[redacted] Eyssel IATs (2) = hostile & benevolent sexism, pg 5 New
N = 131 men pg 8
pgs 12-14, EMs = gender issues (att), ASI, Modern Sexism, women gender attitudes, rape myths, MCPR

(10) DOMAIN: A/1= race, B/2= ethnicity C/3 = gender-sex D/4 = food or drink
E/5 = other consumer F/6= political G/7 = drugs or tobacco pg 7
H/8 = self esteem J/9= personality/self K/10 = clinical
L/11= relationships M/12= other? (not a tony category)

(11) BEHAVIOR: single=1, average=2 pg 9-10

(12) IAT TYPE attitude=1, belief=2, self=3, not reported = 4 pg 11

(13) EM TYPE: attitude=1, belief=2, self=3, not reported = 4 pg 12-14

(14) OVERALL METHOD: not=0, observed=1 pg 9-10

(15) METHOD: RepPast=1, future=2, emotion=3, judge=4, obs=5, neuro=6, other=7

(16) SCORE: millisecond=0, log=1, algorithm=2, NotReported=3 pg 15

(17) words=0, pictures=1, NotReported=2 pg 11

(18) number of IATs: 2 pg 11

pg 9

(19) IAT ORDER: NotReported=0, iatfirst=1, iatsecond=2, iatthird=3 pg 9

(20) EXPLICIT ORDER: NotReported=0, explicitfirst=1, expsecond=2, explthird=3 pg 9

(21) BEHAVIOR ORDER: NotReported=0, behfirst=1, behsecond=2, behthird=3 pg 9

(22) IAT vs. behavior: NotReported=0, before=1, after=2, counter=3 pg 9

(23) EXPLICIT vs. beh: NotReported=0, explicitfirst=1, expsecond=2, counter=3 pg 9

(24) IAT SESSION: same=0, different=1 pg 9

(25) EXPLICIT SESSION: same=0, different=1 pg 9

(26) IAT SOCIAL DESIRABILITY 1-7 5, pg 11

(27) EXPLICIT SOCIAL DESIRABILITY 1-7 5 pg 12-14

(28) BEHAVIOR CONTROLLABLE: **1-10** 6 pg 9-10

(29) IAT SPECIFIC 1-7 2 pg 10 & 11

(30) EXPLICIT SPECIFIC 1-7 2, pg 10 & 12-14

(31) OPPOSITION **1-5** 3, pg 11

(32) RACIAL 0=not, 1=racial pg 1

(33) type of iat: single=1, dual=2, personalized=3 pg 11

ICCs = .01 & .02 for BS-IAT & BS-IAT } pg 37 ✓
ICCs: see table 3 pg 37 for ECCs

Running Head: ENDORSEMENT OF SEXIST HUMOR

Measuring Sexist Behavior in the Laboratory: The Role of Implicit and Explicit Hostile Sexism in Predicting the Endorsement of Sexist Humor

participants were told that they would take part in a series of pilot tests. Their first task was to complete the IATs to indirectly measure hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. The IATs were introduced as a task requiring participants "to sort words according to certain categories". The HS-IAT always preceeded the BS-IAT. A filler task separated both IATs.

After completion of the second IAT, participants were presented with a set of sexist and nonsexist short jokes, which they were asked to rate according to their degree of funniness. Depending on experimental condition, participants either had no time constraints when making their judgments, or were instructed to respond quickly while a progress bar indicated how much time they had left for their funniness ratings (see Materials section for details).

Subsequently, participants were presented with explicit self-report items to assess their attitudes toward a range of gender-related and other issues. This was followed by an open-ended suspicion probe, where participants were given the opportunity to express their assumptions concerning the research question to be tested in the study. Participants were further asked to report their age, sexual orientation, ethnicity, first language, field of study, and level of education. Finally, participants were handed debriefing sheets, and were informed about the purpose of the research by the male experimenter. After receiving payment, they were thanked and dismissed.

Materials

Joke measures. As a means of assessing spontaneous vs. more controlled sexist behavior in the laboratory setting, participants were presented with a set of 23 jokes. The first three jokes were neutral and served as fillers, whereas the remaining set consisted of 10 sexist and 10 nonsexist jokes. A sexist joke was always followed

by a nonsexist joke; otherwise, the presentation order was randomized before the experiment and then held constant across participants. The jokes had been pretested for their degree of funniness within a sample of university students from the target population (see Sabelus, 2004). Examples for sexist joke materials are: "When does a woman lose 99% of her intelligence? When her husband dies", or "Why can't women be both good-looking and intelligent at the same time? Because then they would be men". Typical examples for jokes with nonsexist content [1] are: "How do you recognize a friendly motorbike rider? Flies are stuck in his teeth", or "Why don't bees go to church? Because they are InSects". Participants were asked to rate the funniness of each joke on a 7-point rating scale ranging from 1, *not at all funny*, to 7, *very funny*, that was presented underneath each joke.

The rating procedure varied according to experimental condition: In the *high time constraints condition*, participants were instructed to respond quickly; this instruction was emphasized by means of a progress bar that became visible once each joke was presented on the computer screen. Participants were asked to complete their ratings before the progress bar reached the right margin (see Figure 1 for an original screenshot). The time that the progress bar took to complete its movement was 5 seconds.

--- Insert figure 1 about here ---

In the *low time constraints* condition, participants were simply instructed to rate the funniness of each joke that would be presented on the screen. No time restriction was given, so that participants could take as much time as needed to complete their ratings (see Figure 2 for an original screenshot).

--- Insert figure 2 about here ---

Participants' responses to the 10 sexist and the 10 nonsexist jokes, respectively, were averaged to form one funniness index for each type of joke.

IAT measures. Participants completed two types of IATs – one assessing implicit hostile sexism and the other assessing implicit benevolent sexism. The target stimuli for the IATs were German male first names (e.g., Dominik, Florian) and German female first names (e.g., Claudia, Sabine) that had already been used as IAT stimuli in previous research (Steffens & Mehl, 2003). The attribute stimuli were adjectives that are strongly associated with either benevolent or hostile sexism, or were neutral in meaning (e.g., considerate, inferior, rectangular). The adjectives in the neutral category were selected in such a way that none of them was applicable to persons (whereas, obviously, all of the benevolent and hostile stimuli were applicable to persons). The Appendix provides a complete list of the original German stimuli and their English translations.

In the present study, the IAT was introduced as a "newly developed word categorization task that is being tested in the context of a series of pilot studies". Participants learned that the task would require them to categorize words as quickly and accurately as possible by pressing one of two labeled keys ("D" and "K") on the computer keyboard. To familiarize themselves with the stimulus words, participants completed 40 practice trials during which they categorized neutral and benevolent (or hostile) stimuli according to the categories "applicable to persons" and "not applicable to persons"*)* Examples of stimuli that are "applicable to persons" are *dependent*, *dishonest* (hostile), *loving*, *prepossessing* (benevolent). Terms like *material* and

woven were used as exemplars for the category "not applicable to persons". Words appeared individually in the middle of the computer screen and were presented in a random order that had been determined by the computer program and was held constant across participants. Participants were asked to categorize the stimuli as fast and accurately as possible. They were informed verbally and in writing that each time they made a categorization error, a red cross would be displayed and remain in the lower part of the screen until the correct response was given.

Participants underwent 3 blocks per IAT measure, reacting to 40 words per trial. Category labels were visible on the PC screen throughout the categorization task, and the evaluative mapping also remained constant. Subsequently, participants completed two test blocks of trials; the "compatible" block followed by the "incompatible" block. In the context of this study, "compatible" means that female names shared a response key with the hostile (or benevolent) sexist terms and male names shared a key with neutral terms, whereas "incompatible" means that female first names shared a key with the neutral terms and male names shared a key with the hostile (or benevolent) sexist terms. IAT scores for hostile and benevolent sexism, respectively, were computed by subtracting the mean response latency in the compatible block from the mean response latency in the incompatible block.

Explicit attitude measures

Explicit attitudes related to gender and socio-political issues were assessed with a variety of self-report scales. Each item was accompanied by a 7-point response scale ranging from 1, *completely disagree*, to 7, *completely agree*. Participants were instructed to read each statement carefully and then tick the number that best represented their personal opinion. Items were presented in a randomized order that was the same for all participants.

Ambivalent sexism. A German version (Eckes & Six-Materna, 1999) of the 22-item Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) was used to explicitly measure ambivalent sexism and its subcomponents, hostile (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS). Example items are: "No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman" (BS) or "Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for equality" (HS). Usually, HS and BS are positively correlated, thus, fulfilling the literal meaning of ambivalence ("both valences").

Modern sexism. To assess modern sexist beliefs, a 10-item German version (Eckes & Six-Materna, 1998) of the Modern Sexism Scale (MSS; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) was used. A sample item reads "Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in Germany".

Normative gender role attitudes. To measure normative gender role attitudes, we used 10 items with the highest item-to-total correlation taken from the normative gender roles questionnaire by Athenstaedt (NGRO; 2002). This recently developed instrument was used to measure traditional vs. egalitarian gender role attitudes (e.g., "Ironing shirts is not men's business", "Boys and girls should be responsible for the same chores in the household").

Rape myth acceptance. Participants' rape myth acceptance (RMA) was assessed using 10 items taken from the Acceptance of Modern Myths about Sexual Aggression (AMMSA) scale (Gerger, Kley, Bohner, & Siebler, in press). This scale (item example: "Many women tend to exaggerate the problem of male violence") was designed to assess contemporary myths regarding sexual violence in a more subtle manner than do "traditional" RMA measures (e.g., Burt, 1980; Payne, Lonsway, & Fitzgerald, 1999). Its reliability and validity are well established (Bohner, Jarvis,

reads: "When in company of others, one should not say something negative about minorities".

Results

Preliminary analyses.

IAT measures. Following procedures in previous IAT research, anticipatory responses and inattention were corrected for by recoding outliers and erratic trials. Specifically, reaction times that were smaller than 300 ms or greater than 3000 ms were recoded as 300 ms and 3000 ms, respectively (see Greenwald et al., 1998). As recommended by Greenwald et al. (1998), response latencies were then log-transformed. This was done to normalize the skewed distributions that result from response latency measurements. Finally, the average response times across blocks were calculated. All analyses are based on the mean log-transformed reaction times. However, for ease of interpretation, untransformed mean response times are reported as descriptive data, although the log-transformed scores were used in significance tests. Results of a one-sample t-test indicated a stronger association of women relative to men with benevolent attributes (M = 60), $t(130) = 6.54$, $p < .001$, whereas no such stronger association of women relative to men emerged for the hostile traits (M = -6), $t(130) = -.52$, $p > .10$.

Joke measure. To investigate the factor structure underlying 10 the sexist and the 10 nonsexist jokes, a factor analysis with maximum likelihood extraction and promax rotation was performed. This analysis revealed an almost perfect two-factor solution.[2] That is, all pretested sexist jokes loaded on one factor ("sexist content"), whereas all preselected nonsexist jokes loaded on the second factor ("nonsexist content") – the variables were thus well defined by this two-factor solution. These results support the validity of our selected joke items, which can be distinguished