

Lay Judgements of Benevolent Sexism:
What Factors play a Role when Perceiving Benevolent Sexism?

Annemieke F. Visser
S4375882

CFBGR03610: Capstone Project

Under the supervision of:

Dr. Pelin Gül
Campus Fryslân, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

June 5th, 2023

Abstract

Aims: Although benevolent sexism is often phrased in a positive way, the effect of this form of sexism can have negative effects. However, because of its positive tone and disguise, benevolently sexist acts are often not labelled as ‘sexism’. This research aims to add to the existing literature on benevolent sexism by researching what factors influence lay judgements of benevolent sexism. This paper focuses on factors as perceived harm and perceived intent. Additionally, individual differences, namely age and political orientation are also discussed. This research aims to answer the following research question: *To what extent do perceived harm, intent, and individual differences relate to lay judgements of benevolent sexism?*

Methods: A survey was conducted among participants who are 18 years and older. The questionnaire asked the above mentioned individual characteristics and then participants evaluated four scenarios describing a man uttering a benevolently sexist expression against a woman. The scenarios varied in terms of type of benevolent sexism (2 types: 1) offering unsolicited help, or 2) praising her feminine, communal traits) and setting (2 settings: work or social). Each participant was randomly assigned to rate two of the four scenarios in that, they always saw both types of benevolent sexism, but one was placed in a work setting and the other was placed in a social setting. Participants agreed or disagreed with statements about the scenario, indicating the perceived intent, perceived harm, moral wrongness and whether the behaviour as well as the actor could be defined as sexist. Additionally, participants had the possibility to share their thoughts on the scenario in an open-ended question, which were thematically analysed using a deductive approach.

Results: The quantitative data proves that perceived intent did not influence the perceived level of sexism. There was a significant correlation between perceived harm and judgements of sexism. Additionally, political orientation influenced judgements of benevolent sexism, perceived harm, and moral wrongness, indicating that left-wing individuals perceived higher levels of sexism, harm, and moral wrongness. In some, but not all, scenarios age influenced the judgements of benevolent sexism. In the qualitative data for scenario 1 (work and social setting), intent and harm were often mentioned as a motivation for the judgements of the statement. In scenario 2 (work and social setting), these variables were mentioned less, but stereotypes were touched upon more frequently. In general, scenario 2 was more often seen as positive and a compliment in comparison to scenario 1.

Conclusions: This study clarifies the variables affecting lay perspectives on benevolent sexism. It draws attention to the complexity of the situation, which also includes the roles of perceived intent, perceived harm, individual differences, and variations in judgements between scenarios and versions. Future study can help to improve the understanding of benevolent sexism and its effects on society by taking into account these elements and recognising the differences between academic and lay definitions of sexism.

Keywords: Benevolent Sexism, Lay Judgements, Perceived Harm, Perceived Intent, Individual Characteristics, Political Orientation, Age

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Table of Contents	2
Lay Judgements of Benevolent Sexism: What Factors play a Role when Perceiving Benevolent Sexism?	3
What is Hostile Sexism?	4
What are the Negative Effects of Hostile Sexism?	5
What is Benevolent Sexism?	5
What are the Negative Effects of Benevolent Sexism?	6
What Factors Play a Role in Perceiving Benevolent Sexism?	7
Gaps in the Literature	9
The Current Study	9
Method	11
Participants	11
Design & Procedure	11
Measures	12
Ethical Considerations	14
Data Analysis Plan	15
Results	16
Quantitative Data	16
Scenario 1 - Work Setting	16
Scenario 1 - Social Setting	17
Scenario 2 - Work Setting	19
Scenario 2 - Social Setting	20
Descriptive Statistics from the Scenarios	22
Qualitative Data	24
Scenario 1	24
Scenario 2	25
Discussion	26
Conclusion	29
References	30
Appendix A. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants	38
Appendix B. Qualitative Data	40
Scenario 1 - Work Setting	40
Scenario 1 - Social Setting	42
Scenario 2 - Work Setting	44
Scenario 2 - Social Setting	46

Lay Judgements of Benevolent Sexism: What Factors play a Role when Perceiving Benevolent Sexism?

In the past few months, various news outlets wrote an article about the arrest of influencer Andrew Tate in December 2022 (Gill, 2023; Mistlin, 2023; Radford, 2023; Sugiura, 2023). The previous kickbox champion is well known for his motivational videos and “*Hustlers University*” teaching people how to become rich (Mistlin, 2023; Sugiura, 2023). The multimillionaire, who is banned from multiple social media platforms, became famous through all the controversy that surrounded his content (Radford, 2023; Sugiura, 2023). Andrew describes himself as a misogynist – a person who despises or discriminates against women – and often has sexist statements (Gill, 2023; Mistlin, 2023; Radford, 2023; Sugiura, 2023). Tate has many followers and his videos are viewed by millions despite being banned himself (Mistlin, 2023; Radford, 2023; Sugiura, 2023). However, the sexist statement and ideology is not uncommon, as countries worldwide are familiar with this movement (Gill, 2023). While Tate has been arrested in Romania in the end of 2022 for rape allegations, as well as human trafficking and organised crime, his followers and the sexist attitudes remain (Gill, 2023; Mistlin, 2023; Radford, 2023; Sugiura, 2023).

Even though the situation has vastly improved in some countries, sexism is a phenomenon that is still experienced worldwide (Becker & Wright, 2011; Riemer et al., 2014). Leaper and Spears Brown (2014) define sexism as prejudice and discrimination that is directed towards someone based on their gender. Sexism is a common societal issue that occurs in various settings, such as the workplace (Becker & Wright, 2011), education (Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014), and interpersonal relationships (Riemer et al., 2014). It can be expressed in different ways, including behavioural, verbal and institutional practices that add to inequalities in treatments among different genders (e.g. men and women) (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005).

Sexism can take different forms, such as stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Koc, 2023; Plous, 2003). A stereotype is a cognitive representation of a social group, formed by particular characteristics and they can be either positive, negative or neutral in value (Koc, 2023; Plous, 2003). A prejudice is a positive or negative evaluation of a person (Koc, 2023; Plous, 2003). Discrimination is the behavioural component and occurs when one would treat people based on prejudice (Koc, 2023; Plous, 2003). What is considered sexism can differ among people. This is because sexism is related to the conventional gender norms, which are societal expectations and beliefs about how men and women should behave (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Cislighi & Heise, 2020; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001a; Hammond et al., 2017; Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014; Masser et al., 2010).

Glick & Fiske (1996) were highly influential within sexism research, as they have developed the Ambivalent Sexism Theory. This theory distinguishes between hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, creating a deeper understanding of sexism and its ambiguity (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001a; Hammond et al., 2017; Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014; Masser et al., 2010). In short, hostile sexism can be defined as an attitude towards women that is negative and discriminatory, motivated by a desire to preserve male supremacy

and authority, whereas benevolent sexism is defined as an apparent positive view of women that idealises them, yet limiting their roles and reinforcing gender stereotypes (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001a; Hammond et al., 2017; Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014; Masser et al., 2010).

Andrew Tate's attitude and behaviour could be labelled as hostile sexist, as he conveys a harsh and insulting attitude through the use of disparaging language and the objectification of women (Gill, 2023; Mistlin, 2023; Radford, 2023; Sugiura, 2023). It is crucial to comprehend that Tate's supporters frequently support him and might not be aware of the sexist sentiments (Sugiura, 2023). They often refer to Tate's videos, which have names like "Why women are the most precious thing", where he displays benevolent sexism by idealising women (Sugiura, 2023). By emphasising how attractive and sexually available women are, these videos support the assumption that men should protect and dominate them (Sugiura, 2023). Nevertheless, his followers may remain unaware of the benevolent sexist attitudes, as benevolent sexism is disguised as a compliment

Additionally, when sexism is perceived is highly dependent on the individual. Factors such as intention, harmfulness and moral wrongness have been proven to affect the extent to which benevolent sexism is recognised (Böttcher, 2021; Swim et al., 2003). Furthermore, literature suggests that feminism and political orientation could also influence the perception of benevolent sexism (Bieselt, 2021; De Geus et al., 2022; Hellmer et al., 2018).

This thesis aims to identify what factors play a role in judgements of benevolent sexism. Specifically, the study will focus on the perceived intent, perceived harm and individual characteristics such as age and political orientation. Within this paper, the following research question will be answered: *To what extent do perceived harm, intent, and individual differences relate to lay judgements of benevolent sexism?*

What is Hostile Sexism?

Within social psychology, a distinction is made between hostile and benevolent sexism, based on the Ambivalent Sexism Theory (Glick et al., 2000; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001b, 2001a; Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014). An understanding of hostile sexism is needed, before elaborating on benevolent sexism, as this is the more visible variant of sexism (Barreto & Doyle, 2023). Hostile Sexism is defined as negative attitudes towards those who challenge conventional gender norms (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001a; Hammond et al., 2017; Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014; Masser et al., 2010). Hostile sexism has a derogatory tone and disparages women (such as successful female leaders) who question conventional gender roles and ideology (Barreto & Doyle, 2023). It conveys the idea that gender interactions are conflicting, with women seeking to rule over males and endangering their position of social superiority (Barreto & Doyle, 2023; Sibley et al., 2007). In the *Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* (ASI), which was developed by Glick & Fiske (1996, 2001a), the following statements are displayed as examples of hostile sexism; "Women are offended too quickly", "Once a woman

has a man's commitment, she often seeks to control him tightly”, or “Most women neglect to acknowledge all the things men do for them”.

What are the Negative Effects of Hostile Sexism?

One of the negative effects of hostile sexism is the reinforcement of traditional gender norms. Glick and Fiske (1996) claim that sexist people divide women into two categories: those who preserve gender norms that favour male domination (the preferred group) and those who challenge or threaten male dominance (the disfavored group). By preferring certain women and despising others, they can maintain consistency and reinforce conventional gender norms (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Another negative effect of hostile sexism is degrading women in powerful positions (Masser & Abrams, 2004). Female politicians often face an increased amount of hateful online comments, compared to males, with almost 40% targeting their gender (Saris & van der Ven, 2021). However, sexism is not only present when women are in power positions, but sexism might also hinder females in receiving such a position (Masser & Abrams, 2004).

Despite having the right qualifications, many women find it difficult to advance in their employment, which is known as the "glass ceiling" (Maume, 2004; Purcell et al., 2010). Despite having the abilities and the desire, women are less likely than white men to assume leadership positions (Maume, 2004; Purcell et al., 2010). When it comes to obstacles, women who experience the "glass ceiling" mention sexism, sexist behaviour, sexual harassment, penalty for getting pregnant, patriarchal prejudices, and salary discrepancies during hiring and promotion (Daniels, 2021).

By reducing support for female managers and causing negative evaluations of female applicants, hostile sexism perpetuates the glass ceiling (Masser & Abrams, 2004). Conversely, suggestions to hire male applicants for managerial positions are connected to greater levels of hostile sexism. In conclusion, hostile sexism prevents women from obtaining managerial positions, hence maintaining the glass ceiling (Masser & Abrams, 2004).

What is Benevolent Sexism?

Supporters of hostile sexism often endorse benevolent sexism as well (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Hammond et al., 2017). Benevolent sexism idealises and flatters women who uphold traditional norms (such as mothers caring for her children instead of working) and presents women as morally upright and especially compassionate, yet also as helpless and incapable (Barreto & Doyle, 2023). It presents gender roles as complementary, with women responsible for nurturing and reproduction and males in charge of security and safety (Barreto & Doyle, 2023). While it is framed as a compliment, making benevolent sexism often appear positive, it does not align with typical beliefs about prejudice (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001a; Matthew D Hammond et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2014; Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014; B. Masser et al., 2010). Therefore, as this form of sexism is less obvious, it remains under the radar

and its perception is highly dependent on individual views, morals and perceived harm and intention (e.g. Bieselt, 2021; Böttcher, 2021; Jones et al., 2014).

There are three facets of benevolent sexist views (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The idea that women and men vary from one another in positive ways is known as gender differentiation. The principle of protective paternalism holds that males should provide safety for women because they deserve it. Finally, the notion of heterosexual intimacy holds that males require women in order to be complete. The following remarks are shown as an example of benevolent sexism in the *Ambivalent Sexism Inventory* (ASI), which was created by Glick & Fiske (1996, 2001a); “Men ought to nurture and defend women” (protective paternalism), “There is a purity in many women that is uncommon in men” (gender differentiation), or “No matter how successful he may be, a man cannot be fully whole until he has the love of a woman” (heterosexual intimacy). Benevolent sexist statements still support traditional gender norms by complimenting women on how well they fit the stereotype, making women comfortable within those stereotypes (Becker & Wright, 2011). Two ways in which benevolent sexism is expressed through behaviour, is with providing unsolicited help, which is connected to protective paternalism, and emphasising femininity, which is linked to gender differentiation (Dardenne et al., 2007; Good & Rudman, 2009; Shnabel et al., 2015).

By intimidating or discriminating against women in the political or professional spheres (hostile sexism) (Connor et al., 2016), as well as rewarding and praising women who conform to traditional gender roles (benevolent sexism) (Hammond & Overall, 2016), sexist ideologies work to maintain gender inequality across societies (Brandt, 2011; Glick et al., 2000; Glick & Fiske, 1996). However, reinforcement of gender norms is not the only negative consequence of benevolent sexism.

What are the Negative Effects of Benevolent Sexism?

Workplace. Similar to hostile sexism, benevolent sexism can put women to a disadvantage in the workplace (King et al., 2010; Maume, 2004; Purcell et al., 2010). Research shows that male managers endure more challenging situations and male targets are given more difficult situations than female targets when the assessors have high levels of benevolent sexism (King et al., 2010). This limits women's possibilities for advancement within the company and leads to their underrepresentation at higher organisational levels. For instance, there are multiple examples of gender discrimination cases where women were refused promotion because they displayed too much “femininity” (Adams & Funk, 2010; Branson, 2007). Furthermore, female self-perception is changed by being exposed to benevolent sexism, which impacts their career objectives and willingness to pass on leadership responsibilities to male team members (Barreto et al., 2010).

Domestic Violence & Sexual Harassment. Benevolent sexism is linked to beliefs that defend domestic violence, minimise its severeness, and blame victims (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Valor-Segura et al., 2011; Yamawaki et al., 2009). Moreover, it is linked to sexual harassment, since benevolent sexism leads to males frequently assume that women are

consenting to sexual behaviour, and negative attitudes towards rape victims (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Fraser, 2015; Hellmer et al., 2018; Masser et al., 2010; Viki et al., 2004). The research by Masser and colleagues (2010) demonstrated that a combination of victim stereotyping, gender stereotyping, and benevolent sexism affected victim-blaming. Respondents had a tendency to blame victims in particular if they fit the stereotype of being unethical or sexually permissive or if they violated gender expectations. Additionally, even when the rape victim did not fit any stereotypes, those with greater levels of benevolent sexism were more inclined to blame the victim (Abrams et al., 2003; Masser et al., 2010). Furthermore, a study by Durán et al. (2016) discovered that women's coping mechanisms and emotional responses to sexual assault might be severely impacted by an abusive partner's benevolent sexist beliefs, which may contribute to the perpetuation of gender-based violence.

Reinforcing Gender Norms. Like hostile sexism, benevolent sexism perpetuates gender inequality and stereotypes (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001a). Gender stereotypes are spread by benevolent sexism just as effectively as by hostile sexism (Ramos et al., 2018). According to Ramos et al. (2018), both hostile and benevolent sexism have an impact on how people view men and women's attributes, with hostile sexism causing people to judge women as less warm and competent while benevolent sexism causes people to judge women as more warm but less competent. In addition, benevolent sexism may be viewed as a coping strategy used by women to handle the hostile attitudes and behaviour they encounter from males (Fischer, 2006).

Moreover, at an international level, the extent of endorsement of benevolent sexism is related to United Nations indicators of gender inequality, such as the involvement of women in the economy and politics (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick et al., 2000; Glick & Fiske, 2001a). Women who encounter sexism are sometimes criticised for pursuing careers in male-dominated fields, however, blaming the victim does not solve the issue; rather, it fails to hold the damaging cultural norms accountable (Baires & Koch, 2020). The ways in which benevolent sexism weakens women's resistance to societal gender inequalities are frequently brought up (e.g., Becker & Wright, 2011; Hammond & Sibley, 2011). Moreover, benevolent sexism encourages women to invest in their relationships rather than pursue career or educational goals (Chen et al., 2009; Mastari et al., 2019; Montañés et al., 2013).

What Factors Play a Role in Perceiving Benevolent Sexism?

As benevolent sexism commonly comes across as positive, despite its negative implications, the lay judgements of benevolent sexism is an interesting field (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2001a; Hammond et al., 2017; Leaper & Spears Brown, 2014). When benevolent sexism is perceived by someone, is highly dependent on who this person is and what beliefs this person carries (Hodson & Dhont, 2015; Mastari et al., 2019; Van Assche et al., 2019). Often, people define fundamental moral principles – what is morally right and wrong – differently, as it is often based on their personal views as well as the norms within their culture (Mastari et al., 2019; Scott, 2000; Waldmann et al., 2012). One judges

behaviour based on the morals and standards one has. Therefore, it is interesting to see what role perceived harm, perceived intent, and individual differences could have on the judgement of benevolent sexist behaviour.

Research points out that harm and intent have a role in the lay judgements of benevolent sexism (Bieselt, 2021). Harm and intent are important factors when judging behaviour as the research by Swim et al. (2003) and Böttcher (2021) points out. When the harm was significant and the actor's intent was bad, people were more inclined to judge the action as sexist, prejudiced or discriminating (Böttcher, 2021; Swim et al., 2003).

Individual differences that might have an influence on judgements of benevolent sexism are: level of feminism, political orientation, age, gender and education level (Bieselt, 2021; De Geus et al., 2022; Hellmer et al., 2018; Mastari et al., 2019). Women who have encountered sexism—such as sexual harassment or sexist remarks—are more likely to have feminist or non-conforming attitudes towards gender norms and to be more supportive of women's movements (Renzetti, 1987). Therefore, it's plausible that some feminists may have encountered sexism in the past and are therefore more able to identify it. As an example, one research by Bieselt (2021) investigated the role of feminist perspectives on the judgement of benevolent sexism and concluded that perceived harm, intent and sexism were positively related to feminism levels. In other words, people with feminist views are more likely to perceive (benevolent) sexism.

Political views are often aligned with our morals (Graham et al., 2009; Thoma, 1993; Weisberg, 2005; Zakharin & Bates, 2021). Therefore, parallels can be drawn between prejudice and political orientation (Hellmer et al., 2018). Graham et al. (2009) have developed the *Moral Foundations Hypothesis*, which states that liberals base morality on different foundations compared to conservatives. Whereas conservatives base their morals rather evenly on the five foundations, liberals put more emphasis on Harm/care and Fairness/reciprocity (Graham et al., 2009). Since harm has proven an important indicator for benevolent sexism (Bieselt, 2021; Böttcher, 2021; Swim et al., 2003), liberals might be more sensitive to perceiving harm from benevolent sexist acts and be more likely to label them as 'sexist'.

Morals and judgements differ across one's age, making age an important factor in moral judgement research (Basinger et al., 1995; McNair et al., 2018; O'connor et al., 2021). However, the effect of age on moral judgements is often overlooked (McNair et al., 2018). Its influence became evident in the research by De Geus et al. (2022) and Glick et al. (2002), showing that younger people have lower levels of sexism compared to older people.

Moreover, literature points out that high levels of education are associated with less prejudiced and sexist attitudes (Benson & Vincent, 1980; De Geus et al., 2022; Glick et al., 2002).

Overall, Hellmer and colleagues (2018) conducted a study, looking at a range of individual differences. They proved that the following individual characteristics predict hostile sexism or both hostile and benevolent sexism; low empathic concern, low Openness and Agreeableness (part of the OCEAN / Big 5 personality traits), social dominance orientation

(SDO), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), religiosity, the male gender and low education level. In more detail, the male gender is the main predictor of hostile sexism, followed by SDO, RWA, and poor educational level. RWA is the main predictor of benevolent sexism, followed by male gender, SDO, and religion. Low empathy predicts both hostile and benevolent sexism, and benevolent sexism is also predicted by low perspective taking. Thus, with their research Hellmer and colleagues (2018) replicated findings from previous studies looking at individual differences that contribute to and predict different forms of sexism.

Religion may encourage benevolent sexism by putting a strong emphasis on traditional values (Hellmer et al., 2018; Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014). This is supported by the research by Mikołajczak & Pietrzak (2014), who specifically looked at Catholic religiosity. However, since there is a wide variety of religions (Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014), researching the effect of religion on lay judgements of benevolent sexism is out of the scope of this research.

Gaps in the Literature

Until now, the role of intent and harm in judgements of prejudice and discrimination was studied (Swim et al., 2003), as well as on racial group membership and judgements of intent, harm, and discrimination (Simon et al., 2019). Furthermore, research looked at the effect of comment type and perpetrator type on women's perceptions of sexism, (Riemer et al., 2014) and the role of intent and harm in judgements of sexism towards women in the workplace (Bieselt, 2021).

Additionally, research has been done on the impact of individual differences in the context of lay judgements of hostile and benevolent sexism (Hodson & Dhont, 2015; Van Assche et al., 2019). Especially characteristics such as political orientation, age and feminism levels are interesting to look at. As an example, age has not yet been researched in the context of judging sexism, but solely in the context of expressing hostile or benevolent sexism (De Geus et al., 2022).

However, to fully understand lay judgements of (benevolent) sexism one needs to take into account all of the relevant factors, which is what my research aims to do. The research will be conducted within different fields, such as social psychology, sociology and gender studies. With my Capstone, I aim to answer the following research question: *To what extent do perceived harm, intent, and individual differences relate to lay judgements of benevolent sexism?*

The Current Study

Overall, this research will focus on benevolent sexism since it is more ambiguous when one perceives a statement or act as (benevolent) sexist. As the literature describes, many factors play a role in when benevolent sexism is recognised. Among those are perceived intent, perceived harm and a variety of individual characteristics, such as political orientation, age, and feminism. This research predicts the following results:

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

Hypothesis 1:

When perceived intent is high, benevolent sexism will also be perceived as high.

Hypothesis 2:

When perceived harm is high, benevolent sexism will also be perceived as high.

Hypothesis 3:

Individual differences in demographics and ideology will be correlated with how benevolent sexism is perceived. Specific hypothesis are:

Hypothesis 3a:

Individuals who identify as politically progressive, liberal or left-oriented would be more likely to perceive benevolent sexism acts as sexist.

Hypothesis 3b:

Individuals who identify as politically progressive, liberal or left-oriented would be more likely to perceive benevolent sexism acts as harmful.

Hypothesis 3c:

Individuals who identify as politically progressive, liberal or left-oriented would be more likely to perceive benevolent sexism acts as morally wrong.

Hypothesis 3d:

Younger individuals would be more likely to perceive benevolent sexism acts as sexist.

Hypothesis 3e:

Individuals who score high on the Feminist scale (LFAIS) would be more likely to perceive benevolent sexism acts as sexist.

Method

Participants

Participants were gathered through the network of both the researcher and the supervisor, using convenience sampling. The online survey was spread through several social media platforms, such as WhatsApp, Instagram, LinkedIn and Facebook. By spreading the questionnaire on several platforms, different social groups were reached. Additionally, participants were asked to share the questionnaire within their networks. By using the snowball method, more people were reached outside of the networks of the researcher and supervisor. Additionally, the questionnaire was shared on a survey platform (SurveyCircle), where participants unrelated to the researcher were able to fill in the questionnaire.

One criteria for participation was that respondents had to be above the age of 18. If participants were younger than 18, the questionnaire would not accept the answers. No other requirements were made for participation, as the research aims to find a connection between individual differences and the lay judgements of benevolent sexism (BS).

In total, 168 responses were collected of which 123 respondents finished the questionnaire. Those participants varied between 18 and 76 years old, the mean is 28,08 years old and the standard deviation is 12,76. Most of the participants identified as women, as well as heterosexual. Additionally, since the study was conducted in the Netherlands and participants were gathered through convenience sampling, most participants currently reside in the Netherlands and most have a Dutch nationality. Most participants identify as White - European. The majority of participants have a high school degree as the highest education degree, however, 65,9% are currently studying. Finally, more than half of the respondents would consider themselves politically progressive, so left-oriented. An overview of the demographics can be found in Appendix A (table 8).

Design & Procedure

A questionnaire was created using Qualtrics. Participants first saw general information about the research as well as privacy information and the rights of participants. Consent to participate was asked at the bottom of the page.. After consent was given, participants filled in demographics and individual characteristics. The participant continued to judge two scenarios that could fall under BS. One of those scenarios was in a social setting, whereas the other was in a work setting. The survey ended with a message thanking the participant for taking the time, as well as the contact information of the researcher, the supervisor and the Ethics Committee.

In total, two different scenarios were created and both were adapted to have a work environment version and a social setting version. This was done in order to see if work situated scenarios would be rated differently than scenarios in a social setting. The content of each scenario was kept the same, only the words relating to work or social setting were changed (so as examples; co-worker was changed to friend; and storage room was changed to car). The scenarios were based on the two behaviours through which BS is expressed, namely providing

unsolicited help (scenario 1) and emphasising femininity (scenario 2). If participants saw one scenario in the work environment version, then the second scenario was in the social setting version. Therefore, participants do not see the same scenario twice, albeit in different versions, but they have judged one work and one social scenario. Hence, there were two ways to fill in the survey; scenario 1 in the work version and scenario 2 in the social version or; scenario 1 in the social version and scenario 2 in the work version. Qualtrics made an even distribution (controlled randomisation) among the two options.

Measures

Demographics. Eleven demographic questions were asked to gather data on individual characteristics. The questions asked participants' age, gender and sexual orientation. On the second page, questions about country of residence, nationality and ethnicity were asked. Thirdly, the participant answered questions about their highest educational degree and if the participant is currently studying (and if yes, for what degree). On the final page, the participant was asked about their political orientation.

Feminist views. After the political orientation, participants were asked about their (dis)agreement on certain statements to measure the level of feminism of participants. These statements were based on the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS), which was developed by Morgan (1996). Originally, the LFAIS is a 60-item questionnaire, but since this would make the survey too long for voluntary participation, it was decided to use the short version of the LFAIS, which consists of eleven questions (Morgan, 1996). The three items that referred to a particular country (United States) were altered to fit a wider audience. The first statement was altered from "*Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.*" to "*Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of a country.*". The tenth statement "*Women in the U.S. are treated as second-class citizens. 11.*" was altered to "*Women are treated as second-class citizens.*". Finally, the seventh statement "*America should pass the Equal Rights Amendment.*" was left out completely, as this statement could not be replicated on a global scale. However, due to an oversight in the programming of the survey, the feminist scale was not displayed to participants of the questionnaire. Hence, no data was collected on feminism levels of participants.

Scenarios. In total two scenarios were created, based on unsolicited help and emphasised femininity. Of each of those two scenarios two versions were created, one version in a work setting and one version in a social setting (see table 1).

Table 1
Scenarios and Versions

	Work setting	Social setting
Scenario 1	Dave notices that his female co-worker is carrying a heavy box to the storage room. Without hesitation, he offers to carry the box for her, saying, "Let me take that for you, it's too heavy for a delicate lady like you."	Dave notices that his female friend is carrying a heavy box to the car. Without hesitation, he offers to carry the box for her, saying, "Let me take that for you, it's too heavy for a delicate lady like you."
Scenario 2	At a company meeting, Chris, a male manager, is introducing a new female employee to the team. He says, "We are so lucky to have her on board. She's not only intelligent and talented but also has a warm and nurturing personality. She'll be a great addition to our team, bringing a feminine touch that we've been missing."	At a chess meet-up group, Chris, the male organiser, is introducing a new female chess player to the others. He says, "We are so lucky to have her on board. She's not only intelligent and talented but also has a warm and nurturing personality. She'll be a great addition to our group, bringing a feminine touch that we've been missing."

Judgements of Intent, Harm, and Sexism of Behaviour and Character. Participants were asked to assess how much they agreed with five statements for each situation (see table 2). By assessing their agreement with the phrase "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is intentional" participants collected their perception of the actor's intention. Their agreement with the statement "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is harmful" showed how they perceived the harm. The phrases "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is morally wrong" and "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is sexist" were used to gauge how much sexism the participants saw in the behaviour and whether they considered this behaviour as morally wrong. Participants also indicated that they believed the character to be sexist by agreeing with the sentence, "[Actor] is a sexist man". Answers ranged from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much) on a seven-point Likert scale. Additionally, participants were asked to share their thoughts on the scenarios they viewed in an open-ended question. This created the possibility for the participants to explain, or share their opinion in a more elaborate manner.

Table 2*Likert Scale used to rate a Scenario*

	0 - not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6 - very much
Dave's behaviour/ action was intentional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dave's behaviour/ action was harmful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dave's behaviour/ action was morally wrong	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dave's behaviour/ action was sexist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dave is a sexist man	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ethical Considerations

Participation in the research is completely voluntary. Participants were informed about the privacy regulations as well as their rights and contact information (researcher, supervisor and Ethics Committee) before starting the questionnaire. The final message in the questionnaire contained the same contact information. Participation is confidential and no identifying information was asked. Additionally, participants were not forced into answering a question, but a reminder to answer was given. This enabled participants to skip questions they were not willing to answer. The direct aim of the questionnaire as well as the hypotheses were not shared with the participants. However, the overall topic was communicated to the participant. There was no contact between participants and the researcher and/or supervisor, unless the participant reached out using the provided contact information.

Before distributing the questionnaire and conducting the research, ethical approval was given by the Ethics Committee of Campus Fryslân, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. Participation was only enabled when participants were older than 18 years and gave consent to participating.

Data Analysis Plan

Data was analysed using SPSS 28. For each scenario and version (work or social setting) the descriptive statistics for each variable were provided, which included the mean, standard deviation and number of answers for each variable. To test the hypotheses, the quantitative data from the Likert-scale questions were then analysed by conducting bivariate Pearson correlations for each scenario. A correlation matrix was generated. The variables for intent, harm, moral wrongness, sexist behaviour, and sexist person were included for each scenario and version. The table also includes the variables for age and political orientation. For missing values, pairwise deletion was used. The correlations between the variables were evaluated using two-tailed tests of significance. The p-values for each correlation coefficient are listed in the matrix. The correlation coefficients (Pearson's r) show the degree and direction of the linear link between two variables. The significance levels indicate whether the observed associations were merely coincidental or statistically significant.

Next, the open-ended questions were analysed, as an additional test of the hypotheses. Systematic coding was applied, by highlighting important comments or keywords (e.g. “good”, “bad”, “intentional”, or “harmful”). Some answers were used as quotes, as an example. The answers could provide an explanation for interesting, more nuanced results complementing the quantitative data.

Results

Quantitative Data

The aim of this section is to test the hypotheses that were mentioned by earlier literature. Therefore, the following sections will put emphasis on; the perceived intent in relation to judging a behaviour as sexist (hypothesis 1); the perceived harm in relation to judging a behaviour as sexist (hypothesis 2); and individual characteristics in relation to judging a behaviour as sexist (hypothesis 3), in specific political orientation (hypothesis 3a, 3b & 3c) and age (hypothesis 3d).

Scenario 1 - Work Setting

Table 3

Correlation Matrix of Scenario 1 - Work Setting

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Perceived intent	<i>r</i>	1	,089	,163	,124	,172	,021	-,161
	<i>p</i>		,491	,205	,336	,182	,872	,218
	<i>n</i>	62	62	62	62	62	62	60
2. Perceived harm	<i>r</i>		1	,467**	,450**	,406**	-,377**	-,035
	<i>p</i>			<,001	<,001	,001	,003	,789
	<i>n</i>		62	62	62	62	62	60
3. Moral wrongness	<i>r</i>			1	,730**	,662**	-,516**	-,138
	<i>p</i>				<,001	<,001	<,001	,292
	<i>n</i>			62	62	62	62	60
4. Sexist behaviour	<i>r</i>				1	,815**	-,633**	-,356**
	<i>p</i>					<,001	<,001	,005
	<i>n</i>				62	62	62	60
5. Sexist person	<i>r</i>					1	-,550**	-,150

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

	<i>p</i>		<,001	,253
	<i>n</i>	62	62	60
6.	<i>r</i>		1	,226*
Political orientati on	<i>p</i>			,013
	<i>n</i>	122		119
7. Age	<i>r</i>			1
	<i>p</i>			
	<i>n</i>			119

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

As seen in table 3, in line with hypothesis 2, perceived harm was positively related to judgements of sexism (behaviour and character) and moral wrongness, but contrary to hypothesis 1, perceived intent was not related to judgements of sexism (behaviour or character) nor moral wrongness.

Political orientation negatively correlated with perceived sexist behaviour and character, supporting hypothesis 3a, as individuals were more likely to identify politically progressive or left-wing, they were more likely to see the man's behaviour or character as sexist. Additionally, political orientation is negatively correlated to perceived harm and moral wrongness, supporting hypothesis 3b and 3c, as left-wing individuals perceived more harm and moral wrongness.

Regarding demographic individual differences, age is significantly negatively correlated with perceived sexism behaviour. This supports hypothesis 3d, as younger individuals are more likely to see sexism in these BS expressions.

Scenario 1 - Social Setting

Table 4

Correlation Matrix of Scenario 1 - Social Setting

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1.	<i>r</i>	1	,200	,140	,133	,169	,074	,055
Perceiv ed intent	<i>p</i>		,129	,291	,315	,202	,575	,679
	<i>n</i>	59	59	59	59	59	59	58

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

2.	<i>r</i>	1	,718**	,629**	,655**	-,288*	,060
Perceived harm	<i>p</i>		<,001	<,001	<,001	,027	,655
	<i>n</i>	59	59	59	59	59	58
3.	<i>r</i>		1	,682**	,621**	-,323*	,098
Moral wrongness	<i>p</i>			<,001	<,001	,012	,466
	<i>n</i>		59	59	59	59	58
4.	<i>r</i>			1	,845**	-,403**	-,132
Sexist behaviour	<i>p</i>				<,001	,002	,322
	<i>n</i>			59	59	59	58
5.	<i>r</i>				1	-,428**	-,158
Sexist person	<i>p</i>					<,001	,235
	<i>n</i>				59	59	58
6.	<i>r</i>					1	,226*
Political orientation	<i>p</i>						,013
	<i>n</i>					122	119
7. Age	<i>r</i>						1
	<i>p</i>						
	<i>n</i>						119

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Similar to table 3, in table 4 perceived harm was again positively related to judgements of sexism (behaviour and character) and moral wrongness, supporting hypothesis 2. However, contrary to hypothesis 1, perceived intent was not related to judgements of sexism (behaviour or character) nor moral wrongness.

As people were more likely to identify as politically progressive or left-wing, they were also more likely to regard the man's behaviour or character as sexist. This finding supports hypothesis 3a. As political orientation is also negatively correlated with perceived harm and

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

moral wrongness, left-wing people felt more harm and moral wrongness, confirming hypothesis 3b and 3c.

Scenario 2 - Work Setting

Table 5

Correlation Matrix of Scenario 2 - Work Setting

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Perceived intent	<i>r</i>	1	,110	,185	,163	,190	-,214	-,336*
	<i>p</i>		,407	,160	,218	,152	,103	,010
	<i>n</i>	59	59	59	59	58	59	58
2. Perceived harm	<i>r</i>		1	,745**	,727**	,733**	-,204	-,056
	<i>p</i>			<,001	<,001	<,001	,121	,676
	<i>n</i>		59	59	59	58	59	58
3. Moral wrongness	<i>r</i>			1	,878**	,816**	-,350**	-,157
	<i>p</i>				<,001	<,001	,007	,239
	<i>n</i>			59	59	58	59	58
4. Sexist behavior	<i>r</i>				1	,873**	-,438**	-,221
	<i>p</i>					<,001	<,001	,096
	<i>n</i>				59	58	59	58
5. Sexist person	<i>r</i>					1	-,440**	-,226
	<i>p</i>						<,001	,091
	<i>n</i>					58	59	58
6. Political orientation	<i>r</i>						1	,226*
	<i>p</i>							,013
	<i>n</i>						122	119
7. Age	<i>r</i>							1

p

n

119

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In table 5, it is striking that perceived intent has a negative significant correlation with age. From this one can conclude that younger people perceived more intent than older people. However, no other significant correlation was found for perceived intent, again refuting hypothesis 1. Similar to results from scenario 1, table 5 shows that perceptions of harm were once more significantly correlated with assessments of sexism (behaviour and character) and moral wrongness, confirming hypothesis 2.

Consistent with hypothesis 3a, political orientation is negatively correlated with sexist behaviour and character, indicating that politically progressive people are more likely to judge the behaviour and actor as sexist. As political orientation is also negatively correlated with moral wrongness but not perceived harm, left-wing people felt only more moral wrongness, confirming hypothesis 3c, but not 3b.

Scenario 2 - Social Setting

Table 6

Correlation Matrix of Scenario 2 - Social Setting

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Perceived intent	<i>r</i>	1	,267*	,224	,096	,147	,024	-,108
	<i>p</i>		,036	,079	,459	,254	,851	,410
	n	62	62	62	62	62	62	60
2. Perceived harm	<i>r</i>		1	,777**	,741**	,749**	-,416**	-,127
	<i>p</i>			<,001	<,001	<,001	<,001	,333
	n		62	62	62	62	62	60
3. Moral wrongness	<i>r</i>			1	,845**	,834**	-,464**	-,235
	<i>p</i>				<,001	<,001	<,001	,071
	n			62	62	62	62	60

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

4.	<i>r</i>	1	,893**	-,531**	-,313*
Sexist					
behavio	<i>p</i>		<,001	<,001	,015
ur					
	<i>n</i>	62	62	62	60
5.	<i>r</i>		1	-,604**	-,249
Sexist					
person	<i>p</i>			<,001	,055
	<i>n</i>		62	62	60
6.	<i>r</i>			1	,226*
Political					
orientati	<i>p</i>				,013
on					
	<i>n</i>			122	119
7. Age	<i>r</i>				1
	<i>p</i>				
	<i>n</i>				119

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In table 6, it is interesting that perceived intent has a correlation with perceived harm, indicating that when intention was perceived, harm was also perceived. However, no further significant correlation for perceived intent was discovered, thus disproving hypothesis 1. Similar to results from the other tables, table 6 demonstrates that feelings of harm were once more correlated with evaluations of sexism (behaviour and character) and moral wrongness, supporting hypothesis 2.

Political progressive individuals are more likely to perceive the behaviour and actor as sexist, which is indicated with the negative correlation between political orientation and sexist behaviour and person. These findings are consistent with hypothesis 3a. Additionally, left-wing individuals felt more moral wrongness and perceived harm, supporting hypothesis 3b and 3c, because political orientation is likewise negatively correlated with these variables.

Age has a negative correlation with sexist behaviours, which is consistent with hypothesis 3d, indicating that younger people are more likely to detect sexism.

Descriptive Statistics from the Scenarios

Table 7 provides descriptive statistics, so the mean, standard deviation and number of answers for each variable per scenario and version. In the table, one can view the mean scores, ranging from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much), that were given to different statements about the scenarios by participants, thus providing an overview of how participants rated the scenarios. The standard deviation indicates a range in answers. The larger the standard deviation, the wider the range of answers participants gave. These statements correspond to the following measured variables; perceived intention, perceived harm, moral wrongness, sexist behaviour, and sexist person.

While no inferential tests were conducted on the data from table 7, an inspection of the means show interesting things. The following paragraphs will discuss this per scenario and version.

Table 7*Descriptive Statistics per Scenario and Version*

		Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
Scenario 1	Work Version	Intent	3.60	1.57	62
		Harm	2.90	1.71	62
		Morally wrong	2.45	1.74	62
		Sexist Behaviour	3.37	2.12	62
		Sexist person	2.02	1.54	62
	Social Version	Intent	4.32	1.49	59
		Harm	3.25	1.52	59
		Morally wrong	2.83	1.67	59
		Sexist Behaviour	3.81	1.79	59
		Sexist person	2.86	1.69	59
Scenario 2	Work Version	Intent	3.10	1.72	59
		Harm	2.44	1.76	59

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

	Morally wrong	2.00	1.73	59
	Sexist Behaviour	2.78	2.05	59
	Sexist person	1.64	1.68	59
Social Version	Intent	3.29	1.81	62
	Harm	2.16	1.88	62
	Morally wrong	1.79	1.69	62
	Sexist Behaviour	2.18	2.07	62
	Sexist person	1.55	1.68	62

Scenario 1. In the two versions of scenario 1, it becomes evident that all variables have a higher mean in the social setting. This shows that the social setting is judged more harshly. Especially perceived intent and sexist actor scored higher in the social version. As these results were not tested, one cannot draw conclusions from this.

Scenario 2. Both versions of scenario 2 have lower means for each variable than the variables in both versions of scenario 1. In both the work and social version of scenario 2, intent had the highest score, indicating that respondents rated the behaviour as quite intentional. This finding might be explainable with the qualitative results.

Qualitative Data

Scenario 1

From the open-ended questions, a range of 40 answers were collected for Scenario 1 - Work Setting and 34 answers were received for Scenario 1 - Social Setting (Appendix B). Some participants shared that they did not see any issues with the statement, whereas others stated that they perceived it as sexist, inappropriate and harmful. While there was a range of opinions, the main part of the responses mentioned that they thought Dave had good intentions, but that the statement could be harmful and sexist (*"It's sexist because he is assuming women are weak, but these types of comments are often said without bad intent in my opinion"*). Thus, respondents perceived Dave's comment as sexist, as they perceived harm, even when they did not perceive intent. Therefore, these qualitative results support the findings from the quantitative data for scenario 1, namely that perceived intent was not correlated with sexist behaviour, whereas perceived harm is.

Additionally, it is interesting to see that in this scenario and version a large group of answers labelled the comment about the co-worker being a "delicate lady" as unnecessary, harmful and sexist (*"Being a delicate lady has nothing to do with one's capability to carry boxes."*). Most indicated that the statement in itself was alright, but the "delicate lady" comment made it worse (*"His action is not wrong, but what he said was wrong"*, *"Dave denigrates women by saying that."*).

Some people did not see any issues with the statement by Dave as they did not see any intention nor harm (*"He thinks he is funny."*). Interestingly, one of the responses that did not see any harm could even be classified as hostile sexist (*"Females tend to want to be treated equal, although this is a situation which shows the biological right thing called 'a gentlemen'"*). Some mentioned biological features of males and females, indicating that men are often stronger than women. A few also mentioned that that does not mean that women cannot carry heavy things (*"Biologically speaking, males tend to have stronger muscles than females. However, this does not imply that a woman is not capable of carrying heavy things."*).

In general, many of the answers did recognise some form of sexism and inappropriateness (*"he just helped her out for the fact that she was a women"*). However, not all participants saw any harm, stating that there is nothing wrong with offering help (*"Offering help carrying something heavy is a good thing to do."*). These answers also did not see harm in the comment about the co-worker being a "delicate lady". In addition, most of the responses discussed intention, and a large share touched upon harm (*"Its harmful to stereotype women as delicate"*), moral wrongness and sexism in general. Finally, some comments stated they found it difficult to draw conclusions from the statement, since the context, facial expressions and body language was missing.

Concluding, harm proved to be an important factor in people's judgements of scenario 1, which was based on unsolicited help. If harm was not perceived, respondents did not label the scenario or comment as sexist. Interestingly, intention was also often discussed in the qualitative

data. It was often motivated that Dave's statement was likely not intentional. However, this did not influence the judgement that the statement is sexist nonetheless, which is also proven with the quantitative results.

Scenario 2

For scenario 2, 31 open-ended responses were received for the work setting and 30 answers for the social setting (Appendix B). From this, one can conclude that most of the people received this scenario as less sexist and inappropriate. Some suggested that there was nothing wrong with the scenario and others even mentioned it was a compliment towards the woman (*"A group of guys just is different from a group of males and females."*, *"By nature, women have a different personality than men."*). Others mentioned that it is not necessarily harmful, but it should be differently phrased (*"he could've just said it'll be great to have her intelligence and kindness on the team or something."*, *"I do not think this is harmful but it was unnecessary to mention her personality, since this has nothing to do with chess."*). Overall, intent and harm are mentioned less compared to answers from scenario 1. When intention was mentioned, it was stated that Chris likely did not behave with intention.

However, there are many responses touching upon stereotypes for this scenario, which was based on emphasising femininity. Some respondents answered that they viewed the comment on "feminine touch" as unnecessary and sexist (*"feminine touch is not only something women can bring. This implies that all women should be feminine... And all men should be masculine even though those two things have nothing to do with gender in my opinion."*). A few answers also touched upon patriarchy and that statements like this reinforce gender norms. In general, a share of participants commented that the statement is stereotyping women (*"He reduces her contribution to being a female."*, *"I don't think Chris meant it this way, but he sees this woman not as a chess player (like the rest of the club) but as a stereotype."*).

Overall, variables such as harm and moral wrongness were mentioned less compared to scenario 1. Additionally the statement was viewed as more positive, less harmful, and less sexist, which is also shown in the mean scores from the variables. Factors like intent and harm seemed to be of less importance compared to scenario 1. Some people described the scenario as a compliment and a few wrote that it was a statement towards the men in the office/chess club, as they might lack the abilities that were assigned to the female. Often, people did not blame Chris, mentioning that it was not intentional. A few answers commented that Chris likely grew up in an environment where statements like this were alright, blaming his environment rather than Chris himself.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate what factors play a role in lay judgements of benevolent sexism. The research question was formulated as follows: *To what extent do perceived harm, intent, and individual differences relate to lay judgements of benevolent sexism?*. In order to answer this question, three hypotheses were established. Hypothesis 1 looks at the role of perceived intent. Hypothesis 2 is focussed on perceived harm. Finally, hypothesis 3 takes individual differences into account, specifically political orientation (hypotheses 3a, 3b and 3c) and age (hypothesis 3d). Hypothesis 3e focussed on feminism levels, but no data was collected on that individual characteristic.

The quantitative results show that perceived harm and individual differences play a role in judgements of the scenarios, since hypothesis 2, 3a, 3b, 3c and partially 3d are supported. Moreover, perceived intent did not correlate with sexism judgements. The qualitative data supports the outcomes of the quantitative findings, as the theme of intent and harm came up often. However, perceived intent seemed to have a vaster role than the quantitative data shows.

Hypothesis 1 was not supported by the quantitative results from this study. This is surprising, since previous studies have labelled it as an important predictor of judgements of benevolent sexism (Bieselt, 2021; Riemer et al., 2014; Swim et al., 2003). However, from the qualitative data, intention was an important factor, since it was often discussed. Participants mentioned that it was likely that there was no bad intention from the actor. However, that did not seem to make the statement less sexist. This could explain why hypothesis 1 was not supported. Additionally, as Swim et al. (2003) pointed out in their research, when intent was uncertain, perceived harm influenced the judgements. It might be that participants were unsure of the intentions of the actor, and therefore did not take it into account when judging the scenario on sexism levels. Another interesting note is that although in the qualitative data intention seemed to be low (e.g. [actor] likely did not do it on purpose), the overall means for perceived intent scored high. Prior research did not include qualitative data, therefore it cannot clarify this finding. Important to note is that since a large share of the participants identify with non-English speaking nationalities, there might have been a language barrier. Overall, this study points out that perceived intent might play a smaller role in judgements than prior research indicated. From this research one could conclude that statements can be perceived as sexist, while the actor was not doing it with intention. However, a range of intentions was not taken into account within this research. Research by Graham et al. (2006) suggests the following range of intent: defensive intent, probable intent, definite intent. Benevolent sexism could thus be unintentional, but also fall within a range of intent.

As hypothesis 3a is supported by the results, political orientation can be labelled as one of the factors that influences judgements of benevolent sexism. Moreover, political orientation was linked to judgement of moral wrongness, which is in line with the *Moral Foundations Hypothesis* (Graham et al., 2009). Furthermore, it was predicted that perceived harm would also correlate with political orientation, which was supported by three out of four scenarios (in scenario 2 - work version no significant correlation was found). Whether hypothesis 3d,

considering age, is supported by the results is still questionable. In two of the four scenarios, 3d is supported. As the research by De Geus et al. (2022) points out, the relation between age and sexism is inconsistent across the literature. Additionally, until now the literature has been seeking the relationship between expressing sexism and age, but not the correlation between judging sexism and age. In order to draw solid conclusions on whether age can be an important factor for benevolent sexism judgements, more research must be conducted, preferably with a larger, more representable group of participants.

As the means of the variables showed in the descriptive statistics, the scenarios and versions were not rated in the same way. Scenario 1 - social setting was judged more harshly than the work setting and the first scenario overall scored higher than the second scenario. Although this data was not tested, the means show interesting information, namely that people judge types of benevolent sexist behaviour differently. Unsolicited help was seen as more sexist than emphasising feminine attributes and unsolicited help among friends was noted as more sexist than in a work environment. These results are supported by the qualitative data, which portrays the second scenario as normal or even a compliment. Also, harm and intention were less often mentioned as a justification for their judgements. However, stereotypes were touched upon more in the second scenario. It should be taken into account that not all types of benevolent sexism are judged in a similar way by lay people and that the definition academia has of sexism might also be different among lay people. More research is necessary to reveal the dispersion between academic and lay definition of (benevolent) sexism. It would be interesting to see how each type of benevolent sexism is judged and what motivates that judgement, as it is currently still unclear. In addition, characteristics like perceived intent and harm that are thought to influence lay judgements, might not have as much of an impact as previously thought. Finally, to withstand the prevalence, acceptance, and negative effects of sexism, it is crucial to raise awareness about the harmful effects (Becker & Swim, 2011, 2012; Becker et al., 2014).

Due to time constraints, data collection was only done within two weeks. Even though 168 participants filled in the questionnaire, more data could have been collected if the survey stayed open for longer. Enough data was collected to draw conclusions on how lay people perceive benevolent sexism. Nevertheless, the demographics of the participants are rather similar and a larger sample size could lead to different results. Therefore, it is suggested that future research should be using a larger, more representable sample size. Additionally, a large part of the participants were from the network of the researcher, and many of the participants were students. As a large share of the students were from the same bachelors program as the researcher, these participants might be aware of benevolent sexism. In general, the participant demographics show that the larger share is from Western, Educated, Industrialised, Rich, And Democratic (WEIRD) countries. As most research until now has worked with participants from WEIRD countries, future research should include people from non-WEIRD countries. Especially since this research shows the importance of individual characteristics, it would be interesting to conduct similar research in different areas.

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

Additionally, since most of the respondents were from the Netherlands, it is likely that English was not their native language. As the survey was conducted in English, a language barrier might have been present. Consequently, participants might have misunderstood the scenarios or questions, leading to different results. In the future, the questionnaire should be available in a range of languages, so each participant can finish the survey in their native language.

Furthermore, this study included only two scenarios. In order to draw stronger conclusions, different scenarios should be included. This could strengthen the findings, showing in more detail what variables have an influence on the judgements of benevolent sexism. Moreover, the research could present scenarios with a range of benevolent sexism, in severity and type of benevolent sexism, again providing more detailed results. Finally, a range of intent, as well as harm could be included.

Finally, the questionnaire did not show the feminist scale to participants. Since feminism has proven to influence judgements of benevolent sexism by previous literature, it would have been interesting to research this. It is recommended that future research takes feminism into account when studying what factors play a role in lay judgements of benevolent sexism.

Conclusion

To conclude, this research looked at factors that could influence lay judgements of benevolent sexism. Two scenarios were created based on benevolent sexist behaviours, the first looking at unsolicited help and the second emphasised femininity. The scenarios were adapted to a work and social setting. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. The quantitative results supported the influence of perceived harm and individual differences, while perceived intent did not correlate with sexism judgements. The qualitative data reinforced the importance of intent and harm, although perceived intent played a larger role than suggested by the quantitative findings. The study found that different scenarios and versions were not consistently rated, indicating variations in judgements of different types of benevolent sexist behaviour. The qualitative data also revealed differences in how harm, intention, and stereotypes were discussed in the scenarios. It is crucial to acknowledge that lay judgements of benevolent sexism may differ from academic definitions, highlighting the need for further research to understand this dispersion. Additionally, characteristics such as perceived intent and harm may not have as significant an impact as previously believed. To combat the prevalence and negative effects of sexism, raising awareness about its harmful outcomes is crucial.

In summary, this study sheds light on the factors influencing lay judgements of benevolent sexism. It emphasises the complexities involved, including the roles of perceived intent, perceived harm, individual differences, and the variations in judgements across different scenarios and versions. By considering these factors and understanding the disparities between academic and lay definitions of sexism, future research can contribute to a better understanding of benevolent sexism and its impact on society.

References

- Abrams, D., Viki, 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), 111–125. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111>
- Adams, R., & Funk, P. (2010). Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Does Gender Matter? *Management Science*, *58*(2), 219–235. http://ssrn.com/abstract_id=1475152www.ecgi.org/wp
- Baires, N. A., & Koch, D. S. (2020). The Future Is Female (and Behavior Analysis): A Behavioral Account of Sexism and How Behavior Analysis Is Simultaneously Part of the Problem and Solution. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, *13*(1), 253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40617-019-00394-X>
- Barreto, M., & Doyle, D. M. (2023). Benevolent and hostile sexism in a shifting global context. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *2*, 98–111. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00136-x>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.270>
- Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., & Moya, M. (2010). How Nice of Us and How Dumb of Me: The Effect of Exposure to Benevolent Sexism on Women’s Task and Relational Self-Descriptions. *Sex Roles*, *62*, 532–544. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9699-0>
- Basinger, K. S., Gibbs, J. C., & Fuller, D. (1995). Context and the Measurement of Moral Judgement. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *18*(3), 537–556. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016502549501800309>
- 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, Julia 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, Julia 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.

- https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/2011-04117-001.pdf?auth_token=9f9cacf217b5706bd7f2d9190ffc49f3a4d28f86&returnUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fpsycnet.apa.org%2FdoiLandin%3Fdoi%3D10.1037%252Fa0022615
- Becker, Julia 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>
- Benson, P. L., & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and Validation of the Sexist Attitudes Toward Women Scale (SATWS). *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5*(2).
- Bieselt, H. E. (2021). How People Define Sexism: The Role of Intent and Harm in Judgements of Sexism towards Women in the Workplace. *Master's Thesis, University of Twente*.
- Böttcher, L. (2021). *The Role of Knowledge about Mal-Intent on Judgments of Benevolent Sexism*. University of Twente.
- Brandt, M. J. (2011). Sexism and Gender Inequality Across 57 Societies. *Psychological Science, 22*(11), 1413–1418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611420445>
- Branson, D. M. (2007). No Seat at the Table-How Corporate Governance and Law Keep Women Out of the Boardroom. *NYU Press, 26*. <http://law.bepress.com/pittlwps/art55>
- Chen, Z., Fiske, S. T., & Lee, T. L. (2009). Ambivalent Sexism and Power-Related Gender-role Ideology in Marriage. *Sex Roles, 60*(11–12), 765. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11199-009-9585-9>
- Cislaghi, B., & Heise, L. (2020). Gender norms and social norms: differences, similarities and why they matter in prevention science. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 42*(2), 407. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.13008>
- Connor, R. A., Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2016). Ambivalent Sexism in the Twenty-First Century. *The Cambridge Handbook of the Psychology of Prejudice, 295–320*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316161579.013>
- Daniels, G. (2021). Glass Ceilings: cybermisogyny is a sign of unchecked sexism in media and newsrooms. *Agenda*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2021.1917296>
- 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), 764–779. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.764>

- De Geus, R., Ralph-Morrow, E., & Shorrocks, R. (2022). Understanding Ambivalent Sexism and its Relationship with Electoral Choice in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52, 1564–1583. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123421000612>
- Durán, M., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2016). Benevolent Sexist Ideology Attributed to an Abusive Partner Decreases Women’s Active Coping Responses to Acts of Sexual Violence at PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV on. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* XX, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513507134>
- Fischer, A. R. (2006). Women’s Benevolent Sexism as Reaction to Hostility. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(4), 410–416. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1471-6402.2006.00316.X>
- Fraser, C. (2015). From “Ladies First” to “Asking for It”: Benevolent Sexism in the Maintenance of Rape Culture. *Calif. L. Rev.*, 103. <http://www.avclub.com/article/youre-good-looking-girl-i-want-attack-you->
- Gill, M. (2023, January 8). *Andrew Tate isn’t feminism’s inadvertent bastard child. He’s sexism’s last gasp.* The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jan/08/andrew-tate-isnt-feminisms-inadvertent-bastard-child-hes-sexisms-last-gasp>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). HOSTILE AND BENEVOLENT SEXISM Measuring Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes Toward Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 119–135.
- 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), 109–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109>
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun, B., Osagie, J. E., Akande, A., Alao, A., Brunner, A., Willemsen, T. M., Chipeta, K., Dardenne, B., Dijksterhuis, A., Wigboldus, D., Eckes, T., Six-Materna, I., Expósito, F., ... 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., Lameiras, M., & Castro, Y. R. (2002). Education and Catholic Religiosity as Predictors of Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Toward Women and Men. *Sex Roles*, 47(9).
- Good, J. J., & Rudman, L. A. (2009). When Female Applicants Meet Sexist Interviewers: The Costs of Being a Target of Benevolent Sexism. *Sex Roles*, 62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9685-6>
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and Conservatives Rely on Different Sets of Moral Foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 1029–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1037/A0015141>
- Graham, K., Tremblay, P. F., Wells, S., Parnanen, K., Purcell, J., & Jelley, J. (2006). Harm, Intent, and the Nature of Aggressive Behavior Measuring Naturally Occurring Aggression in Barroom Settings. *Assessment*, 13(3), 280–296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191106288180>
- Hammond, M. D., & Sibley, C. G. (2011). Why are benevolent sexists happier? *Sex Roles*, 65(5), 332–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0017-2>
- Hammond, Matthew D., & Overall, N. C. (2016). Sexism in Intimate Contexts: How Romantic Relationships Help Explain the Origins, Functions, and Consequences of Sexist Attitudes. *The Cambridge Handbook of the Psychology of Prejudice*, 321–343. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316161579.014>
- Hammond, Matthew D, Milojev, P., Huang, Y., & Sibley, C. G. (2017). Benevolent Sexism and Hostile Sexism Across the Ages . *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617727588>
- Hellmer, K., Stenson, J. T., & Jylhä, K. M. (2018). What's (not) underpinning ambivalent sexism?: Revisiting the roles of ideology, religiosity, personality, demographics, and men's facial hair in explaining hostile and benevolent sexism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 122, 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PAID.2017.10.001>
- Hodson, G., & Dhont, K. (2015). The person-based nature of prejudice: Individual difference predictors of intergroup negativity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2015.1070018>
- Jones, K., Stewart, K., King, E., Morgan, W. B., Gilrane, V., & Hylton, K. (2014). Negative consequence of benevolent sexism on efficacy and performance. *Gender in Management*, 29(3), 171–189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-07-2013-0086/FULL/HTML>

- King, E. B., Botsford, W., Hebl, M. R., Kazama, S., Dawson, J. F., & Perkins, A. (2010). Benevolent Sexism at Work: Gender Differences in the Distribution of Challenging Developmental Experiences. *Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310365902>
- Koc, Y. (2023, February 20). *Intergroup Relations: A specific focus on gender* [Guest Lecture].
- Leeper, C., & Spears Brown, C. (2014). CHAPTER SIX Sexism in Schools. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 189–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2014.04.001>
- Masser, B., Lee, K., & McKimmie, B. M. (2010). Bad woman, Bad victim? Disentangling the effects of victim stereotypicality, gender stereotypicality and benevolent sexism on acquaintance rape victim blame. *Sex Roles*, 62(7–8), 494–504. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11199-009-9648-Y/TABLES/2>
- Masser, B. M., & Abrams, D. (2004). Reinforcing the Glass Ceiling: The Consequences of Hostile Sexism for Female Managerial Candidates 1. *Sex Roles*, 51(9).
- Mastari, L., Spruyt, B., & Siongers, J. (2019). Benevolent and Hostile Sexism in Social Spheres: The Impact of Parents, School and Romance on Belgian Adolescents' Sexist Attitudes. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 4, 47. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FSOC.2019.00047/BIBTEX>
- Maume, D. J. (2004). Is the Glass Ceiling a Unique form of Inequality? Evidence from a Random-Effects Model of Managerial Attainment. *Work and Occupations*, 31(2), 250–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888404263908>
- McNair, S., Okan, Y., Hadjichristidis, C., & Bruine de Bruin, W. (2018). Age differences in moral judgment: Older adults are more deontological than younger adults. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.2086>
- Mikołajczak, M., & Pietrzak, J. (2014). Ambivalent Sexism and Religion: Connected Through Values. *Sex Roles*, 70(9–10), 387–399. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11199-014-0379-3/TABLES/5>
- Mistlin, S. (2023, March 9). *Why too many young men love Andrew Tate – and why we need to understand that, not dismiss it*. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/mar/09/andrew-tate-young-men-social-media-motivational-sexism>

- Montañés, P., De Lemus, S., Moya, M., Bohner, G., & Megías, J. L. (2013). How attractive are sexist intimates to adolescents? The influence of sexist beliefs and relationship experience . *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(4), 494–506. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684313475998>
- Morgan, B. L. (1996). Putting the Feminism into Feminism Scales: Introduction of a Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) 1. *Sex Roles*, 34(5).
- O’connor, K. W., Drouin, M., & Niedermeyer, T. (2021). How Do Age, Sex, Political Orientation, Religiosity, and Sexism Affect Perceptions of Sex Assault/Harassment Allegations? *Sexuality & Culture*, 25, 1605–1619. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-021-09837-6>
- Plous, S. (2003). *The psychology of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination: An overview*. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-06587-001>
- Purcell, D., Macarthur, K. R., & Samblanet, S. (2010). Gender and the Glass Ceiling at Work. *Sociology Compass*, 4(9), 705–717. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2010.00304.x>
- Radford, A. (2023, January 12). *Who is Andrew Tate? The self-proclaimed misogynist influencer*. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-64125045>
- Ramos, M., Barreto, M., Ellemers, N., Moya, M., & Ferreira, L. (2018). What hostile and benevolent sexism communicate about men’s and women’s warmth and competence. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 21(1), 159–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216656921/FORMAT/EPUB>
- Renzetti, C. M. (1987). New wave or second stage? Attitudes of college women toward feminism. *Sex Roles* , 16(5), 265–277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289954>
- Riemer, A., Chaudoir, S., & Earnshaw, V. (2014). What Looks Like Sexism and Why? The Effect of Comment Type and Perpetrator Type on Women’s Perceptions of Sexism. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 141(3), 263–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.2014.907769>
- Saris, K., & van der Ven, C. (2021, March 3). Diepgaande data-analyse van de online haat tegen vrouwelijke politici. *De Groene Amsterdammer*. <https://www.groene.nl/voorbeeld/diepgaande-data-analyse-van-de-online-haat-tegen-vrouwelijke-politici>
- Scott, E. D. (2000). Moral Values: Situationally Defined Individual Differences. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 10(2), 497–520. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3857888>

- Shnabel, N., Bar-Anan, Y., Kende, A., Bareket, O., & Lazar, Y. (2015). Help to Perpetuate Traditional Gender Roles: Benevolent Sexism Increases Engagement in Dependency-Oriented Cross-Gender Helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000037>
- Sibley, C. G., Wilson, M. S., & Duckitt, J. (2007). Antecedents of Men's Hostile and Benevolent Sexism: The Dual Roles of Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(2), 160–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167206294745>
- Simon, S., Moss, A. J., & O'Brien, L. T. (2019). Pick your perspective: Racial group membership and judgments of intent, harm, and discrimination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 22*(2), 215–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217735576/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_1368430217735576-FIG2.JPEG
- Sugiura, L. (2023, January 25). *Andrew Tate: research has long shown how feminist progress is always followed by a misogynistic backlash*. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/andrew-tate-research-has-long-shown-how-feminist-progress-is-always-followed-by-a-misogynistic-backlash-197433>
- Swim, J., Scott, E. D., Campbell, B., & Stangor, C. (2003). The Role of Intent and Harm in Judgments of Prejudice and Discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(5). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.944>
- Thoma, S. J. (1993). The relationship between political preference and moral judgment development in late adolescence. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 39*, 359–374. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23087426>
- Valor-Segura, I., Expósito, F., & Moya, M. (2011). Victim Blaming and Exoneration of the Perpetrator in Domestic Violence: The Role of Beliefs in a Just World and Ambivalent Sexism. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 14*(1), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2011.v14.n1.17
- Van Assche, J., Koç, Y., & Roets, A. (2019). Religiosity or ideology? On the individual differences predictors of sexism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 139*, 191–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PAID.2018.11.016>
- Viki, G. T., Abrams, D., & Masser, B. (2004). Evaluating Stranger and Acquaintance Rape: The Role of Benevolent Sexism in Perpetrator Blame and Recommended Sentence Length. *Law and Human Behavior, 28*(3), 295–303. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:LAHU.0000029140.72880.69>

- Waldmann, M. R., Nagel, J., & Wiegmann, A. (2012). *Moral Judgment*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199734689.013.0019>
- Weisberg, H. F. (2005). The Structure and Effects of Moral Predispositions in Contemporary American Politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 67(3), 646–668.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-2508.2005.00333.X>
- Yamawaki, N., Ostenson, J., & Brown, C. R. (2009). The Functions of Gender Role Traditionality, Ambivalent Sexism, Injury, and Frequency of Assault on Domestic Violence Perception. *Violence Against Women*, 15(9), 1126–1142.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209340758>
- Zakharin, M., & Bates, T. C. (2021). Remapping the foundations of morality: Well-fitting structural model of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire. *PloS One*, 16(10).
<https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0258910>

Appendix A. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants**Table 8***Demographic Characteristics of the Participants*

Variable		n	%
Gender	Man	38	30.9
	Woman	79	64.2
	Non-binary / third gender	4	3.3
	Prefer not to say	1	0.8
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual	91	74.0
	Homosexual	8	6.5
	Bisexual	15	12.2
	Asexual	-	-
	Other	5	4.1
	Prefer not to say	3	2.4
Current Country of Residence	Netherlands	117	95.1
	Germany	1	0.8
	United Kingdom	1	0.8
	Other, please specify:	3	2.4
Nationality	Netherlands	96	78.0
	Germany	9	7.3
	United Kingdom	2	1.6
	United States	2	1.6
	Canada	1	0.8
	Other, please specify:	12	9.8
Ethnicity	White - European	110	89.4
	White - American	1	0.8

LAY JUDGEMENTS OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM

	White - Other	3	2.4
	Hispanic/Latino(a)	1	0.8
	Chinese	1	0.8
	Asian - other	2	1.6
	Mixed Race	2	1.6
	Prefer not to say	2	1.6
Highest Educational Degree	Less than high school	3	2.4
	High school graduate	64	52.0
	Bachelor's degree	41	33.3
	Master's degree	11	8.9
	Doctorate	3	2.4
Currently Studying	No	41	33.3
	Yes	81	65.9
Political Orientation	Strongly progressive (left-oriented) 1	26	21.2
	Moderately progressive (left-oriented) 2	39	31.7
	Slightly progressive (left-oriented) 3	14	11.4
	Moderate (neutral) 4	20	16.3
	Slightly conservative (right-oriented) 5	11	8.9
	Moderately conservative (right-oriented) 6	10	8.1
	Strongly conservative (right-oriented) 7	2	1.6

Appendix B. Qualitative Data

Scenario 1 - Work Setting

1. I think Dave's intentions were right, he wanted to help, but the reasoning is bad. Yes it shows a thought that he thinks women are weak but honestly I think this is more of an unlucky phrasing. I would stand up for myself but wouldn't say it is harmful.
2. Helping her is not the problem I think. But his comments are not so nice. He could have asked if she needed/wanted help
3. While this way of thinking is ingrained, Dave's intention was probably not intentional while his comment was sexist. Dave could be considered sexist but he probably did not see any harm.
4. He probably did it intentionally because that's the stereotype but if he had actually thought about it he would have realized that this is not appropriate, especially the comment "delicate lady".
5. I do not know Dave, so I would not be able to say whether he is a sexist man yes or no. I work as a female in construction and from experience I know that it might be considered sexist by a female, but a man does not say it intentionally sexist
6. I mean, it is nice to help someone out if you see them struggling. However, the description did not state the woman was struggling so he could assume that she as a woman could not carry such a heavy box. + the comment about delicate lady is absolutely inappropriate, especially after already helping her with the box for no reason (no struggling signs, or asking for help)
7. I deliver packages as a side job. I'm happy when I hear this! (Only men don't say "delicate lady" lol)
8. Helpen is altijd goed, de opmerking mag achterwege blijven
9. His intentions were probably nice but saying that she can't carry the boxes because she is a woman is harmful/sexist.
I'm not sure if he is sexist because a lot of men are raised like this and are not aware of harm of those remarks. It depends on his reaction if you say something about it
10. He is just offering his help
11. Maybe not a sexist man but definitely a sexist behavior
12. I do not think that it is sexist to assume that women are less strong. This is just basic biology in my opinion. It is only polite to offer to carry the box in Dave's situation.
13. I think Dave is thinking from a stereotype that women can't carry heavy boxes and he just wants to be the stereotype male so I need to carry it and be the stronger person
14. He is not aware of his action right or wrong against women
15. Intentions could have been right, if it weren't for the wrong perspective of women and that being the reason why he did it
16. Dave's action might come from good intentions to help his coworker. He even offers it without hesitation. However he could have used other words. "Delicate lady like you" is not necessarily meant harmful but could be interpreted in the wrong way. This does not immediately make Dave a sexist man. As it is just one action which might not reflect how Dave behaves around women on a regular basis.
17. I believe that Dave is not consciously trying to be sexist, but by definition is because of his actions.

18. It is normal and a fact that woman are weaker and I think it is simply polite without intention.
19. My opinion depends a lot on personal history of the characters
20. If Dave has intentions these would not always be clear by these words. Physical behaviour combined with these words could suggest otherwise
21. It could be Dave doesn't even realize what he's saying is sexist and harmful, since he could just think what he says and does here is him just being a "nice guy"
22. It is nice he offers to help, but the remark that she could not carry the box is sexist
23. The words Dave use :heavy and delicate makes it questionable, but i think he means it well and is raised with the idea to help a woman if she carries something heavy.
24. I think that Dave thinks that delicate or beautiful women cannot be strong at the same time. He is wrong about that. As a woman, I would call him out on this behavior, but I don't think that his behavior is very harmful in this situation.
25. Op deze manier kan alles wat een man tegen een vrouw zegt verkeerd worden geïnterpreteerd. Soms is het wat het is en is iemand behulpzaam
26. I think it's difficult to say. It's sexist because he presumes a woman can't handle her bussiness because she is a woman however, I do believe that he is not necessarily intending to be sexist. Maybe this is the way he was brought up and doesn't know any better or maybe he's just ignorant.
27. I dont think he did it on purpose, but it is more a stigma in our culture
28. Met 1 geval is dave niet een sexist maar in deze casus is het niet erg netjes. Een vraag staat vrij, maar dring je niet op.
29. Of course helping out colleagues is not a problem, but following that with "a delicate lady" as a comment makes the whole situation different. That's is in no way necessary in the situation and really is offensive in my opinion.
30. Dave should have asked first if the lady needed help carrying the box, not just take over. Then secondly, the part of delicate lady doesn't make any sense, there was no need to mention it. Being a delicate lady has nothing to do with one's capability to carry boxes.
31. Didn't see his non-verbal behaviour
32. He is probably not aware of his sexism. But should, although there will be no harm in his behaviour
33. Het is maar net hoe je het opvat denk ik, maar zoals ik het opvat is het gewoon goed en lief bedoeld. Tuurlijk kan het klinken alsof een vrouw "dat niet zou kunnen tillen" maar zo vond ik het niet overkomen
34. His action is not wrong, but what he said was wrong
35. This may be seen as a sexist action by some women. However I would not mind this as a woman as i do not like carrying this and every man I know is stronger than I am. I would not be offended and I don't think this is such a big deal.
36. As stated this action was done "without hesitation", therefore I do not think he was morally wrong, seeing as it wasn't a carefully deliberated statement and probably didn't have ill intend, but it does show the underlying sexism he has and can be harmful to the woman.
37. Goed van hem dat hij helpt
38. Its harmful to stereotype women as delicate
39. It is patronizing and sexist while the action itself is nice. He probably was unaware that

- the reason he gave for helping shows a sexist attitude
40. Offering to help is good, but to comment the person's strength etc is not necessary and can be perceived as rude

Scenario 1 - Social Setting

1. I would say that his intention wasn't wrong, but the words which he used sound sexist and harmful.
2. alleen maar aardig dat dave helpt
3. This example is very context specific. Dave might be helping here based on her physical attributes more than based on her gender. It would be important to know, how heavy the box is and how physically strong his friend is. Then it would be important to know if he would offer the same to an equally physically strong male friend.
4. It's benevolent sexism and degrading her abilities
5. It's nice that he offers, but he makes it inappropriate by saying "for a delicate lady like you". That brings all women down because it indicates that women cannot lift boxes.
6. Not necessarily sexist but it is not right to say that it's to have for a delicate woman.. that sounds not right to me
7. It seems a bit unnecessary to say she's a delicate lady, but it is a nice gesture.
8. It does not say that the woman was struggling, so he just helped her out for the fact that she was a woman. The comment he made with it, is I think degrading indicating that she is not strong enough on her own. He could have asked her if she needed help if he saw that she was struggling, but that would not be different if he saw a man struggling
9. He could ask it in a different way
10. Females tend to want to be treated equal, although this is a situation which shows the biological right thing called "a gentlemen"
11. The action itself was not a problem but the comment was problematic
12. I believe that Dave's behaviour was not that intentional, he wanted to help her, and he provides a reason but it is not intentional to be sexist. He just associated a lady like her to have more difficulty with carrying a heavy box, so he is just there to help her. Therefore I also do think about whether it is harmful that it is a bit harmful because on one hand he is helping her, but on the other hand he might give her the feeling that she is not capable of doing it herself because she is a woman. Therefore I believe that his action is a bit morally wrong because I believe that even though he might mean well, he should consider the implications of his actions, that imply that because she is a woman she is not able to help herself out. I do believe that the action is sexist. But whether he is sexist is hard to say, because I also believe that there is this aspect of helping, and because this is one action and then it is hard to make inferences about the person.
13. It was kind of him to offer help, but not because she looked delicate. A small lady can be stronger than himself...
14. Just trying to help. Nothing wrong with that
15. Dave's intention are presumably not wrong, but when he had offered a helping hand

- and do it together it would have been much better. Now he dismisses her as weak.
16. He Sjoukje help het without caling her a delicate woman
 17. In this scenario i dont accept how he didnt even ask whether the lady needed help, and then just assumed ‚she’s delicate’ since he looked at her from the macho men perspective. Women Can carry boxes by themselves if they want to, if they need help that help is welcome i think, but jumping straight into it without any question plus assumptions isnt right.
 18. Je weet natuurlijk niet of dave dit ook zou doen bij een mannelijke vriend.
Ervanuitgaand dat hij dat niet zou doen is het erg stereotyperend dat vrouwen minder sterk zijn
 19. Most men are stronger than woman and the think that anyway. But to call the lady delicate is not positive... like she's too weak to carry the box 😊
 20. I believe that the comment “for a delicate woman like you” slightly implies that women are weak and should be taken care of in some way. Because of this, i do think that the comment was a tiny bit sexist, however i don’t think it was intentional.
 21. Firstly, it is hard to judge situations like this without facial expressions and the nuances of the situation so I am just judging the situation on what I see and read. The assumption of Dave in which he degrades the female strength with the sentence: it's too heavy for a delicate lady like you, comes across as sexist. Again without the nuances. I do think it is a difficult situation. because I think if you just take the first part of the sentence, this isn't specifically a bad thing. It is always good to help and if you see a friend struggling why wouldn't you offer your help? I think the problem is in the gender-specific view that makes the assumption that males are the strong ones. I also guess in isn't intentional again this is a guess because I don't have much to go off. But I think it is a result of a society which shapes these gender roles based of averages and old traditional situations.
 22. Offering help carrying something heavy is a good thing to do. Roughly speaking, most men are physically stronger due to their natural build. But this doesn't excuse his comment about a gentle woman. A woman can be more than perfectly capable of lifting heavy things. Dave denigrates women by saying that.
 23. Again unnecessary comment again - in general you don’t have too comment on how someone looks like there incapable of moving the box(because they look a certain way)
 24. He thinks he is funny. And he thinks he is polite. In fact he is a bit sexistic from nowadays point of view.
 25. Again, he points out that he proposes the action because she is a woman and he generalizes a supposedly negative quality as being a femal quality so it is sexists. The act might have been meant as a nice gesture but he didn't have to have as reason that she is a woman.
 26. Benevolent sexism. Biologically speaking, males tend to have stronger muscles than females. However, this does not imply that a woman is not capable of carrying heavy things. If it would be helping out as a friend, I would get it. But in this case, the "delicate lday like you" implies that help was necessary because of the woman's gender.
 27. I believe the intention was good but unnecessary to nake such a comment. It could be as simpld as: 'Let me help you.'
 28. Offering to help is good, especially if the person seems to be struggling. But saying "a

- delicate little lady" is unnecessary, uncalled for and sexist
29. It stresses something bad about women. That's why I ranked it higher than the one before.
 30. It is so sad to hear that women are perceived weak by some men...
 31. again not meant to be rude, but still minimizing women
 32. It's sexist because he is assuming women are weak, but these types of comments are often said without bad intent in my opinion
 33. Dave probably genuinely wants to help. I think that comments he made after are indeed sexist. If Dave were to grab the box out of the women's hands rather than wait for her reply to the help, then I would say that he is very sexist.
 34. "Delicate lady" is a kind of damsel in distress trope.

Scenario 2 - Work Setting

1. Ik vind juist dat Chris erg positief is over de nieuwe collega
2. Chris highlights that the main quality that she brings to the team Obsthändlerinnen feminin Touch, but does not specify what he means with that. He reduces her contribution to being a female.
3. It's benevolent sexism
4. I think he describes the woman by her personality traits and not by her appearance. If someone said this about me I would take it as a compliment
5. I think Chris gives a nice introduction of this new female employee.
6. I think people could asses this as benevolent sexism, but I persoanlly don't see the problem in this example, because he gave priority to other more important characteristics of her.
7. Its unnecessary to think this already could be sexist, even though he was joking this isn't supposed to be a threat towards women
8. Chris is probably ignorant and hasn't really informed himself on how it feels for a woman to recieve such a comment. I think he didn't intentionally mean harm but he also didn't make the effort to educate himself in the past about how certain comments shouldn't be said to a woman.
9. It is kind of intentional that you bring a woman to the team, and emphasising the effect of having a feminine touch in the workplace. Although of course her being woman is not the only reason why she was brought to the workplace, if she would not have been intelligent nor talented (enough) than she would not get in so it is intentional but not fully. I believe that the action is not that harmful, because regardless of the reason, the situation does not harm anyone and is rather a win-win, the woman gets accepted and the team gets what it needs, even if it might imply that she only is there because she is a woman, which might feel a bit unfair towards other male workers. I believe that the behaviour is between morally wrong and not morally wrong because I believe it is a bit unfair and it should not be like this, however I also believe that when you are in a workplace where you notice that the team consists mainly of men, representation is also necessary and brings about more equality and better more representative results and new views, so therefore it is also good. Do I believe that his behaviour was sexist,

a bit yes, because well, the fact that her being a woman and therefore accepted because she could bring that feminine touch, not only does this a bit imply that if it weren't for her being a woman she would maybe not get the job, but also that being a woman is directly associated with femininity, therefore a bit stereotyping and using women just for their "warm and nurturing" personality. Do I believe he is a sexist man, no because one action does not say a lot about a person, however I feel like it cannot be excluded because if he weren't a sexist person at all, he would not have accepted her, or at least phrased differently what he says.

10. If she has those qualitys it is good to use it if needed
11. Just a standard managers line to say. No problemen with that at all
12. I think it was not harmful or sexist, it's really not an issue to say bringing a feminine touch to a team.
13. I believe it's a normal thing to say. Women are known to have more feminine qualities than men, therefore perhaps not knowing too many details about the new female colleague (whether for example she doesnt want to be assigned feminine qualities) its Ok he said it.
14. Het feit dat hij naar voren brengt dat ze vrouwelijke kracht en misschien anders perspectieven heeft vind ik een mooi gebaar
15. men and women are very different and the mix can give many benefits. Chris could have done the introduction differently.. especially the "nurturing" is exaggerated.. if one woman has to take care of the whole group of men
16. I don't think he is being sexist because he does have a point. By nature, women have a different personality than men. Additionally, when hiring a person many employers also look at the individual's personality and see what they could provide the workforce with.
17. Chris is implying that it is surprising that the new employee is intelligent and talented. Most of his introduction of the new employee relates to her being a woman, and he uses stereotypes such as 'warm and nurturing personality'.
18. I needed quite some time to analyse the situation. I think it can be hurtful as it might indicate that gender makes you different and that this is why you were picked. On the other hand, you could also see it in a way that the company wants to develop and wants her specialties and qualities, also indicated by what Chris stated before. I also looked at the other text and in the beginning I thought it might seem degrading as apparently it is not assumed that she is intelligent, talented and a warm and nutering person. But on the other hand, if I switched the gender it did not make a difference, and I feel he was just trying to give a nice introduction to the person
19. feminine touch is not only something women can bring. This implies that all women should be feminine... And all men should be masculine even though those two things have nothing to do with gender in my opinion.
20. Its unnecessary to label it feminine since it is gendering characteristics which we should do less
21. His intention seems to be good. He tries to create a safe environment even for the new participant. From now adays point of view he is a bit sexistic. But I think this is not his intention.
22. Sexist just means that you are not treating women and men equally and that you are generalizing characteristics. He might not have meant it in a bad way but it is still

- sexist and he didn't have to add it so it was intentional.
23. I feel like certain characteristics come with being what is socially perceived as "feminine" or "masculine" (traditionally based in gender roles). Therefore, it could have been that the work environment was "missing" some of those characteristics. Nevertheless, Chris's comment defines the new employee as having these because she is a woman. And this is reproducing gender roles which could be harmful.
 24. It sounds a bit like a stereotypical comment of someone who does not see the actions nor the consequences of his comment in regard to the society where we live in nowadays.
 25. Saying being warm and nurturing is a female trait perpetuates binary gender stereotypes. Apart from that, the action conveys an image of a man that does 'diversity' to appease pressures, not out of an intrinsic or founded belief in progressive hiring practices.
 26. I think many people are often not aware that stressing certain gender qualities (if they exist) can be harmful.
 27. It seems as it is systematic sexism, as in he is using terms about women in a patriarchal conservative way which might hurt both men and women about their perceived potentials and characteristics
 28. not trying to be sexist but still being sexist, showing how things work in his mind
 29. I don't see this to be very sexist because he is not making a negative comment about her. It is unnecessary, but not outright sexist in my opinion.
 30. I think that Chris has been surrounded by sexist comments and thoughts but I don't think his intentions are to degrade women. Rather, showing to the team what she may bring.
 31. He probably grew up using language that sounds sexist, even if he isn't really sexist. The "nurturing" part is that which might sound like some confirmation that women are mainly supposed to be caregivers. But men should also be nurturing. The "feminine" touch part is probably meant as a compliment, and perhaps meant as a criticism of men. Yet, it comes off wrong. Someone can have words with him, but he doesn't deserve to get in trouble.

Scenario 2 - Social Setting

1. I personally hate when people assume your personality traits based on your gender. This kind of behaviour makes me angry and it is also very unnecessary. I think it can be harmful as it is promoting not treating someone the same as others.
2. Once again, based on stereotypes. Why does he have to mention the feminine touch? No one would do that if it was a group of women and a man was joining, they wouldn't comment on his "manly touch" or whatever...
3. Same as the previous
4. Intentional in a positive way :) If he spoke about her appearance then it would not be good
5. I would see it as a compliment lol

6. He means it nice, as a compliment but doesn't realise that he is telling her that she is a great addition because she is a woman and not because of who she is as a person
7. He is a good man
8. Same as last question
9. Maybe a little sexist, but not that sexist. A group of guys just is different from a group of males and females.
10. Chris just strongly emphasizes the things that are obvious things that come with women, there is prettig often the assumption that women are more nurturing than man
11. Are there already more female chess players in this group?
12. The way Chris says this indicates that a warm and nurturing personality is a feminine trait. It might not be his intention and he could just try to say something nice about the new member, which would not make him a sexist man, but this can easily be taken (or meant) in the wrong way.
13. I believe that Chris was very aware of what he was saying. By saying that a female brings a warm and nurturing personality to the group, he is stereotyping women. I personally would walk out after he said it.
14. I think this could go for everyone, so I do not think it is seks oriented
15. Depending on the culture of this club all these words could be True and a compliment to the New chess player
16. Another case of a guy who probably assumes there's nothing wrong with what he said. But he could've just said it'll be great to have her intelligence and kindness on the team or something.
17. He only had to mention her chess qualities, the part warm nurturing, smart is sexist
18. I think that Chris believes in different roles for men and women. By introducing the woman in this way, the woman may feel the need to confirm the gender role of being warm and nursing. At the same time could the woman really be warm and nursing and it is not wrong for Chris to say that. However I do think he shouldn't have talked about the feminine touch. There is no need to bring his idea of her gender identity into the conversation.
19. Ik interpreteer dit dat deze man erg blij is met een nieuwe schaak speelster. En een vrouwelijke touch is juist voor de dynamiek in een groep heel goed
20. He praises her on her qualities. The qualities the group might have lacked. He reinforces positivity towards the woman and makes sure the group accepts her and her role within the club.
21. I find this one a bit difficult to assess, as the comments he makes firstly are on her skills and personality, so I would argue that these are (atleast not intentionally) sexist but I can also see that then emphasizing the "feminine touch" again is atleast remotely questionable to add the the compliments made.

22. I do not think this is harmful but it was unnecessary to mention her personality, since this has nothing to do with chess. I wonder if this would have been done if the player was a male.
23. No problem
24. I think that even though framed in a positive way, benevolent sexism as shown here is still harmful as it perpetuates certain patriarchal roles in our society. If I were present during this situation I would feel uncomfortable because of the generalization and assumption that the woman is nurturing (which comes with other implications such as that she is good at care taking and therefore that should be care taking etc)
25. Ik denk dat het gewoon prima gezegd is, niks gemeens of raars aan op te merken
26. I don't think Chris meant it this way, but he sees this woman not as a chess player (like the rest of the club) but as a stereotype. This way women will never be taken seriously for their talents (chess in this scenario) but will always be seen for the nurturing stereotype
27. I don't think that Chris himself looks down on women, however I think his statement gives more insight into the roles he has seen women fulfill in his life. Like he feels that there is a clear distinction between the roles of men and women, probably due to the society he lives in.
28. No
29. Benevolent sexism. It assumes someone's personality based on sex not the actual person
30. Chris' last sentence is a bit sexist towards men and women, because he attributes nurturing warmth etc only to women. Skip the last part of the sentence and the introduction is fine