OVERT, COVERT, AND SUBTLE SEXISM

A Comparison Between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism Scales

Janet K. Swim and Laurie L. Cohen
Pennsylvania State University

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) is routinely used as a general measure of sexism. In this article, it is argued that the AWS (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) actually measures overt or blatant sexism (harmful and unequal treatment of women that is intentional, visible, and unambiguous), whereas the Modern Sexism Scale (MS) measures covert or subtle forms of sexism (sexism that is either hidden and clandestine or unnoticed because it is built into cultural and societal norms). Support for this distinction is shown by way of (a) confirmatory factor analyses, (b) correlations with affective reactions to different categories of women and men (i.e., women and men in general, traditional women and men, feminists, and chauvinists), and (c) correlations with perceptions of sexual harassment. These analyses indicate that the AWS and MS scales measure distinct but related constructs.

A standard way of assessing sexist beliefs about women has been to measure the endorsement of traditional gender roles. Perhaps the best known and most often used scale for measuring such beliefs is Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp's (1973) Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). The AWS (and similar scales) can be considered a measure of sexist beliefs about women

because agreement with its items indicates support for differential treatment of women and men, support for double standards for judging women's and men's behavior, and a belief that women are not as fit as men to perform certain tasks.

Changes in responses to the AWS over the years suggest a decline of at least overt endorsement of sexist beliefs (Spence & Hahn, 1997). Other forms of sexist beliefs likely exist, however. Benokraitis and Feagin (1986, 1995) identified three types of sexism that illustrate the manifestation of sexism in our current social-political climate. These three types are overt (or blatant), covert, and subtle sexism. Overt sexism is defined as "unequal and harmful treatment of women that is readily apparent, visible, and observable, and can be easily documented" (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1986, p. 30). Open endorsement of unequal treatment of women and men on scales like the AWS is indicative of this type of sexism. Covert sexism involves engaging in unequal and harmful treatment of women and men in a hidden or clandestine manner. For instance, individuals may say that they favor gender equality but engage in behaviors that intentionally undermine women's work or lead them to fail.

Subtle sexism is characterized by openly unequal and harmful treatment of women that goes unnoticed because it is perceived to be customary or normal behavior. Individuals who perpetrate such treatment may be in favor of gender equality and their responses to scales such as the AWS may reflect egalitarian beliefs. These same individuals may not notice when they or others are treating individuals unfairly based on their gender or they may not realize that such behaviors contribute to unequal and harmful treatment of women, however. For instance, Butler and Geis (1990) showed that both men and women rated female and male leaders equally, but their nonverbal behaviors toward female leaders were more negative than toward male leaders. These individuals were likely unaware that they were treating the female and male leaders differently. Subtle sexism is also consistent with research demonstrating that stereotyping can reflect automatic cognitive processes that may be unintentional or outside of the stereotyper's awareness (Banaji & Greenwald, 1994).

The content of the AWS suggests that it can identify individuals who hold overtly sexist beliefs and who are willing to endorse them on surveys. The scale is less likely to identify individuals who hold covert or subtle sexist beliefs because these individuals are not likely to indicate openly that they support traditional gender roles. Some recently developed measures of beliefs about women — the Modern Sexism scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) and the Neosexism scale (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995) — may be better able to assess covert and subtle sexism, however. These measures do not rely on endorsement of "old-fashioned" gender stereotypes or approval of unequal treatment of women and men in order to identify individuals who hold sexist beliefs. Modeled after research on symbolic racism and the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986; Sears,

1988), these scales measure whether respondents tend to (a) deny the existence of discrimination against women, (b) resent complaints about discrimination, and (c) resent special "favors" for women.

The original logic behind symbolic and modern racism, which guided the development of the modern sexism scales, was that unfavorable attitudes toward minorities surface in areas in which the attitudes could be interpreted in nonprejudiced terms. One way they emerge is in lack of support for symbols of desegregation (such as busing) rather than in outright rejection of desegregation. Research has shown that the Modern and Symbolic Racism scales are better predictors of attitudes toward policies such as busing than is old-fashioned racism (Sears, 1988). Consistent with this characterization of prejudice are experimental studies that illustrate that European Americans are less likely to help an African American when their lack of helping could be attributed to something other than prejudice (Crosby, Bromley & Saxe, 1980; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). This process is similar to covert sexism in that it implies that symbolic or modern racists are hiding their prejudices, only revealing them in "safe" circumstances where their action could be attributed to something other than race. Their apparent egalitarianism is merely a reflection of social desirability concerns.

Supporting the argument that modern sexist beliefs are related to covert prejudices, Tougas et al. (1995) illustrated that scores on the Neosexism scale rather than an old-fashioned sexism scale contributed unique variance to predicting unfavorable attitudes toward Affirmative Action. Similarly, Swim et al. (1995) showed that Modern Sexism and not Old-Fashioned Sexism was related to the preference for a male rather than a female senatorial candidate. An alternative explanation of the latter finding (that the results were due to other factors related to differences in the candidates' political parties) could not be ruled out, however.

Another interpretation of the content of the Modern Sexism and Neosexism scales is that they assess subtle rather than covert forms of sexism. Endorsement of the beliefs that characterize modern sexism as measured by these two scales (i.e., not perceiving that discrimination still exists and resenting policies or people fighting for equality) may reflect a lack of awareness of the extent to which the work force is gender segregated. It may also reflect a lack of understanding of the forces that negatively affect women's occupational, economic, political, and social status. Support for modern sexist beliefs may also be related to the extent to which individuals define behaviors, such as sexual harassment, as indicative of inequality or disrespect of women. Consistent with Benokraitis and Feagin's (1986, 1995) description of subtle sexism, those who endorse modern sexist beliefs may not be hiding their prejudices; instead, they do not perceive that certain beliefs or behaviors are indicative of prejudice. According to this interpretation, people who oppose programs such as Affirmative Action are not necessarily opposed to equality. Because they believe that there is

no inequality in the first place, they are likely to think that Affirmative Action leads to bias against white males, rather than to equality for women and minorities. Therefore, the modern sexism scales may be assessing differing degrees of sensitivity to discrimination against women. Thus, although some would describe modern sexists as insensitive to sexism, modern sexists may believe that others are too sensitive to sexism that they believe does not exist.

Supporting the argument that modern sexist beliefs reflect insensitivity to gender inequality, Swim et al. (1995) illustrated that people who scored high on the Modern Sexism Scale (MS) were more likely than low scorers to overestimate the percentage of women in several male-dominated jobs (e.g., police officers, airplane pilots, physicians). High scorers were also more likely to believe that the gender-segregated work force is a result of biological differences between women and men and less likely to believe that segregation is a result of socialization and discrimination. Scores on the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale (OFS) were not a predictor of such beliefs. These findings suggest that Modern Sexists were likely to perceive that gender segregation is a function of "normal" or "natural" processes.

ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCT AND DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY

Data were collected to test the predictive and discriminant validity of Swim et al.'s Modern Sexism Scale in relationship to the AWS. The AWS and the MS should be related to each other because both measure sexist beliefs and both are related to beliefs about gender equality. They should also be distinct from each other, however, because they represent separate forms of sexist beliefs (overt versus covert or subtle sexism).

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Confirmatory factor analyses, as described below, support this characterization of both scales by illustrating that the Old-Fashioned Sexism scale and the AWS load together on a factor that represents overtly sexist beliefs; this factor is distinct from a factor that represents the Modern Sexism Scale. In addition, as predicted, MS and AWS correlate with each other.

Responses to the AWS, Modern Sexism Scale, and Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale were obtained from 934 male and 1,819 female, primarily European American psychology students as part of several mass screenings from the spring of 1992 to the spring of 1995. In these sessions, participants completed all three scales in addition to several other psychological assessment instruments used for other, unrelated research. Five confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for both male and female participants. Models specified in these analyses included (a) a null model that predicts no relationships between the items, used as a baseline to compare with more

restrictive models, (b) a single-factor solution specifying that the AWS, MS, and OFS items all load on the same factor, (c) a two-factor solution, testing whether AWS and MS items load on one factor with OFS loading on a second factor, (d) another two-factor solution, testing whether AWS items load with OFS items on one factor with MS items loading on a second factor, and (e) a three-factor solution in which AWS, MS, and OFS each load on separate factors, indicating that each scale measures a distinct construct. The fourth model was predicted to have the best fit because it predicts that the AWS and Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale measure the same construct whereas the Modern Sexism Scale measures a distinct construct.

The results for the factor analyses are presented in Table 1. The fit indices indicated, as predicted, that the second two-factor solution yielded the best fit for both male and female participants. Higher fit indices indicate better fit (see Mulaik et al., 1989, for a description of fit indices). The correlations between the factors for the three-factor solution also indicated that the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale and AWS were more similar to each other than to the Modern Sexism Scale. Although all correlations were significant, the correlation between the OFS and AWS factors was larger (phi = .90 for both males and females) than the correlation between the OFS and MS factors (phi = .25 and .41, for males and females, respectively) and also larger than the correlation between the AWS and MS factors (phi = .35 and .48, for males and females, respectively). The results, therefore, support the prediction that the AWS and the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale are measuring the same construct which is distinct from the construct measured by the Modern Sexism Scale. Because the reliabilities for the AWS are stronger than those for the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale, it would be advisable for future research to employ the AWS rather than the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale when comparing the two forms of sexism (Cronbach's alphas for the MS, the AWS, and the OFS were .82, .79, and .65, respectively).

Predicting Attitudes About Women and Men

There has been an increasing tendency to study prejudice as a type of attitude (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989, 1994; Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1991; Haddock & Zanna, 1994; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993). Prejudice can, therefore, be conceptualized as an evaluation of a particular group (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989). The next set of analyses were conducted to test whether the AWS and the Modern Sexism scale predicted prejudicial attitudes about women and whether each scale contributed unique variance to relationships with these attitudes. Because the category of women encompasses many different types of women, it may be difficult for the large category to capture the range of people's true attitudes about women (see

Table 1

Confirmatory Factor Analyses Comparing Old-Fashioned Sexism (OFS), AWS, and Modern Sexism Scale (MS) for Male and Female Participants

Model	χ^2	df	GFI[a]	PGFI[b]	Tucker–Lewis
Male participants					
(1) Null model	5822.89	378	.46	—	—
(2) One factor	3359.67	350	.78	.67	.40
(3) Two factors: AWS & MS vs. OFS	2215.63	349	.78	.67	.62
(4) Two factors: AWS & OFS vs. MS	1140.66	349	.90	.77	.84
(5) Three factors	1107.78	347	.90	.77	.85
Female participants					
(1) Null Model	10501.53	378	.46	—	—
(2) One factor	3406.42	350	.82	.70	.67
(3) Two factors: AWS & MS vs. OFS	3366.68	349	.82	.70	.68
(4) Two factors: AWS & OFS vs. MS	1816.77	349	.92	.79	.84
(5) Three factors	1791.02	347	.90	.77	.84

[a] GFI = Goodness of Fit Index; [b] PGFI = Parsimonious Goodness of Fit Index.

Glick & Fiske, 1997). Hence, we also examined attitudes toward two subtypes of women: women who hold traditional roles and feminists. Favorable attitudes about women may be revealed primarily when focusing on women who hold traditional roles, whereas negative attitudes may be revealed when feminists are the focus. Additionally, because evaluations of women and men are often pitted against one another with the assumption that people who are prejudiced against women would be prejudiced in favor of men, we also examined the relationship between AWS and the Modern Sexism Scale, and attitudes toward men in general, men who hold traditional roles, and chauvinists.

Most of the participants who completed the AWS, MS, and OFS for the confirmatory factor analyses reported above (ns = 888 men and 1,744 women) also rated one of six groups of people (i.e., women in general, traditional women, feminists, men in general, traditional men, or chauvinists). Traditional women were defined as full-time homemakers with husbands who worked in paid jobs; traditional men were defined as men who worked and had wives who were full-time homemakers. No definitions were given for feminists and chauvinists. The relative order of the sexism scales in relation to the ratings in the mass screenings varied both within and between administrations of the screening packets.

Attitudinal ratings of the six stimulus groups were assessed through the semantic differential scales used by Eagly and Mladinic (1989).[1] The adjective pairs were: good–bad, positive–negative, valuable–useless, pleasant–unpleasant, and nice–awful. Participants were asked to rate, on a 10-point scale, the extent to which these words described how they felt about the group noted at the top of their form. Ratings were scored such that higher numbers indicated more favorable reactions to the group. The responses for each of these adjective pairs were averaged to form one scale. The average Cronbach's alpha for these ratings across target groups was .91 and the range was .89 to .93.

Because both the AWS and the MS are measures of sexism, it was expected that correlations between both scales and attitude measures would show related patterns. In fact, similar patterns of correlations between the two scales and affective reactions were obtained for all categories except the category of men in general.[2] Both modern sexists and traditional (overt) sexists were more likely to have negative attitudes toward women and feminists and more likely to have positive attitudes toward traditional men and chauvinists. Neither the MS nor the AWS were correlated with attitudes toward traditional women. The results also indicate that the scales, although similar, are not completely redundant with each other. The partial correlations indicated that both the AWS and the MS contributed unique variance to the relationships with attitudes toward women, feminists, men, traditional men, and chauvinists (see Table 2).[3]

One difference between the two scales was that the MS, but not the

Table 2

Correlations and Partial Correlations of Attitudinal Ratings with Participant's Gender, MS, and AWS

Group Rated	N	Correlations with Participant's Gender	Correlations Partialling Out Participant's Gender		Correlations Partialling Out Alternative Scale and Participant's Gender	
			MS	AWS	MS	AWS
Women	460	.03	−.20***	−.23***	−.13**	−.18***
Traditional women	425	.01	−.01	−.06	.01	−.06
Feminists	429	−.35***	−.39***	−.40***	−.27***	−.28***
Men	447	−.19***	.10**	−.07	.13**	−.11**
Traditional men	443	.14**	.26***	.27***	.17***	.18***
Chauvinists	429	.28***	.29***	.36***	.16***	.27***

Note: Higher ratings indicate more sexist responses on Modern Sexism and the AWS. Higher ratings on the semantic differential scales indicate more favorable ratings. Male participants were coded 1 and female participants were coded −1.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001 with two-tailed t-tests.

AWS, was positively correlated with attitudes about men. Those who were more likely to endorse modern sexist beliefs were also more likely to rate men more favorably. On one hand, these results when examined alongside correlations with ratings of women, suggest that modern sexists will be biased in favor of men and biased against women. On the other hand, they also suggest that those low in modern sexism will be more biased against men and more biased in favor of women (Trapnell, Suedfeld, & Paulhus, 1996). AWS was negatively correlated with attitudes toward men, but only when modern sexist beliefs were partialled out, suggesting that traditional participants may have both positive and negative attitudes about men.

Although both scales are correlated with attitudes toward women in general, correlations with attitudes toward feminists and chauvinists were even stronger.[4] Thus, although the AWS and MS are correlated with attitudes toward women as a group, they were better at predicting attitudes toward feminists and chauvinists. Because feminists and chauvinists are defined in large part by their beliefs about women and equality, these correlations suggest that there is a tendency for individuals to have more positive affect toward individuals who they perceive to hold beliefs similar to their own (Beaman & Klentz, 1983; Byrne, 1961). This tendency can be seen in both the relatively strong negative correlations between sexism scales and ratings of feminists and in relatively strong positive correlations between sexism scales and ratings of chauvinists.

It is important to consider the implications of negative attitudes toward feminists for attitudes about women in general. Negative reactions to feminists can have repercussions for women, whether or not women label themselves as feminists. Women may know that if they say or do things that could be interpreted as feminist, then certain people will have negative attitudes about them. That is, if they express complaints about women's status, note some form of inequality, or report sexual harassment, then they may expect to be perceived in an unfavorable way. This perception can have a silencing effect on women and serve to maintain the status quo with regard to women's social and economic status.

A final interesting finding is that neither the AWS nor the Modern Sexism Scale were related to beliefs about traditional women. One might argue that this could be a function of a ceiling effect for ratings of traditional women. This is not the case, however, because ratings of traditional women were quite similar to ratings of women in general — a category in which significant correlations with affective ratings were found. The lack of correlation may be a function of the strength of positive stereotypes about women who hold traditional roles (Eagly & Mladinic, 1994). In contrast, the AWS and Modern Sexism Scale were related to people's ratings of traditional men. The results, like those for feminists and chauvinists, may reflect whether or not participants believed that traditional men hold beliefs similar to their own.

Predicting Beliefs about Sexual Harassment

Our final test of the construct and discriminant validity of the Modern Sexism Scale examined the relative ability of the Modern Sexism Scale and the AWS to predict responses to descriptions of sexual harassment. Results from two studies are presented in Table 3. As a measure of differential perceptions of sexism, Modern Sexism should be related to reactions to sexual harassment cases, including whether or not individuals label an incident as sexual harassment, sympathize with an alleged victim, and recommend punishment for a harasser.

In the first study, 17 European American women and 14 European American men, who had completed the MS and AWS in a mass screening in their psychology class were recruited to participate in a study on personnel problems. They were told to assume that they were managers who had to decide how to respond to 10 personnel problems in the workplace. Embedded in these 10 incidents were 3 cases of sexual harassment with a male harasser and a female victim. The cases consisted of: (a) a night manager joking during a training session that women would be required to have a routine bra check conducted before each shift at the restaurant; (b) a quid pro quo case in which a male employer touched a female employee and then told her that he could help her career; and (c) a company where women complained about men's pornographic calendars.[5]

Participants were asked to indicate, on 7-point scales, the extent to which they agreed that the perpetrator committed sexual harassment, behaved inappropriately, acted in a professional manner, and treated the alleged victim fairly; they also indicated the extent to which the woman elicited the treatment she was given and should have appreciated the behavior of the alleged harasser. These latter five questions were averaged to form a scale for each scenario (Cronbach's alphas = .86, .86, .74, respectively for the three scenarios described previously). Finally, participants were asked to assess how they would respond to the incident by selecting one of six possible responses ranging from (1) commending the alleged perpetrator on a job well done to (6) firing him. Responses to the three scenarios were combined.

In the second study conducted by Freedman, Swim, and Silverman (1997), 115 female and 117 male, primarily European American psychology students who had completed the MS and the AWS in a mass screening, read a one-page summary of prosecution and defense arguments based on an actual sexual harassment court case. The prosecution noted that male co-workers of the alleged victim had created a hostile work environment through the display of pornography, graffiti, and sexual comments directed at her. The prosecution had two expert witnesses. One testified that her status as the only woman in the office and the presence of pornography and graffiti increased sexual stereotyping. The other testified that her interviews with female employees led her to believe that the workplace

Table 3
Correlations and Partial Correlations Among Attitude Scales, Participant's Gender, and Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

Perceptions	Mean	Correlations with Participant's Gender	Correlations Partialling Out Gender		Correlations Partialling Out Alternative Scale and Gender	
			MS	AWS	MS	AWS
Study 1						
Was it sexual harassment?	4.55	−.17	−.44**	−.24	−.40*	−.14
Perceptions of perpetrator/victim	5.63	−.33	−.47**	−.42**	−.41**	−.35*
Action recommended	3.43	.03	−.50**	−.23	−.47**	−.11
Study 2						
Should be charged?	4.88	−.19**	−.26***	−.05	−.26***	.04
Verdict	.65	−.17*	−.18**	−.08	−.16**	−.02
Perception of case	4.39	−.28***	−.22***	−.13*	−.19**	−.06

Note: Higher ratings indicate more sexist responses on the Modern Sexism scale and the AWS. Male participants were coded 1 and female participants were coded −1. Higher numbers for the dependent variables in the first study indicate a greater tendency to label the incident as sexual harassment, greater sympathy for the victim, and a greater tendency to recommend a harsher response to the perpetrator. Higher numbers for the dependent variables in the second study indicate more support for a charge of sexual harassment, greater likelihood of giving a guilty verdict, and greater sympathy for the prosecution's argument.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001 with two-tailed t-tests.

yielded a hostile environment. The defense also had two expert witnesses. One testified that the sexual materials found in the woman's workplace do not promote sexual aggression. The other testified that women employed elsewhere found the materials to be only moderately disgusting and offensive. The defense also had as a witness a woman who was a co-worker of the alleged victim who said that she did not find the environment hostile and a man who testified that his comments directed at the woman were meant to be complimentary. Participants in the study were asked to rate, on a 7-point scale, whether they believed that their co-workers should be charged with sexual harassment, and were then asked to turn in a guilty or not-guilty verdict. Following these questions, participants rated on 7-point scales how serious the woman's situation was and the extent to which they believed that the men's behavior was intimidating, disgusting, interfered with the woman's performance, and was done with the intent to harm. They also rated the extent to which they believed that the woman should be flattered by the men's attention and was overreacting. These seven questions were averaged to form one scale (Cronbach's alpha = .86). Items were recoded such that higher scores on all questions indicated more favorability for the prosecution's case.

The Modern Sexism Scale was found to be a better predictor than AWS in both sexual harassment studies (see Table 3).[6] The MS predicted responses to all the measures, even after controlling for responses on the AWS. The AWS also predicted perceptions of the case for both studies, but after controlling for modern sexism, the correlation was only significant in Study 1.

CONCLUSIONS

Results from the three data sets illustrate both the similarity and uniqueness of the Modern Sexism Scale and AWS. The confirmatory factor analyses demonstrate that the two scales are tapping different, though related constructs. Correlations between the two scales and the affect measures indicate that both are related to negative attitudes about women and feminists and positive attitudes about traditional men and chauvinists. Further, partial correlations reveal that each contributes unique variance to these relationships. Finally, the correlations and partial correlations with perceptions of the sexual harassment cases indicate that Modern Sexism is uniquely related to perceptions of these events. This is consistent with the argument that the MS is related to subtle sexist beliefs, which include differential tendencies to define, be aware of, or perceive events as sexist, whereas the AWS is related to more overt or blatant forms of sexism.

The findings presented here provide further evidence for the distinction between traditional and modern forms of sexism as conceptualized within

the framework of overt versus covert or subtle forms of sexism. Researchers interested in identifying individuals who openly endorse and support differential treatment of women and men and traditional gender roles could use the AWS. For those who wish to identify individuals who tend not to notice inequality or who discount sexism when they see it, however, the current results suggest that the Modern Sexism Scale would be a more useful tool.

NOTES

1. A subset of participants also completed two other types of ratings after completing the semantic differential ratings. In one set of ratings, participants indicated the intensity of their positive and negative thoughts and feelings to one of the six groups. In another set, participants indicated which of several different emotions, taken from the circumplex model of emotion (Larson & Diener, 1992), best represented their feelings when interacting with members of the group they rated. The pattern of correlational results for these ratings is not presented because it is similar to that of the semantic differential ratings.
2. The results do not include correlations with the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale because the focus of the article was on a comparison between the AWS and the Modern Sexism Scale and also because the confirmatory analyses indicated that the AWS and the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale measure the same construct, and that the AWS has a higher reliability. Correlations between responses to the Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale and affect responses are very similar to the results reported with the AWS.
3. Partial correlations are also presented, instead of separate correlations for women and men, because moderated regression analyses indicated no substantive gender differences. Main effects for participant's gender and the attitude scale of interest (AWS or Modern Sexism) were first entered into the equation. Next the interaction between the attitude scale and the participant's gender was entered into the equation to test whether gender moderated the relationship between the given scale and the affective responses. Participant's gender moderated two effects for the semantic differential ratings. In another set of analyses, the main effects for participant's gender, and both the AWS and MS, were entered into the equation prior to testing the interaction between one of the scales and participant's gender. Participant's gender moderated three effects for the semantic differential ratings. In all cases in which the interaction terms were significant, the partial correlations for women and the partial correlations for men representing the significant interactions were significant. Hence, the pattern of findings does not change the interpretation of the results presented in Table 2.
4. Moderated regression analyses indicate that the correlation between the attitude scales and affective responses to women in general are significantly different from the correlation between the attitude scales and affective responses to feminists and chauvinists. This was tested by first entering the gender of the participant, one of the attitude scales, and the category rated, into regression equations predicting ratings of women and feminists and predicting ratings of women and chauvinists. Then, the interaction between the attitude scale and the category rated was entered into the equation.
5. Two other sexual harassment cases were also included in the study. Those cases both included a female boss as the perpetrator. In one scenario the supervisor continued to give a male employee a massage even after he requested that she stop. In the other scenario, she made comments about a man's body. Neither the MS nor the AWS were adequate predict-

ors of responses to cases with female perpetrators. One might argue that this finding is a
result of low-scoring modern sexists being less sympathetic to male perpetrators; however,
this is unlikely because these cases were more apt to be seen as sexual harassment, in
comparison to those with a male perpetrator. Thus, the lack of findings may be caused by
these incidents not being ambiguous enough to detect differences between modern and
traditional sexists. They could also be the result of an artifact because the scenarios involv-
ing female perpetrators and male victims were completed at the end of the packet.
6. Partial correlations for both sexual harassment studies are presented, rather than correla-
   tions for males and females separately, because moderated regression analyses indicated no
   gender differences in the results.

REFERENCES

Banaji, M. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (1994). Implicit stereotyping and prejudice. In M. P.
    Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol.
    7, pp. 55–76). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Beaman, A. L., & Klentz, B. (1983). The supposed physical attractiveness bias against sup-
    porters of the women's movement: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychological
    Bulletin, 9,* 544–550.
Benokraitis, N. V., & Feagin, J. R. (1986). *Modern sexism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-
    Hall.
Benokraitis, N. V., & Feagin, J. R. (1995). *Modern sexism* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
    Prentice-Hall.
Butler, D., & Geis, F. L. (1990). Nonverbal affect responses to male and female leaders:
    Implications for leadership evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
    58,* 48–59.
Byrne, D. (1961). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. *Journal of Abnormal and
    Social Psychology, 62,* 713–715.
Crosby, F., Bromley, S. , & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of black and white
    discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 37,* 546–563.
Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and
    men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15,* 543–558.
Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1994). Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers
    from research on attitudes, gender stereotypes, and judgments of competence. In W.
    Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 1–35).
    New York: Wiley.
Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than
    men? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15,* 203–216.
Freedman, S. A., Swim, J. K., & Silverman, C. (1997). *The effects of reasonable person
    and reasonable woman jury instructions on perceptions of and decisions about sexual
    harassment cases.* Unpublished manuscript, The Pennsylvania State University.
Gaertner, S., & Dovidio, J. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In S. L. Gaertner & J. F.
    Dovidio (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61–89). New York: Aca-
    demic.
Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist
    attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21,* 119–135.
Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1994). Preferring "Barbara Bush" to "Hillary Clinton":
    Categorization and the favorability of attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women
    Quarterly, 18,* 25–53.
Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial
    attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social
    Psychology, 65,* 1105–1118.

Larson, R. J., & Diener, E. (1992). Promises and problems with the circumplex model of emotion. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol. 13, pp. 25–29). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In S. L. Gaertner & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). New York: Academic.

Mulaik, S. A., James, L. R., VanAlstine, J., Bennett, N., Lind, S., & Stilwell, C. D. (1989). Evaluation of goodness-of-fit indices for structural equation models. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*, 430–445.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53–84). New York: Plenum Press.

Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 17–34.

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

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

Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 842–850.

Trapnell, P.D., Suedfeld, P., & Paulhus, D.L. (1996). *Prejudice, politics, and the Modern Sexism Scale.* Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia.

APPENDIX

Items with an asterisk require reversed scoring.
Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence et al., 1973)

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.
2. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.*
3. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause in the marriage service.*
4. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.*
5. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
6. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.*
7. A woman should not expect to go exactly the same places or have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
8. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
9. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
10. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.*
11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.*
12. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
13. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in bringing up the children.
14. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.*
15. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

Old-Fashioned Sexism (Swim et al., 1995)

1. Women are generally not as smart as men.
2. I would be equally as comfortable having a woman or a man as a boss.*
3. It is more important to encourage boys than to encourage girls to participate in athletics.
4. Women are just as capable of thinking logically as men.*
5. When both parents are employed and their child gets sick at school, the school should call the mother rather than the father.

Modern Sexism (Swim et al., 1995)

1. Women often miss out on good jobs due to sexual discrimination.*
2. It is rare to see women treated in a sexist manner on television.
3. Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement.
4. It is easy to understand the anger of women's groups in America.*
5. Over the past few years, the government and news media have been showing more concern about the treatment of women than is warranted by women's actual experiences.
6. Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States.
7. On average, people in our society treat husbands and wives equally.
8. It is easy to understand why women's groups are still concerned about societal limitations of women's opportunities.*