

Editorial Manager(tm) for Sex Roles
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number:

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

Article Type: Original Research

Keywords: sexist humor; sexist attitudes; gender prejudice; implicit attitudes; explicit attitudes

Corresponding Author: Friederike Eyssel, M.A.

Corresponding Author's Institution: Universität Bielefeld

First Author: Friederike Eyssel, M.A.

Order of Authors: Friederike Eyssel, M.A.; Gerd Bohner, Prof., PhD

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

Abstract

Spontaneous vs. controlled sexist behavior was assessed in a laboratory experiment with 131 males. Participants rated the funniness of sexist and nonsexist jokes either with or without time pressure, and completed implicit and explicit measures of sexism. With time pressure, participants showed greater liking for sexist jokes than without. No such effect was found for nonsexist jokes. Furthermore, as predicted, explicit hostile sexism predicted controlled sexist behavior better than spontaneous sexist behavior, whereas the hypothesis that implicit hostile sexism would predict spontaneous sexist behavior better than controlled sexist behavior was not supported. Additional analyses attest to the joke measure's high reliability and construct validity. Directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: sexist humor; sexist attitudes; gender prejudice; implicit attitudes; explicit attitudes

The Endorsement of Sexist Humor

How can sexist behavior be measured in a valid and economic manner? In this paper we propose a newly developed method that makes use of a set of sexist and nonsexist jokes to be rated according to their funniness. Similar measures have been used in the past (e.g., Henkin & Fish, 1986; Ryan & Kanjorski, 1998). However, the current study extends prior research on sexist humor by including an innovative experimental manipulation: Specifically, participants had to indicate their liking for sexist (vs. nonsexist) humor either under time constraints or without time constraints. Rating sexist jokes under time constraints was interpreted as an instance of rather spontaneous sexist behavior, whereas rating the jokes without time constraints left participants more time for relatively controlled behavioral responses (Strack & Deutsch, 2004; Wilson, Lindsey, & Schooler, 2000). Taken together, the time pressure manipulation implemented in the joke rating task served to measure two distinct types of sexist behavior: spontaneous vs. more deliberate.

Why is a preference for sexist humor interpreted as an instance of sexist behavior? We will outline several reasons for this view: First, it is assumed that the extent to which people enjoy humor that disparages a social group, such as women, is influenced by the affective disposition toward this group. Jokes are generally perceived as funnier when they derogate a relevant out-group, especially if the group is disliked (Zillmann & Cantor, 1976). Second, previous research has indicated that derogatory humor contributes to the development and maintenance of group stereotypes, for instance, of women. In order to catch the gist of a joke, a mutual understanding of the stereotype about the group that is ridiculed is a prerequisite (Ford, Wentzel, & Lorion, 2001). This has recently been demonstrated in the domain of research on sexist humor (Ford et al., 2001; Ryan & Kanjorski, 1998; Thomas &

Esses, 2004). Clearly, attitudes and behavior in this domain are closely linked, as Greenwood and Isbell (2002) have shown. Their male research participants perceived “dumb blonde” jokes as more amusing and less offensive depending on their level of hostile sexism. In line with this, Ryan and Kanjorski (1998) proposed the endorsement of sexist humor as an indirect measure of „rape supportive and sexist attitudes“(p. 744). Third, according to Sev’er and Ungar (1997), the acceptance of sexist humor that disparages women contributes to the status quo and the structural inequality between the sexes in contemporary society. Ford et al. (2001) particularly emphasized these social consequences of derogatory humor in that the jovial telling of an anti-women joke results in the creation of a “context creating a social norm of tolerance of discrimination against women” (Ford et al., 2001, p. 678; see also Ford & Ferguson, 2004, for a review). In sum, it becomes clear that the endorsement of sexist humor can have rather severe social consequences.

The tacit knowledge of the fact that such sexist behavior is sanctioned in contemporary society might contribute to tendencies not to report a preference for sexist humor. The same is true for the self-reported endorsement of *attitudes* that derogate the group of women. To overcome problems related to social desirability concerns, various approaches have been developed to indirectly measure attitudes and behavior (for reviews, see De Houwer, 2006; Fazio & Olson, 2003). As we measured two types of sexist behavior, – spontaneous vs. more controlled –, in our study, likewise, we assessed ambivalent sexist attitudes in two distinct ways: In addition to using explicit scales to assess sexist attitudes (as was done in past research: Ford et al., 2001; Greenwood & Isbell, 2002), we also applied *implicit* measures of hostile sexist (HS) and benevolent sexist (BS) attitudes. Whereas the *direct* assessment of such ambivalent sexist attitudes has become increasingly

popular in recent years (Glick & Fiske, 1996; 1997), to our knowledge, HS and BS have not yet been assessed in an *indirect* manner. Consequently, it appeared useful to fill this gap in contemporary gender research.

We did so by developing two versions of an Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) designed to measure hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes, thus indirectly capturing both components of ambivalent sexism. The IAT is among the most popular reaction-time based techniques to assess attitudes in an indirect manner. It relies on response latencies with which participants categorize target concepts and evaluative attributes. To illustrate, our participants complete the following procedure: In the practice trials, participants learned to categorize stimuli according to a dichotomy, such as “applicable to persons” vs. “not applicable to persons”. Furthermore, they had to categorize stimuli as belonging to one of two target concepts (men-women). They did so by pressing one of two keys on the computer keyboard once a stimulus was presented on the screen. For instance, in the Hostile Sexism IAT (HS-IAT), participants had to categorize male and female first names, indicating whether the name belonged to the target category “male” or “female”. In addition, hostile vs. neutral stimulus words had to be categorized according to whether they would be “applicable to persons” vs. “not applicable to persons”. 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) (see Method section for further details).

We hypothesized that participants with high implicit hostile sexism would be faster in associating female names rather than male names with hostile sexist (versus neutral) stimuli. The Benevolent Sexism-IAT (BS-IAT) followed the same

rationale and procedure, with the exception that it included benevolent sexist instead of hostile sexist stimulus words. The neutral stimuli as well as the male and female first names were the same as in the HS-IAT. As with implicit hostile sexism, we hypothesized that participants with high implicit benevolent sexism would be faster in associating female names rather than male names with benevolent sexist (versus neutral) stimuli.

In recent years, dual-process models of attitudes and behavior have become increasingly popular. For example, in their model of “dual attitudes”, Wilson et al. (2000) proposed that a person’s attitude consists of both automatic and conscious components. In other words, people can have *dual attitudes*, independent evaluations, toward the same object. One is the implicit, automatic attitude; the other is the explicit one, which requires more cognitive resources and capacity to retrieve from memory. Similarly, Strack and Deutsch (2004) proposed a dual-process model to explain behavior as a function of both reflective and impulsive processes which operate in parallel. According to these authors, “the reflective system requires a high amount of cognitive capacity” (p. 223), whereas the impulsive system takes over once cognitive resources are depleted. Lately, DeCoster, Banner, Smith, and Semin (2006) even demonstrated that implicit and explicit measures “reflect the contents of different memory systems” (p. 17), thus proposing a dual-memory model.

The dual-systems models also rest on the assumption that, on one hand, attitudes measured in an indirect manner predict spontaneous behavior better than controlled behavior. On the other hand, attitudes measured in an explicit manner predict controlled behavior better than automatic behavior (Asendorpf, Banse, & Mücke, 2002). Drawing on these ideas, we hypothesized that our *implicit* measure of hostile sexism, the HS-IAT, would be a better predictor of the endorsement of sexist

jokes under time pressure rather than of the joke ratings without time pressure. As far as the *explicit* measure of hostile sexism was concerned, we proposed that *explicit sexism* would be a better predictor of the endorsement of sexist jokes under conditions without time-pressure than under conditions with time-pressure. The predicted pattern thus is that of a double dissociation between implicit and explicit measures of sexism and spontaneous vs. more deliberate sexist behavior.

Additionally, we hypothesized that under conditions of time pressure, participants would report greater endorsement of sexist humor than under conditions without time pressure. No such effect of limited cognitive capacity on the funniness ratings of the jokes was expected for jokes with nonsexist content. This was due to the fact that the nonsexist jokes were neutral in content, not demanding for suppression of the underlying negative attitude toward the group of women which would be revealed if one was caught enjoying sexist humor.

Finally, this study was designed to demonstrate that preference for sexist humor would be positively correlated with sexism and anti-victim attitudes as measured by means of standard questionnaires. Specifically, we predicted positive correlations of the sexist joke measure with a traditional gender role orientation, modern sexism, the hostile sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996), and rape myth acceptance. Such a correlational pattern would support the convergent validity of the sexist joke measure.

With respect to the effect of *time constraints* (high vs. low) on the correlational pattern, we predicted that the correlations between the preference for sexist humor and explicit measures of sexism and anti-victim attitudes would be *higher* when the jokes were presented *without* time constraints than when the jokes were presented under time pressure. This, too, is in line with the idea that people's explicit attitudes

are better predictors of deliberate rather than of automatic behavior.

As far as the correlation between the HS-IAT and the joke ratings is concerned, the expected statistical relation was predicted to be greater for joke ratings under time constraints than for joke ratings without time constraints.

Finally, we included measures of social desirability concerns and the motivation to control for prejudiced responses. A lack of significant correlations between those measures on the one hand and the preference for sexist humor on the other hand would speak to the discriminant validity of the set of sexist jokes. To test our hypotheses, we conducted a computer-based experiment.

Method

Participants and Design

Participants in the study were 131 male volunteers recruited on the campus of the University of Bielefeld, Germany, ranging in age from 18 to 35 years ($M = 23.95$, $SD = 3.51$). Ninety percent of the sample were Germans. Except for 3 participants, all were students majoring in a variety of fields (e.g., literary studies, history, mathematics, law; only 6 participants were psychology majors). On average, they were in their 5th semester of study ($SD = 4.13$). Participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions (*time constraints*: high or low). They took about 15 to 20 minutes to complete the study and received 2 Euros or course credit plus a candy bar for compensation.

Procedure

The study was conducted in the laboratory using personal computers. Participants were tested individually. During the study, instructions were displayed and responses recorded by an experimental program written in Visual Basic. Initially,

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 preceded 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

1
2
3
4 *woven* were used as exemplars for the category “not applicable to persons”. Words
5
6 appeared individually in the middle of the computer screen and were presented in a
7
8 random order that had been determined by the computer program and was held
9
10 constant across participants. Participants were asked to categorize the stimuli as fast
11
12 and accurately as possible. They were informed verbally and in writing that each time
13
14 they made a categorization error, a red cross would be displayed and remain in the
15
16 lower part of the screen until the correct response was given.
17
18

19
20 Participants underwent 3 blocks per IAT measure, reacting to 40 words per
21
22 trial. Category labels were visible on the PC screen throughout the categorization
23
24 task, and the evaluative mapping also remained constant. Subsequently, participants
25
26 completed two test blocks of trials; the “compatible” block followed by the
27
28 “incompatible” block. In the context of this study, “compatible” means that female
29
30 names shared a response key with the hostile (or benevolent) sexist terms and male
31
32 names shared a key with neutral terms, whereas “incompatible” means that female
33
34 first names shared a key with the neutral terms and male names shared a key with
35
36 the hostile (or benevolent) sexist terms. IAT scores for hostile and benevolent
37
38 sexism, respectively, were computed by subtracting the mean response latency in
39
40 the compatible block from the mean response latency in the incompatible block.
41
42
43
44

45 *Explicit attitude measures*

46
47 Explicit attitudes related to gender and socio-political issues were assessed
48
49 with a variety of self-report scales. Each item was accompanied by a 7-point
50
51 response scale ranging from 1, *completely disagree*, to 7, *completely agree*.
52
53 Participants were instructed to read each statement carefully and then tick the
54
55 number that best represented their personal opinion. Items were presented in a
56
57 randomized order that was the same for all participants.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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,

Eyssel, & Siebler, 2005; Eyssel, Böhner, & Siebler, 2006; Gerger et al., in press).

The 10 items used here were selected based on their high item-to-total correlations.

Need for cognition. A 10-item questionnaire with items taken from the German version of the Need for Cognition scale (NFC; Bless, Wänke, Böhner, Fellhauer, & Schwarz, 1994; Cacioppo & Petty, 1983) was used as a filler task between the HS-IAT and the BS-IAT blocks. Need for cognition is defined as participants' tendency to engage in and enjoy thinking. A sample item reads: "I really enjoy the task of finding new solutions to problems." Items with the highest item-to-total correlations were taken from the short version of the NFC scale. The filler task was implemented because results concerning reliability of the HS- and BS-IAT in previous research (Eyssel & Böhner, 2006) had indicated that this break would be useful to assure sufficiently high reliability of the IAT.

Social desirability. To measure the tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner, participants were asked to complete 10 items taken from (a) the impression management subscale of a German version (Musch, Brockhaus, & Bröder, 2002) of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1994), and (b) the Social Desirability Scale-17 (SDS-17; Stöber, 1999), a modified version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Once more, items with the highest item-to-total correlations were selected, e.g., "There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone", "I sometimes lie if I have to".

Motivation to control for prejudice. To assess participants' motivation to control for prejudice, the 10 items with the highest item-to-total correlation were taken from the German version (Banse & Gawronski, 2003) of the Motivation to Control for Prejudiced Responses scale (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). This scale was developed to measure the motivation to act without prejudices toward minorities. One sample item

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 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

according to their clearly sexist or nonsexist content, respectively.

Internal consistency, means, and variances of principal measures.

Cronbach's α was calculated for the funniness indexes pertaining to sexist and nonsexist jokes, and for each of the self-report scales.

The joke measures showed good internal consistencies, with $\alpha = .93$ for the sexist jokes and $\alpha = .83$ for the nonsexist jokes. Therefore, the mean across the 10 funniness ratings of the sexist jokes was defined as each participant's *sexist jokes score*. Likewise, the mean across the 10 funniness ratings pertaining to the nonsexist jokes was defined as a participant's *nonsexist jokes score*. In addition, a difference score was computed, subtracting the nonsexist jokes score from the sexist jokes score. A greater difference score thus indicates that sexist jokes were perceived as funnier relative to nonsexist jokes.

Split-half (odd-even) reliabilities were calculated for the IATs, revealing sufficient reliability coefficients of .71 for the HS-IAT and .68 for the BS-IAT. The internal consistencies (Cronbach's α) of the self-report scales are displayed in Table 1, along with the scale means and standard deviations.

--- Insert Table 1 about here ---

Where necessary, items were recoded with higher values indicating greater endorsement of the attitude before computing composite scores for self-report scales. Composite scores were computed by averaging the responses to items of each scale, thus forming an index of the endorsement of the attitudes assessed by the various scales.

Effects of time pressure on response latencies. To check the effectiveness of the time constraints manipulation, we analyzed the response times needed to make the joke ratings. Reaction times (RT) were corrected for joke length (number of words), because the nonsexist jokes were slightly longer ($M = 15$ words) than the sexist jokes ($M = 13$ words). These corrected RTs (reflecting response time per word in milliseconds) were subjected to a 2×2 analysis of variance with *time constraints* (high vs. low) as a between-subjects factor and *type of joke* (sexist vs. nonsexist) as a repeated measures factor. This analysis revealed a main effect of *type of joke*, $F(1,129) = 56.54$, $p < .001$, indicating that overall, participants responded faster to sexist jokes ($M = 384$ ms, $SD = 150$ ms) than to nonsexist jokes ($M = 433$ ms, $SD = 187$ ms). More importantly, however, we found the predicted significant main effect of time constraints, $F(1,129) = 36.89$, $p < .001$, which attests to the effectiveness of the time pressure manipulation. That is, overall, participants responded faster to the jokes when under time pressure ($M = 335$) than when they had unlimited time to complete the joke ratings ($M = 489$). Furthermore, we found a significant interaction between *type of joke* and *time constraints*, $F(1,129) = 24.00$, $p < .001$. Importantly, simple effects analyses showed that for both sexist jokes ($M = 326$ ms, $SD = 109$ ms vs. $M = 448$ ms, $SD = 162$ ms) and nonsexist jokes ($M = 343$, $SD = 136$ ms vs. $M = 530$ ms, $SD = 187$ ms), participants responded more quickly when under time pressure than without.

Effects of time constraints and sexism scores on joke ratings. To test the hypothesis that explicit hostile sexism would better predict controlled sexist behavior than automatic sexist behavior, whereas implicit hostile sexism would better predict spontaneous sexist behavior than controlled sexist behavior, we performed a multiple regression analysis. In this analysis, the *joke difference measure* (relative preference

of sexist over nonsexist jokes) was the dependent variable; in a first step, the *time pressure* condition (coded as 0 = low time pressure, 1 = high time pressure), *implicit hostile sexism* and *explicit hostile sexism* scores were entered as predictors, and in a second step, product terms were entered as predictors in order to test the interactions of *implicit hostile sexism by time pressure* and *explicit hostile sexism by time pressure* (see Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

In step 1, we found that time pressure was a significant predictor of the preference for sexist humor, $\beta = .72$, $t(130) = 2.30$, $p = .012$. Furthermore, explicit hostile sexism was a significant predictor of the preference for sexist humor, $\beta = .36$, $t(130) = 4.39$, $p < .001$. The effect of implicit hostile sexism, however, was negligible, $\beta = .01$, $t(130) = 0.10$, $p = .920$. In step 2, we found marginal evidence for an interaction effect of explicit hostile sexism by time pressure, $\beta = -.65$, $t(130) = -1.70$, $p = .091$, indicating that, as hypothesized, explicit HS tended to be a better predictor of the preference for sexist jokes under low (vs. high) time pressure. The interaction between implicit HS and time pressure failed to reach significance, $\beta = -.03$, $t(130) = -0.12$, $p = .908$.

Furthermore, to test the effects of time constraints on the endorsement of sexist and nonsexist jokes, we conducted a mixed 2 x 2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) with *time pressure* (low vs. high) as a between-subjects factor and *type of joke* (sexist vs. nonsexist) as a repeated measures factor. This analysis revealed a main effect of *type of joke*, $F(1,129) = 5.97$, $p = .02$, indicating that overall, nonsexist jokes ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.16$) were perceived as funnier than sexist jokes ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.51$). Secondly, we found a main effect of *time pressure*, $F(1,129) = 6.51$, $p = .01$. Overall, jokes were perceived as funnier under high time constraints ($M = 3.56$) than under low time constraints ($M = 3.05$). Most importantly, the interaction between

type of joke and *time constraints* was significant as predicted, $F(1, 129) = 7.58, p = .01$. To clarify the meaning of this interactive pattern, simple effects contrasts were calculated. Results showed that, in line with our hypothesis, ratings for sexist jokes were significantly higher under time constraints ($M = 3.58, SD = 1.57$) than without time constraints ($M = 2.76, SD = 1.32$), $F(1, 129) = 10.42, p < .001$, whereas this was not the case for nonsexist jokes ($M = 3.34, SD = 1.09$ vs. $M = 3.55, SD = 1.22$), $F(1, 129) = 1.04, p = .31$.

Correlation analyses. Correlation analyses were performed to examine the correlational pattern between the *joke difference score* and the various implicit and explicit measures. Table 3 shows these correlations:

--- Insert Table 3 about here ---

The correlational pattern for the *joke difference measure* and the various self-report scales supported our hypotheses, as liking for sexist humor turned out to be significantly and positively related to measures of sexism (HS, BS, NGRO, and MSS) as well as RMA. These findings support the convergent validity of the joke measure. The discriminant validity of the joke measure was supported by the lack of correlation between the *joke difference measure* and the tendency for desirable responding and the motivation to control for prejudice. Furthermore, correlation analyses were performed to investigate the relationship between the indirect measures of hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes and the various direct measures. It was found that the *joke difference measure* was uncorrelated with both indirect measures, the HS-IAT ($r = .00, p = .99$) and the BS-IAT ($r = -.02, p = .85$). Finally, correlation analyses were conducted to examine the statistical relation between the *joke difference*

measure and the explicit and implicit attitude measures, separately for each level of the *time constraints* factor (high vs. low). Table 4 depicts these correlations.

--- Insert Table 4 about here ---

As predicted, the correlation pattern showed that under high time constraints, correlations between the relative preference for sexist jokes and explicit attitude measures were generally smaller than under low time constraints, with the exception of the relation between the endorsement of sexist humor and NGRO. In this case, the correlation between both variables tended to be higher in the high time constraints condition. Under high time constraints, however, the correlations between the preference for sexist humor and explicit attitude scales mostly remained statistically significant or turned out marginally significant (e.g., with HS, $r = .24$, $p = .054$; or with RMA, $r = .23$, $p = .065$). These results indicate that the explicit measures predict the preference for sexist humor in very different contexts – not only when participants have enough time to think about their joke ratings, but also under conditions where there are limited cognitive resources left to do so. As hypothesized, the relative preference for sexist humor was unrelated to motivation to control for prejudiced responses and social desirability under time constraints. However, unexpectedly, the correlation between sexist behavior and social desirability was significant and positive when participants had enough time to think about their responses, $r = .30$, $p = .02$.

Discussion

In this research we introduced an innovative, economic, and easily applicable method for assessing spontaneous and controlled sexist behavior. The newly

developed measure consists of a set of sexist and nonsexist jokes which proved highly reliable. Results of a factor analysis showed a clear two-factor structure distinguishing sexist and nonsexist text jokes, thereby providing support for the validity of the joke measure. The innovative aspect of the joke measure is due to the fact that participants are asked to rate the jokes according to their funniness under conditions of time pressure vs. no time pressure.

One main goal of our study was to investigate the role of both implicit and explicit hostile sexism in predicting spontaneous vs. controlled sexist behavior as operationalized by joke ratings under time pressure vs. without time pressure. We assessed implicit ambivalent sexism by means of two reliable IATs, designed to tap associations between the group of women (vs. men) and traits related to either hostile or benevolent sexism. To our knowledge, this method has not yet been applied to indirectly measure hostile and benevolent sexism, the subcomponents of ambivalent sexism. This represents a further innovative aspect of the present research. Our results showed that, at the implicit level, participants showed an effect analogous to the “women are wonderful” effect (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989) that is often observed in explicit judgments of women. That is, as predicted, participants with high implicit benevolent sexism were faster in associating female names rather than male names with benevolent sexist stimuli, i.e. stimuli that may have subjectively positive connotations.

To disentangle the role of both implicit and explicit measures of sexism in predicting sexist behavior, we attempted to show a double-dissociation pattern between implicit and explicit hostile sexism and spontaneous vs. more controlled behavior. Although we did not find evidence for the hypothesis that implicit hostile sexism measured by means of the IAT would be a better predictor of joke ratings

under time pressure than without time pressure, we did find, as hypothesized, that explicitly measured hostile sexist attitudes proved to be a better predictor of *controlled* sexist behavior, that is, joke ratings without time pressure, than of spontaneous sexist behavior. This difference notwithstanding, explicit hostile sexism was a marginally significant predictor of the relative preference for sexist humor even under time pressure. Explicit sexist attitudes thus predicted sexist behavior under different conditions.

Taken together, our findings only provided evidence for a simple dissociation, not the full double-dissociation pattern we had predicted. This was so despite the fact that the HS-IAT was highly reliable. Consequently, the HS-IAT and the BS-IAT need to be further validated in future studies. Possibly, despite the time pressure manipulation, participants might still have had enough time for relatively controlled responses to the joke measure. Therefore, it might be useful in future studies to implement even more subtle measures of automatic sexist behavior for validation purposes. For instance, participants could be presented with sexist and nonsexist cartoon jokes. While reporting funniness ratings of the joke materials, an eye tracker would record gaze and fixation times. A preference for sexist humor might be indicated by an increased fixation time for sexist relative to nonsexist jokes, specifically in males high in hostile sexism. Alternatively, the eye-tracker could be applied in the context of an ostensible study on marketing research and advertising. Participants would be asked to rate sexist and nonsexist advertisements on several rating scales. By means of the eye-tracker, it would be possible to examine the amount of time spent looking at sexist advertisements in particular. Here, it might also be informative to analyze the focus of participants' gaze. Possibly, highly sexist participants would enjoy looking at sexist advertising more than their nonsexist

counterparts. This would show in increased fixation times for sexist ads by sexist relative to nonsexist participants. Also, sexist males might focus on female body parts depicted in sexist advertisements more than on other details of the advertisement relative to the nonsexist males.

Using even more indirect measures of spontaneous behavior might result in the detection of a significant relation between implicit (but not explicit) measures of sexism and spontaneous behavior, providing initial evidence for the incremental predictive validity of the sexism-related IATs.

A second goal of our research was to demonstrate the effectiveness of the time pressure manipulation. Results showed that the time pressure manipulation was effective, because participants had shorter reaction times when rating the jokes under time pressure than without. Additionally, we met this goal successfully, as our study provides initial evidence for the fact that the relative lack of cognitive resources under time pressure conditions leads to a higher self-reported liking for disparaging humor. In line with our hypotheses, the findings of the present study showed that under time pressure, when resources were limited, male participants reported greater enjoyment of sexist humor than when resources were unconstrained. By contrast, time pressure did not have an effect on the endorsement of nonsexist humor, where there was no need for controlling responses. As predicted, participants were equally fond of nonsexist jokes, independent of the time pressure manipulation.

Finally, taking into account the correlational findings, it becomes clear that the joke measure constitutes a valid measure of sexist behavior. While greater liking for derogatory and sexist humor was positively correlated with the endorsement of sexist and anti-victim attitudes, it was not related to the motivation to control for prejudice or social desirability concerns. When analyzing the correlation patterns separately for

the rating conditions with versus without time constraints, we found that under time pressure, the relative preference for sexist over nonsexist humor was positively correlated with measures of sexism and anti-victim attitudes and unrelated to measures tapping social desirability concerns and motivation to control for prejudice. As predicted, the correlations between the relative preference for sexist humor, RMA, and explicit measures of sexism were even more pronounced when participants had enough time to think about their responses to the jokes. That is, even when participants had unlimited time to consider their responses, the joke measure proved to be a valid measure of sexist behavior.

Unexpectedly, when time constraints were low, participants' liking for sexist jokes was positively correlated with the likelihood to respond in a socially desirable manner. This may be interpreted in line with findings by Ford et al. (2001), and Ford and Ferguson (2004). These authors argued that "sexist humor expands the bounds of appropriate conduct in the immediate context creating a social norm of tolerance of discrimination against women" (p. 678). Possibly, the context of our study might have established a norm of tolerance for derogatory, sexist humor. That is, the context of the study might have led participants to believe that it is acceptable to be sexist. However, as predicted, no correlation between sexist behavior and social desirability was found when participants were put under time pressure while rating the jokes. Our research also supports findings by Ryan and Kanjorski (1998), who found that hostile sexist humor was positively related to rape myth acceptance (RMA) and related measures of sexual aggression. In our study, RMA and the relative preference for sexist humor were also positively correlated, especially when participants were given unlimited time to respond to the jokes. Overall, the correlational findings support the convergent and discriminant validity of the joke measure.

Future research should investigate further the reliability and validity of the newly developed measure. In a prospective study, participants could, for instance, be asked to complete the funniness ratings of the sexist and nonsexist jokes as part of a repeated-measures design. Specifically, participants would complete joke ratings first with time pressure instructions and then without or vice versa, with joke content counterbalanced. This would allow researchers to assess a difference score between controlled and spontaneous behavior *for each participant*. The higher this score, the more a participant shows evidence of controlling for sexist responses. This might then be studied in relation to scores on a recent self-report measure of the *motivation to control for sexist responses* (Klonis, Plant, & Devine, 2005).

While further evidence in support of the validity of both the implicit sexism measures as well as the joke measure is still outstanding, we conclude that, for the time being, a first step toward the economic and valid assessment of spontaneous and controlled sexist behavior in the laboratory has been taken.

References

- Asendorpf, J. B., Banse, R., & Mücke, D. (2002). Double dissociation between implicit and explicit personality self concept: The case of shy behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 380-393.
- Athenstaedt, U. (2002). Normative Geschlechtsrollenorientierung: Entwicklung und Validierung eines Fragebogens [Normative Gender Role Attitudes: The development and validation of a new questionnaire]. *Zeitschrift für Differentielle und Diagnostische Psychologie*, 21, 91-104.
- Bohner, G., Jarvis, C. I., Eyssel, F., & Siebler, F. (2005). The causal impact of rape myth acceptance on men's rape proclivity: Comparing sexually coercive and noncoercive men. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 819-828.
- Bless, H., Wänke, M., Bohner, G., Fellhauer, R., & Schwarz, N. (1994). Need for cognition: Eine Skala zur Erfassung von Engagement und Freude bei Denkaufgaben [Need for cognition: A scale measuring engagement and happiness in cognitive tasks. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 25, 147-154.
- Cacioppo, J.T. & Petty, R. E. (1983). The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 116-131.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- DeCoster, J., Banner, M. J., Smith, E. R., & Semin, G. R. (2006). On the inexplicability of the implicit: Differences in the information provided by implicit and explicit tests. *Social Cognition*, 24, 5-21.
- De Houwer, J. (2006). What are implicit measures and why are we using them. In R.

- W. Wiers & A. W. Stacy (Eds.), *The handbook of implicit cognition and addiction* (pp. 11-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Dunton, B. C. & Fazio, R. H. (1997). An individual difference measure of motivation to control prejudiced reactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 316–326.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 543-558.
- Eckes, T., & Six-Materna, I. (1998). Leugnung von Diskriminierung: Eine Skala zur Erfassung des modernen Sexismus [Denial of discrimination: A scale measuring modern sexism]. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 29, 224-238.
- Eckes, T., & Six-Materna, I. (1999). Hostilität und Benevolenz: Eine Skala zur Messung des ambivalenten Sexismus [Hostility and benevolence: A scale measuring ambivalent sexism]. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 30, 211-228.
- Eyssel, F. & Bohner, G. (2006). Impliziter Ambivalenter Sexismus: Erste Ergebnisse zur Entwicklung eines reaktionszeitbasierten Forschungsinstruments [Implicit ambivalent sexism: First results on the development of a reaction time-based research instrument]. In H. Hecht, S. Berti, G. Meinhardt, & M. Gamer (Eds.), *Beiträge zur 48. Tagung experimentell arbeitender Psychologen*. Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.
- Eyssel, F., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2006). Perceived Rape Myth Acceptance of Others Predicts Rape Proclivity: The Role of Judgmental Anchors and Social Norms. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 65, 93-99.
- Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 297-327.
- Ford, T. E., & Ferguson, M. A. (2004). Social consequences of disparagement

- humor: A prejudiced norm theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 79-94.
- Ford, T. E., Wentzel, E. R., & Lorion, J. (2001). Effects of exposure to sexist humor on perceptions of normative tolerance of sexism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 677-691.
- Gerger, H., Kley, H. , Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (in press). *Acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression (AMMSA): Parallel scale development in German and English. Interpersonal Violence.*
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1999). The Ambivalence toward Men Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Beliefs about Men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519-536.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. K. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464-1480.
- Greenwood, D., & Isbell, L. M. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and the dumb blonde: Men' s and women's reactions to sexist jokes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 341-350.
- Henkin, B., & Fish, J. M. (1996). Gender and personality differences in the appreciation of cartoon humor. *Journal of Psychology*, 120, 157-175.
- Klonis, S. C., Ashby Plant, E., & Devine, P. G. (2005). Internal and external motivation to respond without sexism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 1237-1249.

- Musch, J., Brockhaus, R., & Bröder, A. (2002). Ein Inventar zur Erfassung von zwei Faktoren sozialer Erwünschtheit [An inventory for the assessment of two factors of social desirability]. *Diagnostica*, 48, 121-129.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). *Manual for the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33, 27-68.
- Ryan, K. M., & Kanjorski, J. (1998). The enjoyment of sexist humor, rape attitudes and relationship aggression in college students. *Sex Roles*, 38, 743-756.
- Sabelus, S. (2004). Sexual harassment: Feminist attitude and physical attractiveness as risk factors. Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Bielefeld, Germany.
- Sev'er, A., & Ungar, S. (1997). No laughing matter: Boundaries of gender-based humour in the classroom. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 87-105.
- Siebler, F., Sabelus, S., & Böhner, G. (2006). A Refined Computer Harassment Paradigm: Validation, and Test of Hypotheses about Target Characteristics. Unpublished manuscript.
- Steffens, M. C., & Mehl, B. (2003). Erscheinen „Karrierefrauen“ weniger sozial kompetent als „Karrieremänner“? – Geschlechterstereotype und Kompetenzzuschreibung [Do “career women” appear less socially competent than “career men”? Gender stereotypes and manager selection]. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie*, 34, 173-185.
- Strack, F., & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 220-247.
- Stöber, J. (1999). Die Soziale-Erwünschtheits-Skala-17 (SES-17). Entwicklung und

- erste Befunde zu Reliabilität und Validität [The Social Desirability Scale-17 (SDS-17): Development and first results on reliability and validity]. *Diagnostica*, 45, 173-177.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S. & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 199-214.
- Thomas, C. A., & Esses, V. M. (2004). Individual differences in Reactions to sexist humor. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 7, 89-100.
- Von Collani, G., & Werner, R. (2002). Ambivalent sexistische Einstellungen (Hostilität und Benevolenz) gegenüber Männern (ASEM): Eine deutsche Skala [Ambivalent sexist attitudes (hostility and benevolence) toward men: A German scale]. In A. Glöckner-Rist (Hrsg.). *ZUMA-Informationssystem, Elektronisches Handbuch sozialwissenschaftlicher Erhebungsinstrumente*. Version 7.00. Mannheim: Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen.
- Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological Review*, 107, 101-126.
- Zillmann, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1976). A disposition theory of humor and mirth. In A. J. Chapman & H. C. Foot (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research and applications*. New York: Wiley.

Footnotes

¹ The complete set of sexist and nonsexist jokes in German language can be obtained from the first author.

² A single joke item („What does a woman do sitting in front of a blank sheet of paper? She is studying her rights”) loaded on the factor „sexist content”, but it also constituted a third factor that could be described as “hostility”. This factor explained 5.51% of the total variance.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Original Screenshot: Experimental condition with *high* time constraints.

Figure 2. Original Screenshot: Experimental condition with *low* time constraints.

Figure 1

In den folgenden Durchgängen sollen Sie Textwitze dahingehend bewerten, für wie witzig Sie diese halten.
Bitte versuchen Sie Ihre Einschätzung abzugeben BEVOR der graue Balken den rechten Rand erreicht!

Woran erkennt man einen freundlichen Motorradfahrer? An den Fliegen zwischen den Zähnen.

überhaupt nicht witzig 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 sehr witzig




Figure 2

In den folgenden Durchgängen sollen Sie Textwitze dahingehend bewerten, für wie witzig Sie diese halten.

Woran erkennt man einen freundlichen Motorradfahrer? An den Fliegen zwischen den Zähnen.

überhaupt nicht witzig 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 sehr witzig

Table 1

Means (M), standard deviations (SD) and internal consistencies (Cronbach's α) of self-report measures.

Explicit Measure	M	SD	α
Hostile Sexism	4.09	1.11	.88
Benevolent Sexism	4.22	1.16	.84
Modern Sexism	3.92	0.94	.80
Normative Gender Role Orientation	2.50	1.10	.85
Rape Myth Acceptance	3.48	1.06	.85
Need for Cognition	5.11	0.82	.75
Social Desirability	4.02	0.88	.59
Motivation to Control for Prejudice	4.89	0.89	.78

Table 2

Means and standard deviations (SD) of funniness ratings as a function of type of joke (sexist, nonsexist) and rating time constraints (low, high).

		Funniness Ratings	
Type of Joke	Time Constraints	M	SD
Sexist	Low	2.76	1.32
	High	3.58	1.57
Nonsexist	Low	3.34	1.09
	High	3.55	1.22

Note. Funniness judgments of the jokes were made on 7-point scales with high values denoting high perceived funniness of the joke.

Table 3

Pearson correlations of the joke difference score with implicit and explicit measures.

Measure	Joke Difference Score
Hostile Sexism	.37**
Benevolent Sexism	.21*
Modern Sexism	.40**
Normative Gender Role Orientation	.40**
Rape Myth Acceptance	.38**
Need for Cognition	-.25**
Social Desirability	.17
Motivation to Control for Prejudice	-.06
Hostile Sexism IAT	.01
Benevolent Sexism IAT	-.02

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 4

Pearson correlations of average funniness ratings of sexist and nonsexist jokes with implicit and explicit measures as a function of time constraints (high, low).

Time Constraints	Low	High
Measure	Joke Difference Score	Joke Difference Score
Hostile Sexism	.50**	.24*
Benevolent Sexism	.18	.18
Modern Sexism	.48**	.31*
Normative Gender Role Orientation	.37**	.40**
Rape Myth Acceptance	.54**	.23
Need for Cognition	-.06	-.38**
Social Desirability	.30*	.05
Motivation to Control for Prejudice	.09	-.21
Hostile Sexism IAT	.08	-.05
Benevolent Sexism IAT	-.10	.07

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Appendix

Stimuli used in the IATs

Benevolent Sexist	Hostile Sexist	Not Applicable To Persons
provident (fürsorglich)	deceitful (hinterlistig)	trapeziform (trapezförmig)
loving (liebepoll)	dishonest (verlogen)	corrugated (geriffelt)
empathetic (einfühlsam)	greedy of money (geldgierig)	triangular (dreieckig)
understanding (verständnisvoll)	egoistic (egoistisch)	chrome-plated (verchromt)
helpful (hilfsbereit)	incapable (unfähig)	right-angled (rechtwinklig)
friendly (freundlich)	calculating (berechnend)	cliffy (felsig)
considerate (rücksichtsvoll)	inferior (minderwertig)	woven (gewebt)
charming (charmant)	dependent (abhängig)	rectangular (rechteckig)
unselfish (selbstlos)	incompetent (inkompetent)	material (stofflich)
prepossessing (anziehend)	submissive (unterwürfig)	synthetic (synthetisch)

German first names used as stimuli in the IATs: Sabine, Anette, Verena, Claudia, Regine, Tobias, Oliver, Dominik, Matthias, Florian

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

Friederike Eyssel¹ and Gerd Böhner¹

¹ Friederike Eyssel and Gerd Böhner, Department of Psychology, Universität Bielefeld, Germany. This research and the preparation of this manuscript was supported by a grant from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (BO 1248/4-3) to Gerd Böhner and Frank Siebler.

We thank Paul Schreiber and Philipp Süßenbach for their help in conducting this study.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Friederike Eyssel, Universität Bielefeld, Abteilung für Psychologie, Postfach 100131, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany; e-mail: friederike.eyssel@uni-bielefeld.de.