How People Define Sexism: The Role of Intent and Harm in Judgements of Sexism towards Women in the Workplace

Helena E. Bieselt

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

Supervisors:

Dr. Pelin Gül

Dr. Mirjam Radstaak

THE UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE

Faculty of Behavioural Management and Social Sciences

Department of Positive Psychology & Technology

June 25th, 2021

Abstract

Aims: Even though there are documented detrimental consequences of subtle and implicit sexism towards women, there is still a widespread controversy about what acts are and what makes a person sexist. Adding to existing sexism research, this paper examined the influence of intent and harm, the type of actor (individuals vs. institutions), and the level of feminism of the perceiver on the judgement of subtle and implicit forms of sexism in the workplace.

Methods: Two studies were conducted to examine if more perceived intent and more perceived harm result in more perceived sexism, if institutions are judged harsher than individuals when performing harmful subtle biased behaviour towards women, and if more feminist beliefs result in more perceived intent, harm and sexism. In Study 1, participants rated six scenarios with ambiguous intent and harm descriptions and different actor types (individual vs. institutional) to investigate the relationships between intent, harm, actor type, and feminism with sexism in a real life-setting. Study 2 examined the directions of the relationships by having participants rate one out of eight scenarios with manipulated intent and harm descriptions and the differing actor types. For both studies, an online Qualtrics survey was used to gather a convenience sample of 77 male and female participants (Study 1) and 408 male and female participants (Study 2). Feminist beliefs were measured with the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS).

Results: Study 1 used Pearson's bivariate correlations and resulted in positive moderate to strong relationships between perceived sexism with perceived intent, harm, and level of feminism. Study 2 used two 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs and Pearson's correlations, revealing that participants judged the behaviour and character as significantly more sexist when there was a high intent to discriminate compared to a low intent but did not perceive a significant difference in sexism when high vs. low harm descriptions were given. Institutions were judged to be significantly more sexist in behaviour than individuals when high intent and high harm were described. Level of feminism was positively related to perceived intent, harm and sexism of both behaviour and character.

Conclusions: This research resulted in novel discoveries that challenge current scientific research on judgement of sexism. It implies that in addition to harm people use intent and the type of actor to form their judgements of sexism, which implied a necessary broadening of the understanding of what counts as sexism to a more nuanced approach when dealing with subtle and implicit sexism in real-life.

In 2015, barrister Charlotte Proudman disclosed a message that she had received by Alexander Carter-Silk on the social media site LinkedIn, in which he praised her profile picture for her looks (Quinn, 2015). She reported finding the message offensive and sexist, arguing that the purpose of LinkedIn is to display one's professionalism and not to be reduced to one's appearance and objectified. While Proudman received praise from several other women (Quinn, 2015), she also received severe backlash for calling the actions of Carter-Silk sexist, ranging from being called a 'feminazi' to rape threats (Davies, 2015). Indeed, like many before, this incident started a divisive debate about what does and does not count as sexism (Davies, 2015) and illustrates that individuals differ in their judgement of it. While some people might focus on the harm that is done to form a conclusion if something is sexist, others may view the intent of the actor as pivotal. Using ideas from moral judgments literature to study judgments of sexism, this research aims to investigate how people judge sexism, and particularly whether the role of intent is relevant to judgments of these controversial forms of sexism in addition to harm.

Judgements of Subtle Expressions of Sexism

The described incident is an example of an ongoing debate about what counts as sexism and what actions can be labelled as sexist. These more controversial and debate-sparking forms are often not the overt and hostile expressions (e.g., "women should not be in politics"), but instead seem to belong more into the category of subtle sexism (e.g., "Women exaggerate the difficulties they face"), which according to some researchers is one distinct form of sexism (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Barreto & Ellemers, 2005b; Dardenne et al., 2007). Many researchers believe that subtle sexism is often not noticed due to the internalisation of it as being acceptable or normal (Brant et al., 1999; Swim & Cohen, 1997) and since it does not seem to have an apparent intent to harm (Swim et al., 2004). Individuals that perform subtle sexist behaviour may support gender equality but fail to notice unfair treatment based on gender (Swim & Cohen, 1997). It is possible that performers of subtle sexism do not realise that certain behaviours contribute to the inequality and harm that women encounter (Swim & Cohen, 1997).

Another controversial form of sexism (i.e., as in individuals often disagree on whether it is sexist or not) is benevolent sexism which involves subjectively positive attitudes and chivalrous behaviour towards women such as "women should be cherished and protected" (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Researchers suggest that these benevolent expressions are considered "sexist" due to the harm that they cause - they reinforce gender stereotypes and the idea of

women's inferiority to men (e.g., that a woman depends on a man) even though they are expressed in a positive or even romantic tone (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Swim et al., 2003). Because benevolent sexism has a flattering tone, it does not seem to fit the prototype of sexism as well as hostile sexism does (Swim et al., 2005), which makes it a more controversial form of sexism among people. This could lead to debates like the one around politician Ed Rendell, who commented positively on Susan Rice because she was smiling at a TV appearance, while describing Kamala Harris as someone who can "rub people the wrong way" (Burnett & Jaffe, 2020). While some saw his comment as sexist due to his reinforcement of gendered expectations – women being aggressive is seen as negative while rewarding them for smiling and being likeable – Rendell himself saw the criticism of his words as "ludicrous" since he wanted to give a compliment, describing the United States of America and its media landscape as "going crazy" (Burnett & Jaffe, 2020).

In sexism research, it appears to spark less discussion since many studies show that, even though benevolent sexism has a romantic and positive presentation, it has detrimental consequences for women. These include but are not limited to a decreased interest of women in thinking independently and to pursue motivational goals designed to meet biological and social needs (Feather, 2004), women experiencing themselves as less competent in context of work (Dumont et al., 2010), a rise in self-objectification (Calogero & Jost, 2011), and a reduction in cognitive performance through altering brain responses (Dardenne et al., 2007; Dardenne et al., 2013). Furthermore, it has been associated with sexual harassment and favourable attitudes towards domestic abuse (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a). Subtle forms of sexism like benevolent sexism appear to be characterised as sexism through the harm that they cause.

Surprisingly, however, people tend to debate these subtle forms of sexism like benevolent sexism more and judge them favourably, despite the detrimental harm they cause to women. For example, men displaying benevolent sexism seem to be judged more positively than those displaying hostile sexism (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Bohner et al., 2010; Kilianski & Rudman, 1998), with a smaller likelihood of benevolent sexists being seen as sexist (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a). In fact, in a study by Kilianski and Rudman (1998), benevolent sexists were evaluated as mildly favourable compared to hostile sexists that were highly unfavoured. Many studies also found that women seem to find men with benevolent sexist attitudes more attractive than those without, and report liking them (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Glick & Fiske, 2001). Indeed, many benevolent sexism behaviours, like

opening doors or paying for dates, seem to be desired even by women wanting egalitarian relationships (Glick & Fiske, 2001; Gul & Kupfer, 2019).

As an explanation for the favourable judgement of subtle sexism, most social psychology research suggests that women do not call benevolent sexism actually "prejudiced/sexist" because women do not recognize that benevolent sexism has harmful effects on women (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Becker & Swim, 2012; Bohner et al., 2010; Goh & Hall, 2015; Swim & Becker, 2011; Swim et al., 2003). Indeed, endorsement of benevolent sexism decreased, and disapproval increased after encouraging women to pay attention to it (Swim & Becker, 2011) and provide information about its harmful effects (Becker & Swim, 2012). Taken together, it seems like individuals are influenced in their judgement through the harmful consequences that subtle forms of sexism have. It appears that most people are just unaware of the harmful consequences. Helping people recognise said harm should then increase negative and decrease positive judgements of it. Recent research, however, showed that women do prefer benevolently sexist men despite recognising these attitudes and behaviours can be undermining to them (Gul & Kupfer, 2019), which suggests that people do not view benevolent sexism as "sexist" despite recognising its harm to women. One possibility that accounts for this discrepancy is that, instead of just focusing on whether the attitudes and behaviours are harmful, people might also be paying attention to the displayed desire to harm or undermine women. They may not perceive the actor of subtle or benevolent sexism as having an explicit intent to harm women and are in turn unwilling to judge subtle or benevolent forms of sexism as "sexist" and "prejudiced". In other words, conceptions of sexism may also emphasise intent and not only the harm that is done. This proposal is based on literature on moral judgement and will be substantiated in the next section.

The Role of an Actor's Intent on Moral Judgements

The role of intent in judging morality has been well established, with intent seemingly being an important influence (Alicke, 2000; Cushman, 2008; Malle et al., 2014). Acts are judged and evaluated more immoral or negative if they are perceived as intentional (Cushman et al., 2013; Swim et al., 2003; Young & Saxe, 2011). Harsher judgement of intentional compared to accidental acts appears across cultures (Barrett et al., 2016; McNamara et al., 2019; Ohtsubo, 2007), and in one study children as young as 3 years old withheld help from individuals that intended harm, even if said intended harm did not happen (Vaish et al., 2010). Failed attempts at intentional harm seem to receive more blame than accidental harm with no

malintent (e.g., intentionally putting poison into the coffee of a co-worker vs. doing it accidentally) (Young & Saxe, 2011). Applying these findings to judgements of sexism, intent could determine whether an act or actor is judged as sexist, with an intention to discriminate against women leading to a harsher judgement.

This can be seen in the study of Swim et al. (2003) that dealt with judgements of discrimination and prejudice, where an actor was more likely to be judged as prejudiced and their behaviour as discriminatory when discrimination was intended. However, this study also demonstrated that not only intent alone is important, but that harm also seems necessary to form a judgement. In the cases where it is uncertain what an actor intends through an action, the harm that was done served as an influence for the judgement, leading to an increase of judging the behaviours as discriminatory but a decrease of judging the actor as prejudiced (Swim et al., 2003). Participants did not, however, differentiate between the two judgements of behaviour and actor when the intent was clear. This way, both harm and intention seem to play an important role in judging discrimination and prejudice, with harm being especially influential in cases where intent is doubtable or unclear and intent being potentially important for judgements of the actor's character (Swim et al., 2003). The same could be true for subtle and implicit forms of sexism, where both a clear intent to harm and displayed harmful consequences for women could lead to harsher judgement of an actor's behaviour and character. Conclusively, it is possible that the more people perceive the actor as having an intention to discriminate against women, the more they will judge the actor's behaviour and character as sexist. Nevertheless, harm should still be important even with the inclusion of intention, so that the more harmful consequences are perceived, the more the actor's behaviour and character will be judged as sexist.

Additionally, apart from the intent to discriminate in and the harm that is caused by a certain behaviour, who performs it may also be important. The effects of different kinds of actors seems to be mostly overlooked, with most of moral judgement research like the ones mentioned above focusing on the judgement of individuals and their actions regarding sexism, discrimination, or prejudice. Even though there has been research done on the customer's perception of the morality of corporations (Castro-González et al., 2019; Komarova et al., 2018; Van Quaquebeke et al., 2019), not much focus has been on the judgement of an institutions' morality when acts of subtle sexism are committed. In a well-ordered society, institutions are expected by the individuals of said society to act according to principles of justice that its members agree upon (Scanlon, 2016). If an institution succeeds in this, the members of society tend to comply with them. However, if an institution is perceived to not

be complying with these principles, it is believed to be unjust and individuals tend to instead demand a change (Scanlon, 2016). This way, the morality of institutions might be judged even harsher, seeing as harm that is done by institutions has a far greater reach than the harm that can be done by an individual (Scanlon, 2016). An example of harsher treatment against institutions or companies is the possibility of costumers who feel wronged directing their moral retaliation (committing fraud by over-reporting performance to cause the company a loss of funds or yelling at employees) not only at guilty companies, but also guiltless ones (Komarova et al., 2018). Customers justify their behaviour of moral retaliation to themselves as a restoration of justice (Komaroya et al., 2018). On the contrary, when a company displays corporate social responsibility, consumer admiration for the company increases (Castro-González et al., 2019) and if ethical leadership is perceived within a company, there is a positive effect on purchasing intentions of costumers (Van Quaquebeke et al., 2019). Given that institutions are held to a higher moral standard than individuals, it is possible that institutions would be more likely to be judged as "sexist" when exhibiting harmful behaviour towards women than individuals.

Individual Differences of Perceivers: Feminist Beliefs

Other influences on moral judgements may possibly be individual differences or different ideologies. For example, the sex, personality, and political orientation of a person appear to influence their perception of crime, with female, right-wing, and conservative people seemingly putting more emphasis on how harmful the crime was and male, left-wing, and New Left oriented people judging a crime based more on intent (Forgas, 1980). Similarly, the judgements of intent, harm, and consequently sexism might depend on individual differences and ideologies, one of which could be a feminist orientation or feminist beliefs.

Feminism is a movement whose goal is ending sexist oppression (Hooks, 1984, as cited in Gowaty, 1992). Its theories address the effect of gender on an individual's ability to control power, resources, and their own life and those of others (Gowaty, 1992). Regarding its history, much feminist research was aimed at shattering gender stereotypes and showing that men and women are fundamentally equivalent in personality, behaviour, and intellect (Eagly, 1995).

Women who experienced sex discrimination (e.g., sexual harassment or sexist comments) are more likely to have feminist or non-traditional attitudes toward gender roles and support women's movements more strongly (Renzetti, 1987). Therefore, it is possible that some feminists might have experienced sexism in the past and because of this are more likely

to recognise it. Indeed, in one online study where participants were asked to indicate their relationship quality, feminist women reported more conflict concerning the equality of both partners in the relationship (Rudman & Phelan, 2007). In a study by Leaper and Brown (2008), adolescent girls' perception of sexism increased by learning about feminism and gender egalitarian attitudes. This way, there is a possibility that individuals with higher feminist beliefs would be more likely to perceive an intent to discriminate, the harm that is caused by a behaviour, and sexism in behaviour that could be described as subtly biased towards women.

The current research

Even though there are documented detrimental consequences of sexism towards women, there is still a widespread controversy about what acts are considered to fall under sexism and what makes a person sexist. Research examined and found that harm and intent matter in judgments of prejudice and discrimination, but little is known about judgments of sexism - especially types of behaviours that are subtle and implicit (not explicitly hostile) or have ambiguous information regarding the harm and intent. Therefore, this paper focuses on the role that intent and harm play in the judgement of subtle biased behaviour towards women (i.e., the types of behaviour that often lead to controversies and debates about sexism). Furthermore, it examines the differences in judgements when an act is done by an individual versus an institution, and the possible moderating role of the perceiver's feminist attitudes. Based on the rationale discussed in the introduction, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H1: The more people perceive the actor as having an intention to discriminate, the more they will judge the actor's behaviour and character as "sexist".

H2: The more people perceive harmful consequences, the more they will judge the actor's behaviour and character as "sexist".

H3: Institutions and their behaviour are more likely to be judged as "sexist" than individuals and their behaviour when exhibiting subtle biased behaviour towards women that results in harm.

H4: Individuals with higher feminist beliefs are more likely to perceive an intent to discriminate, harm, and sexism in subtle biased behaviour towards women.

To investigate these hypotheses, two studies are conducted. Participants are randomly assigned to one of them: Study 1 or Study 2. Both intend them to rate scenarios describing behaviour that can be construed as disadvantageous to women. Seeing as both real world

examples used in the introduction were work-related, Proudman receiving unwanted compliments about her appearance on a platform meant to display one's professionalism (Quinn, 2015) and Rendell possibly reinforcing gendered expectations when talking about two successful women (Burnett & Jaffe, 2020), the workplace was chosen as a setting for the scenarios. Since subtle sexism forms like benevolent sexism do not only negatively influence women's health, but also their competency perception at work (Dumont et al., 2010), it may be especially relevant when subtle sexism is conducted in the workplace.

Study 1 uses scenarios that give no description of the intent the actor has or the harm that is caused, allowing the participants to freely infer intent and harm from the description of the context and displayed behaviour alone. Accordingly, this design is more able to detect individual differences between the perceivers of the scenarios since they are not given an explicit description of what intent and harm were. After establishing the relationships between intent, harm, and sexism in a setting close to real-life through Study 1, Study 2 will use scenarios where intent and harm are manipulated to test differences between the judgements of sexism when comparing high and low intent to discriminate against women and high and low harm caused by the action.

Study 1

Method

Participants

The sample encompassed 77 participants (67.5% female, 32.5% male) aged 19 to 56 years old (M_{age} = 26.36, SD_{age} = 7.04). The most common nationalities reported by participants were the following: German, Dutch, British, and French. The inclusion criteria for participants encompassed that they are proficient in the English language and above 18 years old. There were three exclusion criteria: failing to pass the included attention check at the end of the survey (119 excluded), giving the same rating for every answer (4 excluded), and being under 18 years old.

To get a clear overview of the sample characteristics, descriptive statistics and frequencies were computed on the demographic variables (see Table 1). Most of the participants was female and rather young. It appears to be a West-European sample with a mostly middle SES background. The majority of the samples considered themselves to be in the middle of the right-left-leaning political orientation spectrum instead of being strong leaning on any side.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of Study 1

Variable		n	%
Gender	Male	25	32.5
	Female	52	67.5
	Other/Prefer not to say	-	-
Age	18-25	42	54.5
	26-35	29	37.7
	36-45	4	5.2
	46- 55	1	1.3
	56-70	1	1.3
Country of Birth	Germany	27	35.1
	Netherlands	9	11.7
	United Kingdom	16	20.8
	Austria	1	1.3
	Denmark	2	2.6
	Belgium	-	-
	France	7	9.1
	Other	15	19.5
Education Level	Less than High School	-	-
	High School	34	44.2
	College graduate	20	26.0
	Undergraduate degree	16	20.8
	Master's degree	6	7.8
	PhD or higher	1	1.3
Employment Status	Student	26	33.8
	Employed	45	58.5
	Unemployed	1	1.3
	Self-employed	3	3.9
	Unable to work	1	1.3
	Retired	-	-
SES	Poor	11	14.3
	Middle	62	80.5
	Rich	4	5.2
Political Orientation	Strongly right-oriented	7	9.1
	Moderate	47	61.0
	Strongly left-oriented	23	29.9

Design & Procedure

A cross-sectional and experimental design was used. Study 1 was designed with a one-factor within-subjects design (actor as within-subject factor) in which participants rated a total of six baseline scenarios (with no specific harm and no specific intent description), half of which had an individual as the actor while the other half had an institution.

Convenience sampling and snowball-sampling (Forshaw, 2013) were used by posting the link of the survey on several social media sites (Instagram, Reddit, etc.) and sharing the link with acquaintances and asking them for further distribution. To obtain individuals with varying levels of feminism, the link was posted both on forums focusing on feminism and forums focussing on more general topics or even opposing feminism. As compensation for filling out the questionnaire, they were rewarded with the possibility to win an Amazon voucher of 50 Euros or 0.25 credits if the survey was filled out using the SONA system of the University of Twente. Data was collected for six weeks. The study was approved by the BMS Ethics Committee of the University of Twente and followed its guidelines by having all participants sign a written consent form at the beginning of the survey which briefed them about the contents of the survey and the aim of the study (see Appendix A).

Participants first completed five demographic questions. Then, they rated six different scenarios that display an actor engaging in a behaviour that can be construed as disadvantageous to women. The rating of a scenario was done on five aspects: how intentional, harmful, morally wrong, and sexist the act is and how sexist the actor is. Finally, a scale measuring participants' level of feminist beliefs was filled out. When the survey was concluded, participants were debriefed (see Appendix B) and thanked for their participation.

Materials

Demographic questions. Five demographic questions were used for age, sex, nationality, level of education, employment status, SES, and political orientation (see Appendix C).

Scenarios. Six baseline scenarios were created with no specific harm and intent descriptions, with half of the scenarios featuring an individual as the actor and the other half featuring an institution as the actor who performed the behaviour. Every scenario displayed an actor engaging in a behaviour that can be construed as subtly biased or disadvantageous towards women in a workplace setting. While the other scenarios can be found in Appendix

D, an example of a scenario of Study 1 which has an individual as actor (institution as actor text is written in brackets) is as follows:

> Tom [Techquipo], a human resources manager at a big tech company [a big tech company], is planning upcoming meetings with talented new employees for a training camp to help them become more eligible for promotion to senior management jobs in the company. He [The company] schedules the meetings at 5pm, a time that is inconvenient for female employees with childcare responsibilities who have to pick up their children from the nursery after work.

Judgements of Intent, Harm, and Sexism of Behaviour and Character. For every scenario, participants were asked to rate five statements on how much they agree with them (see Appendix F). Participants captured their *perceived intent* by rating their agreement to the following statement: "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is intentional". Their *perceived harm* was indicated by their agreement to the following statement: "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is harmful". Two statements were given to capture how much *sexism* the participants *perceived in the behaviour*: "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is morally wrong" and "[Actor]'s action/behaviour is sexist". The ratings of these two statements were combined into a total mean score of perceived sexism of the behaviour for each of the three scenarios seperately. Lastly, participants indicated their *perceived sexism of the character* by their agreement to the following statement: "[Actor] is a sexist [noun]".

The three ratings given for each statement, one of each on all three scenarios, were combined into the total mean scores of perceived intent (Study 1: $\alpha_{individual} = .58$, $\alpha_{institution} = .47$), perceived harm ($\alpha_{individual} = .53$, $\alpha_{institution} = .63$), and perceived sexism of the behaviour ($\alpha_{individual} = .70$, $\alpha_{institution} = .72$) and of the character ($\alpha_{individual} = .49$, $\alpha_{institution} = .50$). Answers were rated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*not at all)* to 6 *(very much)*.

Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS). To measure the level of feminist beliefs or attitudes, 18 items of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) were used. The overall LFAIS scale has overall acceptable psychometric properties, with the entire scale having high reliability ($\alpha = .83$) and good convergent, divergent, concurrent, and known-groups validity (Morgan, 1996). The 18 selected items were previously used by Koyama et al. (2004) due to their applicability to a UK sample and their relevance regarding gender roles, emphasizing beliefs about autonomy and equality. In their study, Koyama et al. (2004) did not find a difference between the mean scores of the 18 items and the entire questionnaire, making these 18 items a plausible measurement for feminist

believes in the general public.

Each item contains one statement that is rated on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from “strongly agree” (1) to “strongly disagree” (7). An example of a statement is “Both husband and wife should be equally responsible for the care of your children.” (see Appendix G). Respective items were reverse coded before all items were averaged to create a composite score ($\alpha = .89$).

Data Analysis

The program IBM SPSS Statistics 24 was used to analyse the data. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were computed and reported under each condition to present the patterns in the data.

The overarching aim of Study 1 was to create closer real-life setting by giving no descriptions of intent and harm, which enables to detect individual differences more since participants made their own judgements. Pearson’s bivariate correlations were calculated between perceived intent, perceived harm, perceived sexism of behaviour and character, and level of feminism for individual and institutional scenarios separately. Looking at these relationships served as an initial test of Hypotheses 1,2, and 4. Comparing the sizes of the relationships between scenarios who had an individual as the actor and those who featured an institution actor served as an initial test for Hypotheses 3.

For all analyses, the significance level of $p < .05$ was chosen, meaning that a p-value below .05 indicates that a correlation can be considered significant.

Results

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of the study variables by type of actor (individual vs institution) and Table 3 present the bivariate correlations by type of actor. Except for the correlation between level of feminism and perceived sexism of the character, all study variables correlated significantly with each other ranging from low to strong sizes. This served as initial support for Hypotheses 1, 2, and 4 - participants’ perceived intent and perceived harm were related to perceived sexism of both behaviour and character and level of feminism was related to perceived sexism of the behaviour. The correlations were of generally greater size for institutions as actor than individuals, which could hint at possible harsher judgements of institutions. This was initial support for Hypothesis 3.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for each Rating of the Ambiguous Intent/Ambiguous Harm Scenarios by Type of Actor

Logistic Parameter	Individual as Actor	Institution as Actor
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*
Perceived Intent	2.83 (1.25)	2.75 (1.18)
Perceived Harm	3.18 (1.18)	3.16 (1.25)
Perceived Sexism (Behaviour)	2.81 (1.11)	2.84 (1.11)
Perceived Sexism (Character)	2.58 (1.16)	2.58 (1.16)
Level of Feminism	4.91 (1.14)	

Note. Mean and standard deviation of level of feminism are presented across both actor conditions.

Table 3

Bivariate Correlations between each Rating and Level of Feminism by Actor

	Perceived Harm	Perceived Sexism (Behaviour)	Perceived Sexism (Character)	Level of Feminism
		Individual as Actor		
Perceived Intent	.59*	.69*	.39*	.50*
Perceived Harm	1	.72*	.46*	.43*
Perceived Sexism (Behaviour)		1	.72*	.43*
Perceived Sexism (Character)			1	.07
		Institution as Actor		
Perceived Intent	.73*	.71*	.50*	.53*
Perceived Harm	1	.78*	.61*	.50*

Perceived Sexism (Behaviour)	1	.78*	.48*
Perceived Sexism (Character)		1	.16

Note. * Correlation is significant below the .001 level.

The aim of Study 1 was to detect individual differences by letting the participants make their own judgements about intent, harm, and sexism without giving any direction on intent and harm. Through this ambiguousness, another aim was to first establish the relationships of perceived intend, perceived harm, and level of feminism with perceived sexism in a real-life setting. Seeing as positive relationships ranging from low to strong sizes have been found, Study 2 focuses on the hypotheses made in the introduction by manipulating perceived intent and harm in the scenarios.

Study 2

Method

Participants

The sample encompassed 408 participants (69.9% female, 28.7% male, 1.2% other) aged 18 to 57 years old (M_{age} = 29.45, SD_{age} = 6.74). The most common nationalities that were reported were the following: German, Dutch, British, and US American. The same inclusion and exclusion criteria as in Study 1 were used. 358 participants were excluded for failing to pass the included attention check at the end of the survey, 110 for giving the same rating for every answer, and one for being under 18 years old.

To get a clear overview of the sample characteristics, descriptive statistics and frequencies were computed on the demographic variables (see Table 4). Similar to Study 1, the majority of the participants was female, rather young, and Western-European with a mostly middle SES background and considered themselves to be in the middle of the right-left-leaning political orientation spectrum.

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants of Study 2

Variable		N	%
Gender	Male	117	28.7
	Female	285	69.9
	Other/Prefer not to say	5	1.2
Age	18-25	133	32.7
	26-35	209	55.5
	36-45	56	9.6
	46- 55	7	1.7
	56-70	2	.4
Country of Birth	Germany	72	17.7
	Netherlands	66	16.2
	United Kingdom	99	24.3
	Austria	9	2.2
	Denmark	8	2.0
	France	14	3.4
	Belgium	7	1.7
	Other	132	32.4
Education Level	Less than High School	2	.5
	High School	83	20.3
	College graduate	90	22.1
	Undergraduate degree	147	36.0
	Master's degree	60	14.7
	PhD or higher	25	6.1
Employment Status	Student	81	19.9
	Employed	295	72.5
	Unemployed	21	1.7
	Self-employed	7	1.7
	Unable to work	2	.0
	Retired	1	.2
SES	Poor	30	7.4
	Middle	337	82.8
	Rich	40	9.6
Political Orientation	Strongly right-oriented	27	6.4
	Moderate	336	82.6
	Strongly left-oriented	44	10.8

Design & Procedure

Study 2 also used a cross-sectional and experimental design. The first scenario of the three scenarios of Study 1 was broadened with a 2 (low intent vs. high intent) x 2 (low harm vs. high harm) x 2 (individual vs. institution) design. There were four conditions (low intent-low harm, low intent-high harm, high intent-low harm, and high intent-high harm) and each scenario was then created to have two alternative types (individual vs. institution as the actor). Participants rated one scenario and were randomly assigned to one of the actors and one of the four conditions.[1]

The study was approved by the BMS Ethics Committee of the University of Twente. Data was collected parallelly to Study 1 for six weeks using the same sampling strategy, compensation, and procedure, with the exception that one scenario was rated instead of six.

Materials

Study 2 used the same demographic questions and LFAIS scale ($\alpha = .78$) as Study 1 (see Appendix C & G). It also had the participants rate their agreement to the same statements about each scenario (see Appendix F), where again the ratings of perceived moral wrongness and perceived sexism were combined into a total mean score of perceived sexism of the behaviour ($r_{sp} = .70$)[2].

Scenarios. There was a total of 8 different scenarios, varying in their degree of intent (low vs. high), degree of harm (low vs. high) and actor type (individual vs. institution). Again, all scenarios described an action committed in the workplace that can be construed as subtly biased or disadvantageous towards women. All scenarios can be found in Appendix E. An example of a scenario (using the high intent-high harm condition with an individual as actor) is as follows (institution in brackets):

> John [Consultio], a counsellor at a big company [a big consulting company], puts together a speech for the employees where he [that] is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. In his speech, he [The company's speech] intentionally refers to employees as "he" and as

[1] *Note*. In the original design of Study 2, the type of actor was a within-subject factor, meaning that every participant was supposed to be randomly assigned to one of the four conditions where they had to rate both actor types. However, a bug in the program used for data collection had the participants rate only the institutional scenario, skipping the individual scenarios entirely. Therefore, a second data collection had to be performed parallelly, where participants only rated the individual scenarios, changing the design to a between-person factor for actor type and having participants rate only one scenario.

[2] Spearman-Brown coefficient was used seeing as it is the reliability statistic that is the most appropriate for a two-item scale (Eisinga et al., 2013).

> having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". He [The company] doesn't want to include everyone in his [the] speech (male and female employees) and [deliberately refers only to men] he deliberately refers only to men. The female employees notice him using male pronouns [that only male pronouns are used]. They feel excluded by what he [is] said and that they shouldn’t apply for promotion.

Data Analysis

Like in Study 1, IBM SPSS Statistics 24 was used to analyse the data and descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were computed and reported under each condition to present the patterns in the data.

Manipulation checks were conducted using a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs with intent, harm, and actor as between-subject independent variables and perceived intent and harm as the dependent variables respectively. Here, the main effect of harm on perceived harm and the main effect of intent on the perceived intent were examined. Significant main effects of both intent and harm would provide support that the manipulations of intent and harm were effective.

Hypotheses 1-3 were tested using a 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVAs with intent, harm, and actor as between-subject independent variables and perceived sexism of the behaviour and of the character as the dependent variables respectively. To test Hypothesis 1 (*the more people perceive the actor as having an intention to discriminate, the more they will judge the actor’s behaviour and character as “sexist”*), the main effect of intent (low vs. high) was examined. A significant main effect of intent would provide support for Hypothesis 1.

For Hypothesis 2 (*the more people perceive harmful consequences, the more they will judge the actor’s behaviour and character as “sexist”*), the main effect of harm (low vs high) was investigated. Similar to Hypothesis 1, a significant main effect of harm would provide support for Hypothesis 2.

For Hypothesis 3 (*institutions and their behaviour are more likely to be judged as “sexist” than individuals and their behaviour when exhibiting subtle biased behaviour towards women that results in harm*), the interaction effect of intent, harm, and actor was examined. Inclusions of the EMMEANS subcommand (see Appendix I) allowed for further exploration, by comparing the *simple* main effects of both actors (individual vs. institutional) on judgements of sexism under the high harm condition in both high and low intention conditions. A significant interaction effect and a significant difference between the individual

and institutional actors would serve as support for Hypothesis 3.

Lastly, Hypothesis 4 (*individuals with higher feminist beliefs are more likely to perceive an intent to discriminate, harm, and sexism in subtle biased behaviour towards women*) was tested by aggregating means over all conditions and running Pearson's correlations with feminist beliefs and the judgements (intent, harm, sexist behaviour and character). Significant correlations would provide support for Hypothesis 4.

For all analyses, the significance level of $p < .05$ was chosen, meaning that a p-value below .05 indicates that a predictor can be considered significant. Additionally, the standardised coefficient beta was examined for the magnitude of the effect size.

Results

Table 5 present the means and standard deviations of the study variables by type of actor and condition.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Study Variables by Actor and Condition

	Individual as Actor				Institution as Actor			
	Low Intent		High Intent		Low Intent		High Intent	
	Low Harm	High Harm	Low Harm	High Harm	Low Harm	High Harm	Low Harm	High Harm
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Perceived Intent	2.53 (1.60)	2.85 (1.50)	3.39 (1.47)	2.96 (1.80)	1.74 (1.20)	2.33 (1.63)	3.74 (1.82)	3.53 (2.09)
Perceived Harm	3.16 (1.60)	3.29 (1.62)	3.51 (1.43)	3.06 (1.69)	3.74 (1.28)	3.00 (1.35)	3.04 (1.78)	3.79 (2.15)
Perceived Sexism (Behaviour)	3.31 (1.39)	3.52 (1.32)	3.72 (1.42)	3.26 (1.45)	3.40 (1.28)	2.67 (1.30)	3.50 (1.73)	4.05 (1.60)
Perceived Sexism (Character)	2.96 (1.74)	3.38 (1.51)	3.54 (1.47)	3.22 (1.80)	2.42 (1.87)	2.21 (1.56)	3.04 (1.72)	3.63 (1.77)
Level of Feminism	4.61 (.78)							

Note. Mean and standard deviation of level of feminism were created using both scenarios featuring an individual and an institution as actor.

Manipulation Checks for Harm-Intent Scenarios

Participants perceived higher intent in the high intent condition than in the low intent condition, $F(1,400) = 27.44$ $p < .000$, $d = .43$. However, participants did not perceive higher harm in the high harm condition than in the low harm condition, $F(1,400) = .15$, $p = .697$, $d = -.07$. These results show that the manipulation of intent but not harm was successful.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: ***The more people perceive the actor as having an intention to harm, the more they will judge the actor's behaviour and character as "sexist".***

Perceived sexism of the actors' behaviour was judged as higher in the high intent than in the low intent conditions, $F(1,400) = 5.63$, $p = .018$, $d = .14$, and participants in the high intent condition perceived the actor's character as more sexist than participants in the low-intent conditions, $F(1,400) = 9.22$, $p = .003$, $d = .22$. Thus, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypothesis 2: ***The more people perceive harmful consequences, the more they will judge the actor's behaviour and character as "sexist".***

Perceived sexism of the actors' behaviour did not differ between high and low harm conditions, $F(1,400) = .37$, $p = .542$, $d = -.08$, and there was also no difference in perceived sexism of the actor's character between the high and low harm conditions, $F(1,400) = .33$, $p = .568$, $d = .04$. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Hypothesis 3: ***Institutions and their behaviour are more likely to be judged as "sexist" than individuals and their behaviour when exhibiting subtle biased behaviour towards women that results in harm.***

Regarding perceived sexism of the behaviour, there was a statistically significant three-way interaction between intent, harm, and actor, $F(1,400) = 8.02$, $p = .005$, $d = -.06$. Looking at the simple main effects, there was no difference between the perceived sexism of the behaviour of institutions and individuals when both harm and intent were low, $F(1,400) = .06$, $p = .808$, and when there was low harm but the actor had high intent, $F(1,400) = .431$, $p = .512$. When harm was high but intent was low, participants did perceive the institution's behaviour as less sexist than the individual's behaviour, $F(1,400) = 6.89$, $p = .009$. However, when both harm and intent were high, participants perceived the institution's behaviour as more sexist than the individual's behaviour, $F(1,400) = 4.88$, $p = .028$.

Regarding perceived sexism of the character, the three-way interaction between intent,

harm, and actor was not significant , $F(1,400) = 3,59$, $p = .059$, $d = -.28$. There was no difference in the simple main effects between the perceived sexism of the character of institutions and individuals when both harm and intent were low, $F(1,400) = 1.66$, $p = .198$, and when there was low harm but high intent, $F(1,400) = 1.58$, $p = .210$. When harm was high but intent was low, participants perceived the institution's character as less sexist than the individual's character, $F(1,400) = 9.31$, $p = .002$. When both harm and intent were high, there was no difference between the perceived sexism of the character of institutions and individuals, $F(1,400) = .97$, $p = .325$. Thus, overall, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 4: ***Individuals with higher feminist beliefs are more likely to perceive intent to discriminate, harm, and sexism in subtle biased behaviour towards women.***

Table 6 presents the Pearson's correlations between level of feminism with each study variable. Individuals with higher feminist beliefs were more likely to perceive intent, harm, and sexism in the actor's behaviour and character. This serves as support for Hypotheses 4.

Table 6

Pearson's Correlations between Level of Feminism and each Overall Rating

	Perceived Intent	Perceived Harm	Perceived Sexism (Behaviour)	Perceived Sexism (Character)
Level of Feminism	.10*	.31**	.34**	.17**

Note. * Correlation is significant below the .005 level. ** Correlation is significant below the .001 level.

General Discussion

This paper aimed to examine the role that intent and harm play in the moral judgement of more subtle and implicit forms of sexism to investigate how people define sexism. Furthermore, it set out to investigate the differences in judgements when an act is done by individuals versus institutions, and the possible moderating role of the level of feminism one possesses.

Regarding Hypothesis 1, which looked at the role that intent plays in the judgement of subtle and implicit sexism, Study 1 led to the discovery that the perceived amount of intent seems to be moderate to strongly positively related to judgements of sexism. Study 2 substantiated this experimentally by showing that participants judged both the behaviour as

well as the character as more sexist when there was a high intent compared to a low intent, confirming that intent plays a major role in the judgement of implicit and subtle forms of sexism. These findings are novel for sexism literature but correspond with those of previous research on moral judgements, where displayed actions were evaluated more negatively if they were perceived to be intentional (Cushman et al., 2013; Swim et al., 2003; Young & Saxe, 2011). It appears that intention is the most important aspect for adults to form their judgements about morality and judging said morality of behaviour appears to rely on the actor's mental state (Cushman, 2008).

Hypothesis 2 theorised that the harm that is done also influences the judgements of sexism. Consistent with the prediction, Study 1 revealed a positive relationship of strong size especially between the perceived sexism of the behaviour and perceived harm. Contrary to this initial support for the Hypothesis, participants in Study 2 did not seem to generally perceive more sexism when descriptions of high harm compared to low harm were given. However, the manipulation checks in Study 2 revealed that the manipulation of perceived harm in the scenarios was not effective, which could have interfered with the findings. Furthermore, finding no effect of harm by itself should not be taken as a sign that harm does not play a role in moral judgements of sexism since there was a significant interaction between intent, harm, and actor when running tests for Hypothesis 3, meaning that the exact influence of harm may depend on whether there is an intention to harm and what type of actor is causing and intending the harm. Former moral judgement research also found interactions between intent and harm. Swim et al. (2003) demonstrated that judgements of discrimination are based on harm if it is unclear or doubtable if the person intended said harm. Similarly, Wu et al. (2018) report an interaction between intent and outcome in social interactions. Here, people - who rated events presented to them where two people interacted - perceived the interaction to be stronger when the outcome of an action (help or harm) had a strong effect on the receiver rather than a weak one (Wu et al., 2018). This effect was amplified by a high intention compared to a low intention (Wu et al., 2018).

Hypothesis 3 examined if institutions are given harsher judgements than individuals when committing subtle biased acts towards women that results in harm. The correlations in Study 1 between perceived intent, perceived harm, and perceived sexism were generally of stronger size for scenarios where institutions were the actor than scenarios featuring an individual actor, hinting at the possibility that institutions might receive harsher judgement. Study 2 seems to partially confirm this, by revealing a significant interaction between intent, harm, and actor when judgements were made about the behaviour. Even though institutions

were judged as less sexist in their behaviour than individuals when low intent but a harmful outcome were given, institution's behaviour was judged as more sexist when the high harm was also intended, partially confirming the Hypothesis. A possible explanation for the exclusivity of harsher judgement only when both high intent and high harm are given is that high intent might extinguish the possibility of justifying or excusing the institution for its behaviour. In one study, acceptance of harm-doings of a corporation increased through justifying or excusing the harm that a corporation committed (Folkes & Whang, 2003). However, describing a high or clear intent to cause harm might rule out possible excuses or justifications for harm that was done, leaving the participant with no option of accepting the behaviour, but in turn, judge the institution's behaviour as more "sexist" than individuals.

Regarding Hypothesis 4, which looked at the role that one's feminist beliefs play in the formation of judgements of sexism, both Study 1 and 2 demonstrated positive relationships between one's level of feminism and judgements of intent, harm, and sexism of a behaviour and a character, confirming the Hypothesis. Accordingly, the level of feminism one possesses appears to play a role when looking at how moral judgements of sexism are formed by influencing how much intent, harm, and sexism in both behaviour and character is perceived. The latter concurs with the study by Leaper and Brown (2008) not by the size of the effect, but by its direction of the relationship - perception of sexism increasing through knowledge of feminism and gender egalitarian attitudes.

There were some unexpected but interesting findings in Study 2. Judgements about the sexism of a behaviour were higher than those about the character (see Table 5). When participants' judgement of the actor as prejudiced decreased when intent was left unclear, Swim et al. (2003) proposed that participants may need more evidence and a sense of cross-situational constancy to feel comfortable in making a judgement about a person compared to their behaviour. Similar to how players in a game are judged to play more unfairly when the people making a judgement are given a history that describes the player playing unfairly in several games (Kliemann et al., 2008), judgements about a person's character might be based on several behaviours, not the most recent one alone.

Next, there is a particular unexpected pattern in the interplay between intent, harm, and actor in Table 5. When a low intent and a high harm description was given and the harm that was done could therefore be considered as an accident, individuals were judged as having more intent, doing more harm, and being more sexist both in behaviour and character than institutions. People seem to attribute blame to the humans who are the closest to the harm that was done (Shultz & Schleifer, 1983, as cited in Zemba et al., 2006), like a captain of a tanker

that caused an oil spill (Zemba et al., 2006), or blaming higher-level managers who might have indirectly caused the harm (Hamilton, 1978). Seeing as the companies in the used scenarios were only given a name with no further description of their personnel, the participants might have found it hard to single out a culprit that was the closest to causing the accidental harm. Indeed, it may have been easier to put blame on a single individual for an accident than on a faceless company.

Implications of the Research

This research has several theoretical implications. When looking at research that has been done on this topic, subtle and implicit forms of sexism seem to be characterised by the harm that they cause – reinforcement of gender stereotypes and women's inferiority to men (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Swim et al., 2003). When examining why people do not see subtle and implicit forms of sexism as sexist, the focus has been on harm alone and the lack of knowledge of it (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005a; Becker & Swim, 2012; Bohner et al., 2010; Goh & Hall, 2015; Swim & Becker, 2011; Swim et al., 2003). This research, however, challenges the existing literature by showing that the theoretical model of why there is discrepancy among people in their judgement of sexism has to be broadened. It found that not only the harm that is done and perceived has to be considered, but that especially intent and also the type of actor that performs the "sexist" behaviour have to be acknowledged. This way, the understanding of what counts as sexism might also have to be broadened: from something that causes harm to something that causes harm and intends it.

These theoretical breakthroughs also have practical implications. When dealing with sexism, especially subtle and implicit forms, a more nuanced approach might be needed in real-life scenarios. When an act of subtle or implicit sexism is committed, not only the harm that was done should be examined, but it should also be considered if the harm was intended or if the act was even committed in good faith. This way, societal and legal consequences could be adjusted according to both intent and harm, going against the recent trend of "cancel culture", in which support (e.g., follows on social media, purchases of endorsed products by the person, or viewership) is withdrawn from a person who is perceived to have behaved in a way or said something that is highly problematic or unacceptable, especially regarding sexism, homophobia, racism, bullying, or related issues (Ng, 2020). While seemingly fighting for a good cause, it seems like cancel culture performers do not succeed in raising awareness to the structural embedment of for example racism but even distract attention from it by

focusing on one individual that is demonised, individualising racism and depoliticising and decontextualising it in the process (Bouvier, 2020). Furthermore, a nuanced approach to transgressions appears to be lost – people with a history of sexual harassment seemingly receiving the same treatment as people with one problematic post made in the past (Brooks, 2019, as cited in Ng, 2020). A nuanced focus could be restored by broadening what counts as an offense - putting focus not only on the potential harm but also on the intent that someone had.

By examining what people base their judgements of sexism on, it aids in understanding how different populations define sexism, which helps tackle it in the future. Seeing as more subtle forms of sexism are often not noticed since they are often seen as normal and acceptable (Brant et al., 1999; Swim & Cohen, 1997), which probably hinders it from being challenged (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005b), knowing the bases for moral judgement of sexism creates possibilities on educating different populations on what counts as sexism. This could lead to forms of sexism that are debated today to become frowned upon in the future, limiting the amount of harm done to women and increasing women's health and equality in society.

Strengths, Limitations, & Further Research

This research possesses several strengths. First and foremost, by including not only harm but also intent as a possible influence on judgements of sexism this research is novel in regard to current sexism research. Another strength is that while similar insightful studies about intent and harm and their role in moral judgements like the one of Swim et al. (2003) used scenarios that were quite different from each other according to which harm or intent description was chosen, the newly created scenarios in this study were completely standardised except for the short descriptions of intention and harm, making the changes in rating attributable only to those manipulations and no other random feature. Here, the manipulation check confirmed that intent was manipulated as intended, meaning that future research that focuses on subtle or implicit sexism and the effect of intent can use these scenarios in the future. This research also used two different study designs for two studies, which created more nuanced and stronger findings of a broader picture. Next, the study design also created several strong points. By using an online study, large amounts of data could be collected over a relatively short period, analyses could be performed quickly, and instructions for the participants could be completely standardised.

However, some limitations should be kept in mind while interpreting the findings.

While the manipulation of intent was effective in the scenarios, the manipulation of harm was not, leaving descriptions of harm unsuited if the effects of harm are to be examined. The Cronbach's alphas of the scenario ratings in Study 1 were also low, meaning all scenarios of Study 1 should be examined individually. This research focused on a controversial topic and included items where the participant had to rate how 'sexist' something was. Even though the survey was done completely anonymous, a social desirability bias cannot be completely ruled out. Next, the samples that were used consisted mostly of young adults, so generalising findings of this study to other age groups should be done with caution.

Lastly, during the initial stages of the data collection, it was noticed that the program used for data collection had a bug in assigning participants to both actor types of the different conditions, which meant that scenarios with individual or institutional actors could not be rated by the same participants. The factor of actor had to be changed from a within-subjects to a between-subjects factor and a new data collection for Study 2 had to be performed. Therefore, the differences that were observed in the ratings for individuals and institutions cannot be completely attributed to the actor type only but may also be possible due to different samples being used. This also resulted in unequal sample sizes regarding participants who judged individual scenarios or institutional ones. However, this can be improved in future research, where this study could be repeated using within-subject variables.

Furthermore, this research can be also expanded on by using a design that includes scenarios where intent descriptions are left out, making the intent unclear, but manipulating harm descriptions. While this research showed that harm seems to play a role in the judgements of sexism in its interaction with intent, it may be possible that it is used alone if no description of the intent is given. This way, the study findings of Swim et al. (2003), where harm was used to form moral judgement in case of unclear intent, could be recreated with sexism instead of prejudice and discrimination.

While this research examined the level of feminist beliefs someone possesses as an individual difference of the perceiver, there are other individual differences that might be important to examine. Judgments of sexism might be influenced by sex, political orientation, and personality similar to crime perceptions: with female, right-wing, and conservative people putting more emphasis on harm and male, left-wing, and new Left oriented people paying more attention to intent (Forgas, 1980). Younger people might also focus more on intent, seeing as there is a bigger likelihood for younger people in Europe to be politically left-leaning (Silver & Johnson, 2018).

The context of the scenarios could also be changed or broadened. While this research

looked only at a workplace setting, there might be differences in judgement if certain behaviours are performed in a less strict setting, like a conversation between friends and family. It could also be examined if a decrease in victims results in different judgements. In this research, scenarios observed judgements of actors who aimed their behaviour against a group of women. Future research could investigate how "sexist" a behaviour or character is judged to be if the target of it is one single woman instead of a group.

Lastly, different cultures could also be explored. One study found that intent and harm's influence on moral judgement might be shaped by different cultures through differing concepts of how to interpret the world around us (McNamara et al., 2019). Therefore, the interplay between intent and harm when judging sexism could be examined in cultures that differ in these concepts. The way individuals vs. institutions are judged in sexism might also differ from what was observed for East Asian perceivers: since they seem to be oriented towards assuming collective agency (Menon et al., 1999), they might judge the institutions that are presented as a collective, with no individual member to single out, harsher.

Conclusion

By including not only harm but also intent as a possible influence on judgements of sexism, this research enriched current sexism research through the novel discovery that not harm alone, but especially intent and the type of actor play a role in the formation of judgements about subtle and implicit forms of sexism, challenging the existing theories that put the focus solely on harm. Participants did judge both the behaviour as well as character as significantly more sexist when there was high compared to low intent. While an effect of harm alone was not found, it did influence sexism judgements through interactions with intent and actor type in which institutions were judged to be significantly more sexist in behaviour than individuals when both a high intent and a harmful outcome were described. Furthermore, one's level of feminism also plays a role - feminist beliefs were positively related to intent, harm and sexism. These findings have theoretical and practical implications, from broadening our understanding of what counts as sexism, which could aid in tackling it within society and improving women's well-being and equality, to a more nuanced approach when dealing with subtle and implicit sexism in real-life, instead of "cancelling" perpetrators immediately.

References

Alicke, M. D. (2000). Culpable control and the psychology of blame. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(4), 556–574. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.556

Barrett, H. C., Bolyanatz, A., Crittenden, A. N., Fessler, D. M., Fitzpatrick, S., Gurven, M., Henrich, J., Kanovsky, M., Kushnick, G., Pisor, A., Scelza, B.A., Stich, S., von Rueden, C., Zhao, W., Laurence, S. (2016). Small-scale societies exhibit fundamental variation in the role of intentions in moral judgment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *113*(17), 4688–93. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1522070113

Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005a). The burden of benevolent sexism: how it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*(5), 633–642. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.270

Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N. (2005b). The perils of political correctness: men's and women's responses to old-fashioned and modern sexist views. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *68*(1), 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250506800106

Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2012). Reducing endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist beliefs: differential effects of addressing harm versus pervasiveness of benevolent sexism. *Social Psychology, 43*(3), 127–137. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000091

Bohner, G., Ahlborn, K., & Steiner, R. (2010). How sexy are sexist men? women's perception of male response profiles in the ambivalent sexism inventory. *Sex Roles : A Journal of Research, 62*(7-8), 568–582. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9665-x

Bouvier, G. (2020). Racist call-outs and cancel culture on twitter: the limitations of the platform's ability to define issues of social justice. *Discourse, Context & Media*, *38*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2020.100431

Brant, C. R., Mynatt, C. R., & Doherty, M. E. (1999). Judgments about sexism: a policy capturing approach. *Sex Roles : A Journal of Research*, *41*(5-6), 347–374. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018870715993

Burnett, S. & Jaffe, A. (2020, August 4). Smile more? Some critics see sexism debate over Biden VP. *AP News.* https://apnews.com/article/election-2020-joe-biden-ap-top-news-michael-pence-politics-c0f1c2257ec0135d8ee5d9e7816c76da

Calogero, R. M., & Jost, J. T. (2011). Self-subjugation among women: Exposure to sexist ideology, self-objectification, and the protective function of the need to avoid closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 211-228.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021864

Castro-González, S., Bande, B., Fernández-Ferrín, P., & Kimura, T. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and consumer advocacy behaviors: the importance of emotions and moral virtues. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *231*, 846–855. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.238

Cushman, F., Sheketoff, R., Wharton, S., & Carey, S. (2013). The development of intent-based moral judgment. *Cognition*, *127*(1), 6–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.11.008

Cushman, F. (2008). Crime and punishment: distinguishing the roles of causal and intentional analyses in moral judgment. *Cognition*, *108*(2), 353–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.03.006

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), 764–79. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.764

Dardenne, B., Dumont, M., Sarlet, M., Phillips, C., Balteau, E., Degueldre, C., Luxen, A., Salmon, E. Maquet, P., & Collette, F. (2013). Benevolent sexism alters executive brain responses. *Neuroreport*, *24*(10), 572–577. https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0b013e3283625b5b

Davies, C. (2015, December 29). Stories of 2015: the barrister branded a 'feminazi' in LinkedIn sexism row. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/dec/29/charlotte-proudman-feminazi-barrister-linkedin-sexism-row

Dumont, M., Sarlet, M., & Dardenne, B. (2010). Be too kind to a woman, she'll feel incompetent: Benevolent sexism shifts self-construal and autobiographical memories toward incompetence. *Sex Roles, 62*, 545-553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9582-4

Eagly, A. H. (1995). The science and politics of comparing women and men. *American Psychologist*, *50*(3), 145–58. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.50.3.145

Eisinga, R., Grotenhuis, M., & Pelzer, B. (2013). The reliability of a two-item scale: pearson, cronbach, or spearman-brown? *International Journal of Public Health*, *58*(4), 637–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-012-0416-3

Feather, N. T. (2004). Value correlates of ambivalent attitudes toward gender relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 3-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203258825

Folkes, V. S., & Whang, Y. O. (2003). Account-giving for a corporate transgression

influences moral judgment: when those who "spin" condone harm-doing. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(1), 79–86. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.79

Forgas, J. P. (1980). Images of crime: a multidimensional analysis of individual differences in crime perception. *International Journal of Psychology*, *15*(1-4), 287–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207598008246998

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.70.3.491

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance. hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *The American Psychologist*, *56*(2), 109–18. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109

Goh, J. X., & Hall, J. A. (2015). Nonverbal and verbal expressions of men's sexism in mixed-gender interactions. *Sex Roles, 72*, 252-261. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0451-7

Gowaty, P. A. (1992). Evolutionary biology and feminism. *Human Nature*, *3*(3), 217–249. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02692240

Gul, P., & Kupfer, T. R. (2019). Benevolent sexism and mate preferences: why do women prefer benevolent men despite recognizing that they can be undermining? *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *45*(1), 146–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218781000

Hamilton, V. L. (1978). Who is responsible? toward a social psychology of responsibility attribution. *Social Psychology*, *41*(4), 316–328. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033584

Kilianski, S. E., & Rudman, L. A. (1998). Wanting it both ways: do women approve of benevolent sexism? *Sex Roles : A Journal of Research*, *39*(5-6), 333–352. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018814924402

Kliemann, D., Young, L., Scholz, J., & Saxe, R. (2008). The influence of prior record on moral judgment. *Neuropsychologia*, *46*(12), 2949–2957. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2008.06.010

Komarova, L. Y., Haws, K. L., & Bearden, W. O. (2018). Businesses beware: consumer immoral retaliation in response to perceived moral violations by companies. *Journal of Service Research*, *21*(2), 184–200. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670517738366

Koyama, N. F., McGain, A., & Hill, R. A. (2004). Self-reported mate preferences and "feminist" attitudes regarding marital relations. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *25*(5), 327–335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.06.004

Leaper, C., & Brown, C. S. (2008). Perceived experiences with sexism among adolescent girls. *Child Development*, *79*(3), 685–704. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01151.x

Malle, B. F., Guglielmo, S., & Monroe, A. E. (2014). A theory of blame. *Psychological Inquiry*, *25*(2), 147–186. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.877340

McNamara, R. A., Willard, A. K., Norenzayan, A., & Henrich, J. (2019). Weighing outcome vs. intent across societies: how cultural models of mind shape moral reasoning. *Cognition*, *182*, 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.09.008

Menon, T., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (1999). Culture and the construal of agency: attribution to individual versus group dispositions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(5), 701–717. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.76.5.701

Morgan, B. L. (1996). Putting the feminism into feminism scales: introduction of a liberal feminist attitude and ideology scale (lfais). *Sex Roles : A Journal of Research*, *34*(5-6), 359–390. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01547807

Ng, E. (2020). No grand pronouncements here…: reflections on cancel culture and digital media participation. *Television and New Media*, *21*(6), 621–627. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476420918828

Ohtsubo, Y. (2007). Perceived intentionality intensifies blameworthiness of negative behaviors: blame-praise asymmetry in intensification effect 1: intensification effect. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *49*(2), 100–110. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5884.2007.00337.x

Quinn, B. (2015, September 8). Barrister hits out over sexist comment on her LinkedIn photo by legal expert. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/law/2015/sep/08/charlotte-proudman-alexander-carter-silk-linkedin-photo-comment-law-firms

Renzetti, C. M. (1987). New wave or second stage? Attitudes of college women toward feminism. *Sex Roles : A Journal of Research*, *16*(5-6), 265–277. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289954

Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2007). The interpersonal power of feminism: is feminism good for romantic relationships? *Sex Roles : A Journal of Research*, *57*(11-12), 787–799. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9319-9

Scanlon, T. (2016). Individual morality and the morality of institutions. *Filozofija I Drustvo*, *27*(1), 3–36. https://doi.org/10.2298/FID1601003S

Silver, L., & Johnson, C. (2018, October 30). *Younger adults in Western Europe are more socially, politically progressive than older age groups.* Pew Research Center.

https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/10/30/younger-western-europeans-more-socially-and-politically-progressive/

Swim, J. K., & Becker, J. C. (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

Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism : a comparison between the attitudes toward women and modern sexism scales. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*(1), 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00103.x

Swim, J. K., Mallett, R., & Stangor, C. (2004). Understanding subtle sexism: detection and use of sexist language. *Sex Roles : A Journal of Research*, *51*(3-4), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000037757.73192.06

Swim, J. K., Mallett, R., Russo-Devosa, Y., & Stangor, C. (2005). Judgments of sexism: a comparison of the subtlety of sexism measures and sources of variability in judgments of sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*(4), 406–411. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00240.x

Swim, J. K., Scott, E. D., Sechrist, G. B., 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), 944–59. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.944

Vaish, A., Carpenter, M., & Tomasello, M. (2010). Young children selectively avoid helping people with harmful intentions. *Child Development*, *81*(6), 1661–1669. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01500.x

Van Quaquebeke, N., Becker, J. U., Goretzki, N., & Barrot, C. (2019). Perceived ethical leadership affects customer purchasing intentions beyond ethical marketing in advertising due to moral identity self-congruence concerns. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *156*(2), 357–376. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3577-4

Wu, X., Hua, R., Yang, Z., & Yin, J. (2018). The influence of intention and outcome on evaluations of social interaction. *Acta Psychologica*, 182, 75–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2017.11.010

Young, L., & Saxe, R. (2011). When ignorance is no excuse: different roles for intent across moral domains. *Cognition*, *120*(2), 202–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2011.04.005

Zemba, Y., Young, M. J., & Morris, M. W. (2006). Blaming leaders for organizational accidents: proxy logic in collective- versus individual-agency cultures. *Organizational*

Behavior and Human Decision Processes, *101*(1), 36–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.04.007

Appendix A

Informed Consent

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to advance our understanding of people's judgments of various behaviours that concern women that can happen in the workplace. The acts and behaviours that will be encountered in this study are inspired by everyday life. We kindly ask you to participate in this study, as we are trying to understand this in a diverse group of individuals. We aim to examine why certain acts and behaviours towards women are judged as more positive while others are judged as more negative to deepen our understanding of what factors these opinions and judgements are based on. **This survey is only open to participants who are 18+ years old.**

INVESTIGATORS: *Helena E. Bieselt, Department of Positive Psychology and Technology, University of Twente; Dr. Pelin Gül, Department of Psychology, Health, and Technology, University of Twente, Netherlands.*

PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate, you will be asked general demographics questions (age, sex, nationality, etc.). Following this, you will be presented with a number of scenarios that describe various different acts. For each scenario, you will be asked a number of questions You will also be asked questions about certain attitudes. It is important to keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in the attitudes, experiences, and honest judgement of individuals. Therefore, our research relies on your own honest opinion. At the end of the survey, you will be provided with more details about this study. You will also have a chance to enter your email address if you would like to be considered in a **€50 raffle for an Amazon voucher for those who complete the survey.**

Your participation will last approximately **10-15 minutes**. People who participate via SONA Systems will be compensated with **0.25 credits.**

PARTICIPANT RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to decline to participate, refuse to answer any individual questions, or withdraw from the study at any time without the need to give any reason.

RISKS AND BENEFITS

There are no known or anticipated risks associated with this study. Although this study will not benefit you personally, we hope that our results will add to the knowledge about factors influencing people's judgments of actions/behaviour in the workplace that concern women.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your responses are completely anonymous and cannot be traced back to you because no information with which you can be personally identified (names, address, etc.) is asked in this survey. The information you provide will not be disclosed to third parties, and they will be

aggregated with the responses of other participants and examined for hypothesized patterns. Your anonymous responses will be used for scientific research into various aspects of personality and social psychology and will be published.

QUESTIONS
For further information about this study, you may contact **Helena E. Bieselt**, h.e.bieselt@student.utwente.nl, or **Dr. Pelin Gül, p.gul@utwente.nl.**

If you would like to talk with someone other than the researchers to discuss problems or concerns, to discuss situations in the event that a member of the research team is not available, or to discuss your rights as a research participant, please contact the Ethical Review Committee of the Behavioral and Management Sciences Faculty, University of Twente, Netherlands, ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl.

CONSENT AND AUTHORIZATION PROVISIONS
In order to continue with this survey, you have to agree with the aforementioned information and consent to participate in the study.

Clicking **"I agree and consent to participating in this study"** indicates that you have been informed about the nature and method of this research in a manner which is clear to you, you have been given the time to read the page, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Appendix B

Debriefing Information

Thank you very much for participating in our study!

In this study, we are focusing especially on more controversial forms of sexism where opinions often differ on whether it is actually sexist or not. Precisely, we are investigating to what extent the actor's intent to harm, the harm that was done, and one's level of feminist beliefs can account for these differences in judgement.

We thank you for your help and the decision to participate in our study. If you know of any friends or acquaintances that are eligible to participate in this study, we request that you do not discuss it with them until after they have had the opportunity to participate. Prior knowledge of the questions asked during the study can invalidate the results. We greatly appreciate your cooperation.

For further information about this study, you may contact **Helena E. Bieselt (h.e.bieselt@student.utwente.nl)** or **Dr. Pelin Gül, p.gul@utwente.nl.**

If you have any questions about the rights of research participants, please contact the Ethical Review Committee of the Behavioral and Management Sciences Faculty, University of Twente, Netherlands, **ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl**.

If you are feeling distressed and are unable to contact a person associated with this study, please contact the **Counseling centre at the University of Twente at +31 53 489 2035**.

Thank you for filling you this questionnaire.

Appendix C

Demographic Questions

First, we will ask you to describe your background (age, sex, ethnicity, nationality etc.) as part of demographic information...

Age

How old are you?

_____

Sex **What is your sex?**

- ○ Female (1)
- ○ Male (2)
- ○ Other / prefer not to say (3)

Nationality **What is your country of birth?**

- ○ Germany (1)
- ○ Netherlands (2)
- ○ United Kingdom (3)
- ○ Austria (4)
- ○ Denmark (5)
- ○ France (6)

- ○ Belgium (7)
- ○ Other, please indicate: (8)

_____

Edu **What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

- ○ Less than high school (1)
- ○ High school graduate (2)
- ○ College graduate (3)
- ○ Undergraduate degree (4)
- ○ Master's degree (5)
- ○ PhD or higher level degree (6)

Employ **What is your current employment status?**

- ○ Student (1)
- ○ Employed full-time (32+ hrs a week) (2)
- ○ Employed part-time (less than 32 hrs per week) (3)
- ○ Unemployed (currently looking for work) (4)
- ○ Unemployed (currently not looking for work) (5)
- ○ Retired (6)
- ○ Self-employed (7)
- ○ Unable to work (8)

SES **What is your socio-economic status?**

- ○ very poor 1 (1)
- ○ 2 (2)
- ○ 3 (3)
- ○ middle class 4 (4)
- ○ 5 (5)
- ○ 6 (6)
- ○ very wealthy 7 (7)

PolOri **How would you describe your political orientation on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly left-oriented) to 7 (strongly right-oriented)?**

- ○ Strongly left-oriented (1)
- ○ 2 (2)
- ○ 3 (3)
- ○ Moderate 4 (4)
- ○ 5 (5)
- ○ 6 (6)
- ○ Strongly right-oriented 7 (7)

Appendix D

Scenarios Study 1

Scenario 1: Individual, Ambiguous Intent and Ambiguous Harm

John, a counsellor at a big company, puts together a speech for the employees where he is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. In his speech, he refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses".

Scenario 1: Institution, Ambiguous Intent and Ambiguous Harm

Consultio, a big consulting company, puts together a speech for the employees that is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. The company's speech refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses".

Scenario 2: Individual, Ambiguous Intent and Ambiguous Harm

Tom, a human resources manager at a big tech company, is planning upcoming meetings with talented new employees for a training camp to help them become more eligible for promotion to senior management jobs in the company. He schedules the meetings at 5pm, a time that is inconvenient for female employees with childcare responsibilities who have to pick up their children from the nursery after work.

Scenario 2: Institution, Ambiguous Intent and Ambiguous Harm

Techquipo, a big tech company, is planning upcoming meetings with talented new employees for a training camp to help them become more eligible for promotion to senior management jobs in the company. The company schedules the meetings at 5pm, a time that is inconvenient for female employees with childcare responsibilities who have to pick up their children from the nursery after work.

Scenario 3: Individual, Ambiguous Intent and Ambiguous Harm

Rob, a software engineer at a big tech company, notices the low numbers of females in engineering and leadership roles in the company, and wants to understand why so few women are in these roles. So, he reads the scientific literature on psychological gender differences

which suggests that the reason why so few women choose engineering is due to women's generally higher interest in "people rather than things", higher tendency to be agreeable rather than assertive, cooperative rather than competitive, and their higher anxiety and lower stress tolerance. He writes a document describing these findings along with some concrete ideas to make the IT culture more suitable to women. He sends the document to all employees.

Scenario 3: Institution, Ambiguous Intent and Ambiguous Harm

TechnoZa, a big tech company, notices the low numbers of females in engineering and leadership roles in the company, and wants to understand why so few women are in these roles. The company's diversity committee gathers the the scientific literature on psychological gender differences which suggests that the reason why so few women choose engineering is due to women's generally higher interest in "people rather than things", higher tendency to be agreeable rather than assertive, cooperative rather than competitive, and their higher anxiety and lower stress tolerance. The committee writes a document describing these findings along with some concrete ideas to make the IT culture more suitable to women. The document gets sent out to all employees.

Appendix E

Scenarios Study 2

Scenario 1: Individual, High Intent and High Harm

John, a counsellor at a big company, puts together a speech for the employees where he is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. In his speech, he intentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". He doesn't want to include everyone in his speech (male and female employees) and he deliberately refers only to men. The female employees notice him using male pronouns. They feel excluded by what he said and that they shouldn't apply for promotion.

Scenario 1: Individual, High Intent and Low Harm

John, a counsellor at a big company, puts together a speech for the employees where he is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. In his speech, he intentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". He doesn't want to include everyone in his speech (male and female employees) and he deliberately refers only to men. The female employees don't notice him using male pronouns. They feel included by what he said and that they should apply for promotion.

Scenario 1: Individual, Low Intent and High Harm

John, a counsellor at a big company, puts together a speech for the employees where he is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. In his speech, he unintentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". He wants to include everyone in his speech (male and female employees), but he doesn't realise he was accidentally using only male pronouns. The female employees notice him using male pronouns. They feel excluded by what he said and that they shouldn't apply for promotion.

Scenario 1: Individual, Low Intent and Low Harm

John, a counsellor at a big company, puts together a speech for the employees where he is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. In his speech, he unintentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as

“he or she” and as having "spouses". He wants to include everyone in his speech (male and female employees), but he doesn't realise he was accidentally using only male pronouns. The female employees don't notice him using male pronouns. They feel included by what he said and that they should apply for promotion.

Scenario 1: Institution, High Intent and High Harm

Consultio, a big consulting company, puts together a speech for the employees that is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. The company's speech intentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". The company doesn't want to include everyone in the speech (male and female employees) and deliberately refers only to men. The female employees notice that only male pronouns are used. They feel excluded by what is said and that they shouldn't apply for promotion.

Scenario 1: Institution, High Intent and Low Harm

Consultio, a big consulting company, puts together a speech for the employees that is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. The company's speech intentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". The company doesn't want to include everyone in the speech (male and female employees) and deliberately refers only to men. The female employees don't notice that only male pronouns are used. They feel included by what is said and that they should apply for promotion.

Scenario 1: Institution, Low Intent and High Harm

Consultio, a big consulting company, puts together a speech for the employees that is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. The company's speech unintentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". The company wants to include everyone in the speech (male and female employees), but doesn't realise that accidentally only male pronouns are used. The female employees notice that only male pronouns are used. They feel excluded by what is said and that they shouldn't apply for promotion.

Scenario 1: Institution, Low Intent and Low Harm

Consultio, a big consulting company, puts together a speech for the employees that is supposed to inform the staff about potential promotions to the manager position. The

company's speech unintentionally refers to employees as “he” and as having "wives" rather than as “he or she” and as having "spouses". The company wants to include everyone in the speech (male and female employees), but doesn't realise that accidentally only male pronouns are used. The female employees don't notice that only male pronouns are used. They feel included by what is said and that they should apply for promotion.

Appendix F

Scenario Ratings

To what extent to you think that…

- ○ [Actor]'s action/behaviour is intentional.
- ○ [Actor]'s action/behaviour is harmful.
- ○ [Actor]'s action/behaviour is morally wrong
- ○ [Actor]'s action/behaviour is sexist.
- ○ [Actor] is a sexist [noun].

Seven-point Likert-type scale: ranging from 0=*not at all* to 6=*very much*

Appendix G

Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS)

(1)* It is insulting to the husband when his wife does not take his last name.

(2)* If the husband is the sole wage earner in the family, the financial decisions should be his.

(3) When they go out, a man and a woman should share dating expenses if they both have the same income.

(4)* As head of the household, the father should have final authority over his children.

(5) Both husband and wife should be equally responsible for the care of your children.

(6)* The first duty of a woman with young children is to home and family.

(7) A man who has chosen to stay at home and be a house-husband is not less masculine than a man who is employed full time.

(8) An employed woman can establish as warm and secure relationship with her children as a mother who is not employed.

(9) A woman should not let bearing and rearing children st and in the way of a career if she wants it.

(10)* Women should be more concerned with clothing and appearance than men.

(19) Men and women should be able to freely make choices about their lives without being restricted by gender.

(26) Abortion is an issue of women's rights.

(29) If men were the sex who got pregnant, more reliable and convenient birth control would be available.

(33) It is reasonable to boycott a company's product if you think that their commercial are sexist.

(35)* There is no such thing as rape between a man and his wife.

(45)* People who complain that pornography treats women like objects are overreacting.

(46) Men still don't take women's ideas seriously.

(50) All men receive economic, sexual, and psychological benefits from male domination.

Seven-point Likert-type scale: ranging from 1=*strongly agree* to 7=*strongly disagree*

Asterisk: reverse-scored items

Appendix H

Syntax Study 1

```
RECODE LFAIS_1 LFAIS_2 LFAIS_4 LFAIS_6 LFAIS_10 LFAIS_15 LFAIS_16 (1=7) (2=6) (3=5) (4=4) (5=3) (6=2) (7=1).

EXECUTE.


COMPUTE FemScale=mean.1(LFAIS_1, LFAIS_2, LFAIS_3, LFAIS_4, LFAIS_5, LFAIS_6, LFAIS_7, LFAIS_8, LFAIS_9, LFAIS_10, LFAIS_11, LFAIS_12, LFAIS_13, LFAIS_14, LFAIS_15, LFAIS_16, LFAIS_17, LFAIS_18).

VARIABLE LABELS FemScale 'Feminism Scale'.

VALUE LABELS FemScale 1 'strongly disagree' 7 'strongly agree'.

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES FemScale.

EXECUTE.


RELIABILITY

  /VARIABLES=LFAIS_1 LFAIS_2 LFAIS_3 LFAIS_4 LFAIS_5 LFAIS_6 LFAIS_7 LFAIS_8 LFAIS_9 LFAIS_10 LFAIS_11 LFAIS_12 LFAIS_13 LFAIS_14 LFAIS_15 LFAIS_16 LFAIS_17 LFAIS_18

  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL

  /MODEL=ALPHA

  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR

  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.


COMPUTE IndIntent=mean.1(S1Ind_Amb_1, S2Ind_Amb_1, S3Ind_Amb_1).

VARIABLE LABELS IndIntent 'Individual Intent Scale'.

VALUE LABELS IndIntent 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
```

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES IndIntent.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE IndHarm=mean.1(S1Ind_Amb_2, S2Ind_Amb_2, S3Ind_Amb_2).
VARIABLE LABELS IndHarm 'Individual Harm Scale'.
VALUE LABELS IndIntent 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES IndHarm.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE IndSexism=mean.1(S1Ind_Amb_3, S2Ind_Amb_3, S3Ind_Amb_3,
S1Ind_Amb_4, S2Ind_Amb_4, S3Ind_Amb_4).
VARIABLE LABELS IndSexism 'Individual Perceived Sexism Scale'.
VALUE LABELS IndSexism 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES IndSexism.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE IndSexismChar=mean.1(S1Ind_Amb_5, S2Ind_Amb_5, S3Ind_Amb_5).
VARIABLE LABELS IndSexismChar 'Individual Perceived Sexism of Character Scale'.
VALUE LABELS IndSexismChar 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES IndSexismChar.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE InstIntent=mean.1(S1Inst_Amb_1, S2Inst_Amb_1, S3Inst_Amb_6).
VARIABLE LABELS InstIntent 'Institution Intent Scale'.
VALUE LABELS InstIntent 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
```

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES InstIntent.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE InstHarm=mean.1(S1Inst_Amb_2, S2Inst_Amb_2, S3Inst_Amb_9).
VARIABLE LABELS InstHarm 'Institution Harm Scale'.
VALUE LABELS InstIntent 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES InstHarm.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE InstSexism=mean.1(S1Inst_Amb_3, S2Inst_Amb_3, S3Inst_Amb_10,
S1Inst_Amb_4, S2Inst_Amb_4, S3Inst_Amb_11).
VARIABLE LABELS InstSexism 'Institution Perceived Sexism Scale'.
VALUE LABELS InstSexism 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES InstSexism.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE InstSexismChar=mean.1(S1Inst_Amb_5, S2Inst_Amb_5, S3Inst_Amb_12).
VARIABLE LABELS InstSexismChar 'Institution Perceived Sexism of Character Scale'.
VALUE LABELS InstSexismChar 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES InstSexismChar.
EXECUTE.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Ind_Amb_1 S2Ind_Amb_1 S3Ind_Amb_1
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
```

```
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Ind_Amb_2 S2Ind_Amb_2 S3Ind_Amb_2
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Ind_Amb_3 S1Ind_Amb_4 S2Ind_Amb_3 S2Ind_Amb_4 S3Ind_Amb_3
S3Ind_Amb_4
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Ind_Amb_5 S2Ind_Amb_5 S3Ind_Amb_5
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Inst_Amb_1 S2Inst_Amb_1 S3Inst_Amb_6
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Inst_Amb_2 S2Inst_Amb_2 S3Inst_Amb_9
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Inst_Amb_3 S1Inst_Amb_4 S2Inst_Amb_3 S2Inst_Amb_4
S3Inst_Amb_10 S3Inst_Amb_11
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=S1Inst_Amb_5 S2Inst_Amb_5 S3Inst_Amb_12
```

```
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.

MEANS TABLES=IndIntent
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=IndHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=IndSexism
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=IndSexismChar
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=InstIntent
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=InstHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=InstSexism
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.
```

```
MEANS TABLES=InstSexismChar
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=FemScale
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=IndIntent IndHarm IndSexism IndSexismChar FemScale
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.

CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=InstIntent InstHarm InstSexism InstSexismChar FemScale
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.
```

Appendix I

Syntax Study 2

```
IF(FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_HighHarm = 1)
ActorCond = 1.
EXECUTE.

IF(FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_LowHarm = 1)
ActorCond = 1.
EXECUTE.

IF(FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_HighHarm = 1)
ActorCond = 1.
EXECUTE.

IF(FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_LowHarm = 1)
ActorCond = 1.
EXECUTE.

IF(FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_HighHarm = 1)
ActorCond = 2.
EXECUTE.

IF(FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_LowHarm = 1)
ActorCond = 2.
EXECUTE.
```

```
IF(FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_HighHarm = 1)

ActorCond = 2.

EXECUTE.


IF(FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_LowHarm = 1)

ActorCond = 2.

EXECUTE.


RELIABILITY

  /VARIABLES=LFAIS_1 LFAIS_2 LFAIS_3 LFAIS_4 LFAIS_5 LFAIS_6 LFAIS_7
LFAIS_8 LFAIS_9 LFAIS_10 LFAIS_11 LFAIS_12 LFAIS_13 LFAIS_14 LFAIS_15
LFAIS_16 LFAIS_17 LFAIS_18

  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL

  /MODEL=ALPHA

  /STATISTICS=DESCRIPTIVE SCALE CORR

  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.


RECODE LFAIS_1 LFAIS_2 LFAIS_4 LFAIS_6 LFAIS_10 LFAIS_15 LFAIS_16 (1=7)
(2=6) (3=5) (4=4) (5=3) (6=2) (7=1).

EXECUTE.


COMPUTE FemScale=mean.1(LFAIS_1, LFAIS_2, LFAIS_3, LFAIS_4, LFAIS_5,
LFAIS_6, LFAIS_7, LFAIS_8, LFAIS_9, LFAIS_10, LFAIS_11, LFAIS_12, LFAIS_13,
LFAIS_14, LFAIS_15, LFAIS_16, LFAIS_17, LFAIS_18).

VARIABLE LABELS FemScale 'Feminism Scale'.
```

```
VALUE LABELS FemScale 1 'strongly disagree' 7 'strongly agree'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES FemScale.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE OverIntent=mean.1(IndA1Intent_1.0, InstA1Intent_1.0).
VARIABLE LABELS OverIntent 'Overall Perceived Intent'.
VALUE LABELS OverIntent 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES OverIntent.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE OverHarm=mean.1(IndA1Intent_2.0, InstA1Intent_2.0).
VARIABLE LABELS OverHarm 'Overall Perceived Harm'.
VALUE LABELS OverHarm 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES OverHarm.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE OverMoralWrong=mean.1(IndA1Intent_3.0, InstA1Intent_3.0).
VARIABLE LABELS OverMoralWrong 'Overall Perceived Moral Wrongness'.
VALUE LABELS OverMoralWrong 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES OverMoralWrong.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE OverSexismB=mean.1(IndA1Intent_4.0, InstA1Intent_4.0).
VARIABLE LABELS OverSexismB 'Overall Perceived Sexism of the Behaviour Alone'.
VALUE LABELS OverSexismB 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
```

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES OverSexismB.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE OverSexismBehav=mean.1(IndSexismBehav, InstSexismBehav).
VARIABLE LABELS OverSexismBehav 'Overall Perceived Sexism of Behaviour'.
VALUE LABELS OverSexismBehav 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES OverSexismBehav.
EXECUTE.

COMPUTE OverSexismActor=mean.1(IndA1Intent_5.0, InstA1Intent_5.0).
VARIABLE LABELS OverSexismActor 'Overall Perceived Sexism of Actor'.
VALUE LABELS OverSexismActor 0 'not at all' 6 'very much'.
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES OverSexismActor.
EXECUTE.

RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=OverMoralWrong OverSexismB
  /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
  /MODEL=SPLIT
  /STATISTICS=SCALE.

MEANS TABLES=IndA1Intent_1.0 BY FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_LowHarm
```

```
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.


MEANS TABLES=IndA1Intent_2.0 BY FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_LowHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.


MEANS TABLES=IndSexismBehav BY FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_LowHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.


MEANS TABLES=IndA1Intent_5.0 BY FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Individual_LowIntent_LowHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.



MEANS TABLES=InstA1Intent_1.0 BY FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_LowHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.
```

```
MEANS TABLES=InstA1Intent_2.0 BY FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_LowHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=InstSexismBehav BY FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_LowHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

MEANS TABLES=InstA1Intent_5.0 BY FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_HighIntent_LowHarm
FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_HighHarm
    FL_41_DO_S1Institution_LowIntent_LowHarm
  /CELLS=MEAN COUNT STDDEV.

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=FemScale
  /STATISTICS=STDDEV MEAN
  /ORDER=ANALYSIS.

UNIANOVA OverIntent BY IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
```

```
/PLOT=PROFILE(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond)
/EMMEANS=TABLES(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond) compare (ActorCond)
adj(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT ETASQ DESCRIPTIVE
/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond IntentCond*ActorCond
HarmCond*ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond.

UNIANOVA OverHarm BY IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/PLOT=PROFILE(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond)
/EMMEANS=TABLES(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond) compare (ActorCond)
adj(BONFERRONI)
/PRINT ETASQ DESCRIPTIVE
/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)
/DESIGN=IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond IntentCond*ActorCond
HarmCond*ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond.

UNIANOVA OverSexismBehav BY IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond
/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)
/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE
/PLOT=PROFILE(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond)
/EMMEANS=TABLES(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond) compare (ActorCond)
adj(BONFERRONI)
```

```
/PRINT ETASQ DESCRIPTIVE

/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)

/DESIGN=IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond IntentCond*ActorCond
HarmCond*ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond.


UNIANOVA OverSexismActor BY IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond

/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)

/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE

/PLOT=PROFILE(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond)

/EMMEANS=TABLES(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond) compare (ActorCond)

adj(BONFERRONI)

/PRINT ETASQ DESCRIPTIVE

/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)

/DESIGN=IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond IntentCond*ActorCond
HarmCond*ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond.


UNIANOVA OverSexismBehav BY IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond

/METHOD=SSTYPE(3)

/INTERCEPT=INCLUDE

/PLOT=PROFILE(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond)

/EMMEANS=TABLES(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond) compare (HarmCond)

/EMMEANS=TABLES(IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond) compare (IntentCond)

adj(BONFERRONI)

/PRINT ETASQ DESCRIPTIVE

/CRITERIA=ALPHA(.05)
```

```
/DESIGN=IntentCond HarmCond ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond IntentCond*ActorCond
HarmCond*ActorCond IntentCond*HarmCond*ActorCond.

CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=OverIntent FemScale
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.

CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=FemScale OverHarm
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.

CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=FemScale OverSexismBehav
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.

CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=FemScale OverSexismActor
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.
```