P. (2006). "SOMEONE LIKE ME CAN BE SUCCESSFUL": DO COLLEGE STUDENTS NEED SAME-GENDER ROLE MODELS? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 36–46.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00260.x>

Lowery, B. S., Eisenberger, N. I., Hardin, C. D., & Sinclair, S. (2007). Long-term effects of subliminal priming on academic performance. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(2), 151–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530701331718>

Ma, V., & Schoeneman, T. J. (1997). Individualism versus collectivism: A comparison of Kenyan and American self-concepts. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 19(2), 261–273.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15324834basp1902_7

MacKerron, G., & Mourato, S. (2013). Happiness is greater in natural environments. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 992–1000.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.03.010>

Mak, W. W., Chen, S. X., Lam, A. G., & Yiu, V. F. (2008). Understanding Distress The Role of Face Concern Among Chinese Americans, European Americans, Hong Kong Chinese, and Mainland Chinese. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(2), 219–248.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008316378>

Mallett, R. K., & Wagner, D. E. (2011). The unexpectedly positive consequences of confronting sexism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(1), 215–220.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.001>

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2003). Models of Agency: Sociocultural Diversity in the

- Construction of Action. In V. Murphy-Berman & J. J. Berman (Eds.), *Cross-cultural Differences in Perspectives on the Self* (Vol. 49). University of Nebraska Press.
- Marsella, A., De Vos, G., & Hsu, F. L. K. (1985). *Culture and self*. London: Tavistock.
- Masser, B. M., & Abrams, D. (2004). Reinforcing the Glass Ceiling: The Consequences of Hostile Sexism for Female Managerial Candidates. *Sex Roles, 51*(9–10), 609–615. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-004-5470-8>
- Matsumoto, D. (1999). Culture and self: An empirical assessment of Markus and Kitayama's theory of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*(3), 289–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00042>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist, 52*(5), 509. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.52.5.509>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of Personality, 60*(2), 175–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x>
- Miller, D. T., & McFarland, C. (1991). When Social Comparison Goes Awry: The Case of Pluralistic Ignorance. In J. Suls & T. Wills (Eds.), *Social Comparison: Contemporary Theory and Research*. Hillsdale, N.J: Erlbaum.
- Mischke, J. (2017, October 25). #MeToo: Female MEPs tell of their own sexual harassment experiences. *Politico*. Retrieved from <https://www.politico.eu/article/european-parliament-metoo-female-meps-tell-of-their-own-sexual-harassment-experiences/>
- Murdock, G. P., & Provost, C. (1973). Factors in the division of labor by sex: A cross-cultural

- analysis. *Ethnology*, 12, 203–225. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3773347>
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Nadler, A. (2015). The other side of the help giving paradigm: Seeking and receiving help. In D. A. Schroeder & W. G. Graziano (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of prosocial behavior* (pp. 307–329). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nier, J. A., Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Banker, B. S., Ward, C. M., & Rust, M. C. (2001). Changing Interracial Evaluations and Behavior: The Effects of a Common Group Identity. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 4(4), 299–316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430201004004001>
- Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). The go/no-go association task. *Social Cognition*, 19(6), 625–666. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.19.6.625.20886>
- Nugent, P. M. S. (2013, April 7). What is CONFLICT? definition of CONFLICT (Psychology Dictionary). Retrieved February 21, 2018, from <https://psychologydictionary.org/conflict/>
- Nussinon, R., Seibt, B., Häfner, M., & Strack, F. (2010). Come a bit closer: Approach motor actions lead to feeling similar and behavioral assimilation. *Social Cognition*, 28(1), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2010.28.1.40>
- O'Donnell, M., Nelson, L., McLatchie, N. M., & Lynott, D. J. (2017). Registered Replication Report: Dijksterhuis & van Knippenberg (1998):Multilab direct replication of: A variant of study 4 from Dijksterhuis, A., & van Knippenberg, A. (1998). The relation between perception and behavior, or how to win a game of trivial pursuit. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/88629/>
- Oetzel, J. G. (1998). The effects of self-construals and ethnicity on self-reported conflict styles.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08934219809367695>

Oetzel, J. G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2003). Face Concerns in Interpersonal Conflict A Cross-Cultural Empirical Test of the Face Negotiation Theory. *Communication Research*, 30(6), 599–624. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650203257841>

Ohbuchi, K.-I., Fukushima, O., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Cultural values in conflict management: Goal orientation, goal attainment, and tactical decision. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(1), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022199030001003>

Ohbuchi, K.-I., & Takahashi, Y. (1994). Cultural Styles of Conflict Management in Japanese and Americans: Passivity, Covertness, and Effectiveness of Strategies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24(15), 1345–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1994.tb01553.x>

Oyserman, D. (2015). Culture as Situated Cognition. In *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118900772.etrds0067>

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 3–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.1.3>

Parrigon, S., Woo, S. E., Tay, L., & Wang, T. (2017). CAPTION-ing the situation: A lexically-derived taxonomy of psychological situation characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112(4), 642. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000111>

Pashler, H., & Harris, C. R. (2012). Is the replicability crisis overblown? Three arguments examined. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6), 531–536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612463401>

- Pashler, H., & Wagenmakers, E. (2012). Editors' Introduction to the Special Section on Replicability in Psychological Science: A Crisis of Confidence? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6), 528–530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612465253>
- paternalism | Definition of paternalism in English by Oxford Dictionaries. (n.d.). Retrieved January 24, 2018, from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/paternalism>
- Perkins, H Wesley. (2002). Social norms and the prevention of alcohol misuse in collegiate contexts. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Supplement*, (s14), 164–172. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsas.2002.s14.164>
- Perkins, H. Wesley, & Berkowitz, A. D. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. *International Journal of the Addictions*, 21(9–10), 961–976. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826088609077249>
- Pichevin, M.-F., & Hurtig, M.-C. (1996). Describing men, describing women: Sex membership salience and numerical distinctiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(4), 513–522. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199607\)26:4<513::AID-EJSP774>3.0.CO;2-Y](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199607)26:4<513::AID-EJSP774>3.0.CO;2-Y)
- Pietri, E. S., Johnson, I. R., Ozgumus, E., & Young, A. I. (2018). Maybe She Is Relatable: Increasing Women's Awareness of Gender Bias Encourages Their Identification With Women Scientists. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 0361684317752643. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684317752643>
- Pollay, R. W., & Lysonski, S. (1993). In the Eye of the Beholder: *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 6(2), 25–43. https://doi.org/10.1300/J046v06n02_04
- Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (1993). Pluralistic ignorance and alcohol use on campus: some consequences of misperceiving the social norm. *Journal of Personality and Social*

- Psychology*, 64(2), 243. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.64.2.243>
- Radke, H. R. M., Hornsey, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2016). Barriers to women engaging in collective action to overcome sexism. *American Psychologist*, 71(9), 863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040345>
- Radke, H. R. M., Hornsey, M. J., Sibley, C. G., & Barlow, F. K. (2017). Negotiating the hierarchy: Social dominance orientation among women is associated with the endorsement of benevolent sexism. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajpy.12176>
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). A Measure of Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(2), 368–376. <https://doi.org/10.2307/255985>
- Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(1), 8–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754>
- Reis, H. T. (2018). Why bottom-up taxonomies are unlikely to satisfy the quest for a definitive taxonomy of situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(3), 489–492. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000158>
- Roberts, M. S., Crooks, W., Tolody, T. J., Pavlovic, T., Rombola, K. J., & Standing, L. G. (2013, January 1). No effect on intelligence from priming. Retrieved May 18, 2017, from <http://www.PsychFileDrawer.org/replication.php?attempt=MTQz>
- Rossiter, M. W. (1984). *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(1), 40–62. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0201_3

- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: the costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 629. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629>
- Rudman, L. A., & Heppen, J. B. (2003). Implicit romantic fantasies and women's interest in personal power: A glass slipper effect? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(11), 1357–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203256906>
- Sampson, E. E. (2000). Reinterpreting individualism and collectivism: Their religious roots and monologic versus dialogic person–other relationship. *American Psychologist, 55*(12), 1425. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.12.1425>
- Sanbonmatsu, D. M., & Fazio, R. H. (1990). The role of attitudes in memory-based decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(4), 614. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.4.614>
- Sarlet, M., Dumont, M., Delacollette, N., & Dardenne, B. (2012). Prescription of protective paternalism for men in romantic and work contexts. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 36*(4), 444–457. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684312454842>
- Sarrasin, O., Gabriel, U., & Gygax, P. (2012). Sexism and Attitudes Toward Gender-Neutral Language. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 71*(3), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185/a000078>
- Saucier, G., Bel-Bahar, T., & Fernandez, C. (2007). What Modifies the Expression of Personality Tendencies? Defining Basic Domains of Situation Variables. *Journal of Personality, 75*(3), 479–504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00446.x>
- Schmader, T., Croft, A., Whitehead, J., & Stone, J. (2013). A Peek Inside the Targets' Toolbox: How Stigmatized Targets Deflect Discrimination by Invoking a Common Identity. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 35*(1), 141–149.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2012.746615>

Schmidt, S. (2009). Shall we really do it again? The powerful concept of replication is neglected in the social sciences. *Review of General Psychology, 13*(2), 90.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015108>

Schroeder, C. M., & Prentice, D. A. (1998). Exposing pluralistic ignorance to reduce alcohol use among college students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(23), 2150–2180.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01365.x>

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*(1), 1–65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60281-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6)

Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist, 54*(2), 93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.2.93>

Shanks, D. R., Newell, B. R., Lee, E. H., Balakrishnan, D., Ekelund, L., Cenac, Z., ... Moore, C. (2013). Priming Intelligent Behavior: An Elusive Phenomenon. *PLoS ONE, 8*(4), e56515.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056515>

Shelton, J. N., & Stewart, R. E. (2004). Confronting perpetrators of prejudice: The inhibitory effects of social costs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*(3), 215–223.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00138.x>

Shnabel, N., Bar-Anan, Y., Kende, A., Bareket, O., & Lazar, Y. (2016). Help to perpetuate traditional gender roles: Benevolent sexism increases engagement in dependency-oriented cross-gender helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*(1), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000037>

Shweder, R. A., & Bourne, E. J. (1984). Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In R. A. Shweder & R. A. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion*

- (pp. 158–199). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sibley, C. G., & Overall, N. C. (2011). A Dual Process Motivational Model of Ambivalent Sexism and Gender Differences in Romantic Partner Preferences. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 303–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684311401838>
- Sibley, C. G., & Wilson, M. S. (2004). Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexist Attitudes Toward Positive and Negative Sexual Female Subtypes. *Sex Roles, 51*(11–12), 687–696. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-004-0718-x>
- Siebler, F., Sabelus, S., & Bohner, G. (2008). A Refined Computer Harassment Paradigm: Validation, and Test of Hypotheses About Target Characteristics. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*(1), 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00404.x>
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science, 22*(11), 1359–1366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417632>
- Simons, D. J. (2014). The Value of Direct Replication. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 9*(1), 76–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613514755>
- Sinclair, L., & Kunda, Z. (1999). Reactions to a Black professional: Motivated inhibition and activation of conflicting stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(5), 885–904. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.885>
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The Measurement of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*(5), 580–591. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205014>
- Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2007). *Social psychology*. Hove[u.a.]: Psychology Press.
- Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). Stereotype threat and women’s math

- performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(1), 4–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1373>
- Stahlberg, D., Braun, F., Irmen, L., & Sczesny, S. (2011). Representation of the Sexes in Language. In K. Fiedler (Ed.), *Social Communication*. Psychology Press.
- Stahlberg, D., & Sczesny, S. (2001). Effekte des generischen Maskulinums und alternativer Sprachformen auf den gedanklichen Einbezug von Frauen.
<https://doi.org/10.1026//0033-3042.52.3.131>
- Stangor, C., Sechrist, G. B., & Jost, J. T. (2001). Changing Racial Beliefs by Providing Consensus Information. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(4), 486–496.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201274009>
- Stone, J., Whitehead, J., Schmader, T., & Focella, E. S. (2011). Thanks for asking: Self-affirming questions reduce backlash when stigmatized targets confront prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(3), 589–598.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.12.016>
- Strack, F., & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and Impulsive Determinants of Social Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3), 220–247.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0803_1
- Stroebe, W., & Strack, F. (2014). The Alleged Crisis and the Illusion of Exact Replication. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(1), 59–71.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613514450>
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199–214.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199>
- Swim, J. K., Becker, J. C., & DeCoster, J. (2010). Core dimensions underlying contemporary

- measures of sexist beliefs. *Manuscript in Preparation*.
- Swim, J. K., Becker, J. C., Lee, E., & Pruitt, E. R. (2009). Sexism reloaded: Worldwide evidence for its endorsement, expression, and emergence in multiple contexts. *Handbook of Diversity in Feminist Psychology*, 137–172.
- Swim, J. K., Becker, J. C., Lee, E., & Pruitt, E.-R. (2010). Sexist Beliefs Around the World. In H. Landrine & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Handbook of Diversity in Feminist Psychology*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—What did you just say?!: Women’s public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(1), 68–88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1370>
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday Sexism: Evidence for Its Incidence, Nature, and Psychological Impact From Three Daily Diary Studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 31–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00200>
- Swim, J. K., Mallett, R., & Stangor, C. (2004). Understanding Subtle Sexism: Detection and Use of Sexist Language. *Sex Roles*, 51(3–4), 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000037757.73192.06>
- Tajfel, H. (2010). *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1(2), 149–178. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420010202>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual

- bases of person memory and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(7), 778–793. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.36.7.778>
- Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G., Trubisky, P., Yang, Z., Soo Kim, H., Lin, S.-L., & Nishida, T. (1991). Culture, face maintenance, and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: A study in five cultures. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 2(4), 275–296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022702>
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: an updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(2), 187–225. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(98\)00004-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(98)00004-2)
- Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., & Oetzel, J. G. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(1), 47–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(99\)00023-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(99)00023-1)
- Tjosvold, D., & Sun, H. F. (2002). Understanding Conflict Avoidance: Relationship, Motivations, Actions, and Consequences. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(2), 142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022872>
- Toch, H., & Kolfas, J. (1984). Pluralistic Ignorance, Revisited. In G. M. Stephenson & J. H. Davis (Eds.), *Progress in Applied Social Psychology* (Vol. 2). New York: Wiley.
- Torelli, C. J. (2006). Individuality or conformity? The effect of independent and interdependent self-concepts on public judgments. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 16(3), 240–248. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp1603_6
- Travaglia, L. K., Overall, N. C., & Sibley, C. G. (2009). Benevolent and Hostile Sexism and preferences for romantic partners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(6), 599–604. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.015>

- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Interscience.
- Triandis, Harry C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, *96*(3), 506. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295X.96.3.506>
- Trubisky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S.-L. (1991). The influence of individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *15*(1), 65–84. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(91\)90074-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(91)90074-Q)
- Uchino, B. N., Cacioppo, J. T., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (1996). The relationship between social support and physiological processes: a review with emphasis on underlying mechanisms and implications for health. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*(3), 488. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.3.488>
- United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
- United Nations Development Programme. (1998). *Human development report 1998*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Van Baaren, R. B., Maddux, W. W., Chartrand, T. L., De Bouter, C., & van Knippenberg, A. (2003). It takes two to mimic: behavioral consequences of self-construals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(5), 1093. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1093>
- Van Heck, G. L. (1984). The construction of a general taxonomy of situations. In H. Bonarius, G. L. Van Heck, & N. Smid (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe: Theoretical and Empirical Developments* (pp. 149–164). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- van Zomeren, M. (2013). Four Core Social-Psychological Motivations to Undertake Collective Action. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *7*(6), 378–388. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12031>

- Van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: a quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(4), 504. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504>
- Verplanken, B., Trafimow, D., Khusid, I. K., Holland, R. W., & Steentjes, G. M. (2008). Different selves, different values: Effects of self-construals on value activation and use. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(6), 909–919. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.587>
- Vorauer, J. D., Martens, V., & Sasaki, S. J. (2009). When trying to understand detracts from trying to behave: Effects of perspective taking in intergroup interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(4), 811–827. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013411>
- Weingarten, E., Chen, Q., McAdams, M., Yi, J., Hepler, J., & Albarracín, D. (2016). From primed concepts to action: A meta-analysis of the behavioral effects of incidentally presented words. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(5), 472–497. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000030>
- Wheeler, S. C., & DeMarree, K. G. (2009). Multiple Mechanisms of Prime-to-Behavior Effects. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3(4), 566–581. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00187.x>
- Wheeler, S. C., DeMarree, K. G., & Petty, R. E. (2007). Understanding the role of the self in prime-to-behavior effects: The active-self account. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(3), 234–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868307302223> Format
- Wheeler, S. C., DeMarree, K. G., & Petty, R. E. (2014). Understanding prime-to-behavior effects: Insights from the active-self account. *Understanding Priming Effects in Social Psychology*, 114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.6.1014>
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study* (rev. Sage

- Publications, Inc. Retrieved from <http://doi.apa.org/psycinfo/1990-97701-000>
- Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A Model of Dual Attitudes. *Psychological Review*, *107*(1), 101–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.107.1.101>
- Woodzicka, J. A., & LaFrance, M. (2001). Real versus imagined gender harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00199>
- World Economic Forum. (2017). The Global Gender Gap Report 2017. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2017.pdf
- Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(6), 994. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.994>
- Yabuuchi, A. (2004). Face in Chinese, Japanese, and U.S. American cultures. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, *14*(2), 261–297. <https://doi.org/10.1075/japc.14.2.05yab>
- Ybarra, O., & Trafimow, D. (1998). How priming the private self or collective self affects the relative weights of attitudes and subjective norms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*(4), 362–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167298244003>
- Zane, N., & Yeh, M. (2002). The Use of Culturally-Based Variables in Assessment: Studies on Loss of Face. In K. S. Kurasaki, S. Okazaki, & S. Sue (Eds.), *Asian American Mental Health* (pp. 123–138). Springer US. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4615-0735-2_9

Attachment

Erklärung über die Eigenständigkeit der erbrachten wissenschaftlichen Leistung

Ich erkläre hiermit, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit ohne unzulässige Hilfe Dritter und ohne Benutzung anderer als der angegebenen Hilfsmittel angefertigt habe. Die aus anderen Quellen direkt oder indirekt übernommenen Daten und Konzepte sind unter Angabe der Quelle gekennzeichnet.

Bei der Auswahl und Auswertung folgenden Materials haben mir die nachstehend aufgeführten Personen in der jeweils beschriebenen Weise unentgeltlich geholfen.

1. Studie „Collective Action against Sexism in Germany, Turkey, and Japan: The Influence of Self-Constraint and Face Concerns“
Datenerhebung und länderspezifische Beratung: Mie Kito und Dilek Zamantılı Nayır.
Supervision und Mitwirkung am Artikel: Julia C. Becker.
Diese Studie wurde von den folgenden Autoren und Ko-Autoren erstellt (in der korrekten Reihenfolge der Autorenschaft): Freyja B. Fischer, Julia C. Becker, Mie Kito, Dilek Zamantılı Nayır.
2. Studie „Situational variables moderate the perceived likelihood and acceptability of benevolent and hostile sexist behavior: the impact of locations, interpersonal associates, and passively experienced processes“
Fragebogenerstellung und Datenauswertung durch Julia C. Becker und Janet K. Swim.
Diese Studie wurde von den folgenden Autoren und Ko-Autoren erstellt (in der korrekten Reihenfolge der Autorenschaft): Julia C. Becker, Janet K. Swim, Stephanie H. de Oliveira Laux, Helena Radke, Freyja B. Fischer
3. Studie „Are women getting smarter when primed with a female professor (compared to male professor)? Replication and extension of the professor stereotype priming effect on general knowledge“
Supervision und Mitwirkung am Artikel: Julia C. Becker.
Diese Studie wurde von den folgenden Autoren und Ko-Autoren erstellt (in der korrekten Reihenfolge der Autorenschaft): Freyja B. Fischer, Julia C. Becker.

Weitere Personen waren an der inhaltlichen materiellen Erstellung der vorliegenden Arbeit nicht beteiligt. Insbesondere habe ich hierfür nicht die entgeltliche Hilfe von Vermittlungs- bzw. Beratungsdiensten (Promotionsberater oder andere Personen) in Anspruch genommen. Niemand hat von mir unmittelbar oder mittelbar geldwerte Leistungen für Arbeiten erhalten, die im Zusammenhang mit dem Inhalt der vorgelegten Dissertation stehen.

Die Arbeit wurde bisher weder im In- noch im Ausland in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form einer anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt.

.....
(Ort, Datum)

.....
(Unterschrift)