ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM

CAN GENDER OF SOURCE MAKE A DİFFERENCE IN REDUCING SEXISM?

AN INTERVENTION STUDY WITH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

AYŞENUR DİLARA DÜVEN KAAN

117637005

HALE BOLAK BORATAV, PROF.

İSTANBUL

2020

CAN GENDER OF SOURCE MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN REDUCING SEXISM? AN INTERVENTION STUDY WITH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

CİNSIYETÇİLİĞİN AZALTILMASINDA KAYNAĞIN CİNSİYETİ BİR FARK YARATABİLİR Mİ? ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİYLE BİR MÜDAHALE ÇALIŞMASI

AYŞENUR DİLARA DÜVEN KAAN

117637005

Thesis Advisor: Hale Bolak Boratav, Prof.

İstanbul Bilgi University

Jury Member: Ümit Akırmak, Faculty Member, Ph.D.

İstanbul Bilgi University

Jury Member: Yasemin Kisbu-Sakarya, Asst. Prof.

Koç University

Date of Thesis Approval: 15.06.2020

Total Number of Pages: 64

Anahtar Kelimeler (Turkish)	Keywords (English)
1) Cinsiyetçilik	1) Sexism
2) Toplumsal Cinsiyet	2) Gender
3) Müdahale	3) Intervention
4) İyicil Cinsiyetçilik	4) Benevolent Sexism
5) Düşmanca Cinsiyetçilik	5) Hostile Sexism

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT…….. vi

ÖZET…… vii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS…… viii

INTRODUCTION…… 1

1. CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVİEW……..... 2

1.1. SEXISM……. 2

1.1.1. Sex-Gender-Sexism ……..... 2

1.1.2. Ambivalent Sexism ……..... 2

1.1.2.1. Hostile and Benevolent Sexism ……..... 2

1.1.2.2. Evidence for Hostile and Benevolent Sexism……..... 3

1.1.2.3. Ambivalent Sexism ……..... 5

1.1.2.4. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory ……..... 6

1.1.3. Roots of Sexism: Patriarchy …… 6

1.1.4. Consequences of Sexism ……..... 8

1.1.5. How Women React in the Face of Sexism ……..... 11

1.2. INTERVENTIONS ON SEXISM …….. 11

1.2.1. Previous Intervention Research ……..... 11

1.2.2. How can the Impact on Men be Enhanced? ……..... 15

1.3. CURRENT STUDY …… 16

1.3.1. Research Questions ……..... 16

1.3.2. Hypotheses ……..... 17

2. CHAPTER 2: METHOD ……... 18

2.1. PARTICIPANTS …… 18

2.2. INSTRUMENTS …….. 19

2.2.1. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) ……..... 19

2.2.2. Intervention and Control Essays ……..... 20

2.2.3. Demographic Information Form ……..... 20

2.3. PROCEDURE ……..... 20

2.4. DATA ANALYSIS …….. 21

3. CHAPTER 3: RESULTS …….. 22

3.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS …….. 22

3.2. EFFECTS OF ESSAY TYPE AND RESEARCHER GENDER ON MEN ……..... 25

3.3. EFFECTS OF ESSAY TYPE AND RESEARCHER GENDER ON WOMEN ……..... 26

3.4. BENEVOLENT AND HOSTILE SEXISM SCORES OF WOMEN AND MEN……..... 28

4. CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION ……..... 30

4.1. EFFECTS OF GENDER, RESEARCHER GENDER, AND ESSAY TYPE ON BENEVOLENT SEXISM ……..... 30

4.2. LIMITATIONS …… 33

4.3. FUTURE DIRECTIONS …… 34

CONCLUSION ……..... 35

REFERENCES ……..... 36

APPENDICES…..... 46

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form ……..... 46

Appendix B: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) ……..... 48

Appendix C: Intervention and Control Essays…… 51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. The Distribution of Parental Education Level of the Participants **19**

Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics of Benevolent and Hostile Sexism Scores **23**

Table 3.2. Distribution of Correct and Wrong Answers over Participant Gender…… **23**

Table 3.3. Distribution of Correct and Wrong Answers over Researcher Gender Variable…….. **24**

Table 3.4. Distribution of Correct and Wrong Answers over Essay Type Variable……... **24**

Table 3.5. Participants' BS and HS Scores Correlations with Demographic Variables by Gender …….. **29**

ABSTRACT

The limited number of studies on interventions on sexism has demonstrated that reducing men's sexism levels can be more challenging than women's. In the current study, an attempt was made to increase the effectiveness of a brief educational intervention in a form of an essay on sexism particularly on men through manipulation of the gender of researcher. essay. It was hypothesized that compared to women, men would be more affected by the intervention, if they were informed that research on sexism was conducted by a man. 145 female and 78 male undergraduate student participants were randomly distributed on an online platform to one of the four study conditionss: intervention essay with a female researcher, intervention essay with a male researcher, control essay with a female researcher, and control essay with a male researcher. The findings of the study revealed that researcher gender and essay type did not have a significant effect on either female and male participants' benevolent sexism scores. Women had significantly lower levels of benevolent and hostile sexism scores than men. Implications of these findings, limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: sexism, gender, intervention, benevolent sexism, hostile sexism.

ÖZET

Cinsiyetçilik üzerine yapılmış kısıtlı sayıdaki müdahale çalışmaları erkeklerin cinsiyetçilik seviyelerinin düşürülmesinin kadınlara göre daha zor olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu çalışmada, cinsiyetçilik üzerine bir metinden oluşan kısa bir eğitsel müdahalenin özellikle erkekler üzerindeki etkinliği, araştırmacı cinsiyetinin manipülasyonu ile artırılmaya çalışılmıştır. Erkeklerin cinsiyetçilik üzerine araştırmanın bir erkek tarafından yapıldığı yönünde bilgilendirildiklerinde, müdahaleden daha fazla etkileneceği varsayılmıştır. 145 kadın ve 78 erkek lisans öğrencisi katılımcı dört araştırma grubundan birine çevrimiçi bir platformda rastlantısal bir şekilde dağıtılmıştır: Kadın araştırmacı içeren müdahale metni, erkek araştırmacı içeren müdahale metni, kadın araştırmacı içeren kontrol metni, erkek araştırmacı içeren kontrol metni. Araştırmanın bulguları araştırmacı cinsiyetinin ve makale türünün kadın ve erkek katılımcıların iyicil cinsiyetçilik seviyeleri üzerinde anlamlı herhangi bir etkisinin olmadığını göstermiştir. Kadınların erkeklerden anlamlı düzeyde daha düşük düşmanca ve iyicil cinsiyetçilik skorlarına sahip oldukları gözlemlenmiştir. Bu bulguların anlamları ve araştırmanın sınırlılıkları ve bundan sonra yapılacak araştırmalar için öneriler tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: cinsiyetçilik, toplumsal cinsiyet, müdahale, iyicil cinsiyetçilik, düşmanca cinsiyetçilik.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor Hale Bolak Boratav for all her help and guidance, which made this thesis possible. I am also thankful to my jury members, Ümit Akırmak, and Yasemin Kisbu-Sakarya for their helpful comments and contributions which enriched my thesis.

I owe thanks to my husband Hilmi Kaan, for his invaluable and endless support throughout my education in the clinical program and my process of writing my thesis. His encouragement and his confidence in me helped me to get through many difficult times.

I would also like to thank my friends Barış Can, Ece Soysal, Oya Masaracı, Öyküm Taner, Thor Han Smith, Tuğçe Merve Aytaç for their encouragement and emotional support. My graduate education in the clinical program would have been much more challenging without their warm friendship.

I am also deeply grateful for all the instructors and friends that I have encountered in this program for providing me with so much insight and knowledge.

I am forever grateful to my parents, Hümeyra and Numan Düven, and my brother Ahmet Düven, for always believing in and wishing the best for me with their unconditional love.

Finally, I would like to thank TÜBİTAK for the financial support through scholarship which helped me complete my graduate education and this thesis.

INTRODUCTION

Sexism is a form of prejudice affecting the lives of both women and men throughout the world. Therefore, it is important to investigate different forms of sexism, sources of sexism, consequences of sexism, and how people react in the face of sexism. It is also important to investigate possible ways to eliminate or reduce it.

Compared to the number of studies investigating interventions on other forms of prejudices, the number of studies investigating interventions on sexism is relatively scarce (Becker, Zawadzki, & Shields, 2014). These interventions used different methods such as experiential learning or informing participants about the nature of sexism, focused on different mechanisms such as self-efficacy or education to create a change (Shields, Zawadzki, & Johnson, 2011; Good & Woodzicka, 2010). Effectiveness of such interventions changed from one method to another, and sometimes from one group of people to another. The current study focuses on increasing the effectiveness of an educative intervention on men.

CHAPTER 1
LITERATURE REVİEW

1.1. SEXISM

1.1.1. Sex-Gender-Sexism

Sex is assigned at birth based on anatomical features; gender is a social construct encompassing all the expectations (traits, behaviors, roles) are considered appropriate for each sex in a given society. Cultures have different ideas about what roles of gender should entail and how flexible gender roles should be (Wade & Tavris, 1994).

Sexism is a form of oppression and unjust treatment resulting from one's sex and gender. Sexism can be defined as beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that either contain negative assessments of individuals because of their sex or support unequal status of men and women (Swim & Hyers, 2009, p. 407). Although sexism can also be directed at men, women are overwhelmingly the main target of sexism and have historically suffered as a result of it.

1.1.2. Ambivalent Sexism

1.1.2.1. Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

Sexism has been most commonly understood as negative stereotypes about and prejudice and discrimination towards women. Maybe the earliest conceptualization of the complexity of sexism was by Nadler and Morrow (1959) six decades ago, who defined two forms of authoritarian attitudes toward women. "Openly subordinating attitudes" included stereotypes of women as inferior, thus deserving of subordination and support of policies restricting women to a subordinate status in the society. The other form was named "chivalry", that constructed women as physically fragile, intellectually naive and morally pure, and thus as deserving special protection and deference. Chivalry also encourages certain rules and rituals of conduct toward women. Since then, Blee and Jackman (1994) has also argued that subordination and affection are not mutually exclusive, that they can go hand-in-hand. Members of the dominant groups offer subordinates a

patronizing affection and can act warmly toward them as a reward for accepting subordination instead of rebellion.

A similar and more recent conceptualization of sexism has come from Glick and Fiske (1996), who have argued that sexist hostility often goes hand in hand with subjectively positive attitudes toward women. Their theory of ambivalent sexism encompasses hostile and benevolent sexism as two sets of sexist attitudes.

Hostile sexism is an antagonistic view of women, seeking to justify traditional gender roles, male power, and men's exploitation of women. Hostile sexism is based upon the derogatory characterizations of women and the perception that women seek to control men through means of sexuality or feminism. (Glick & Fiske, 1997; Glick & Fiske, 2001). Benevolent sexism is a set of attitudes in which women are viewed through gender stereotypes, accompanied by subjectively positive feelings and prosocial behaviors (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Stereotypes about women include many positive traits such as being nice, morally pure beings who ought to be supported, protected, and adored. Stereotypes of women regarding their agency, on the other hand, imply that women are incompetent at many important public roles and that they are weak, therefore, best suited for traditional gender roles. These attributions about women are also the traits that place them in less powerful and subordinate positions in daily interactions (Ridgeway, 1992, p.220). The traditional gender roles for women are interpreted as cherishing, rather than restricting (Glick & Fiske, 2001) Benevolent sexism is a kinder justification of restricting gender roles and male dominance, embracing a romanticized view of intergender relations through recognition of men's dependence on women for sexual reproduction (Glick & Fiske, 1997; Guttentag & Secord, 1983, as cited in Glick & Fiske, 1996).

1.1.2.2. Evidence for Benevolent and Hostile Sexism

Hostile sexism tries to maintain male dominance over women and to place women in subordinate and traditional roles. It also includes derogatory views and antagonism toward women. Especially in the last century, there has been a marked improvement in the rights and status of women in many countries around the world;

however, hostile attitudes toward women continue to pose a problem around the world.

In many cultures and time periods, men have had access to more power and more status than women (Wade & Tavris, 1994). Even though there is progress in the status of women, gender discrimination is a continuing problem. In the USA, the gender gap in earning has narrowed in the past decades, but there is still a significant gap and it remains relatively stable (Graf, Brown & Patten, 2018). Sexual harassment in work environments continues to be a chronic problem in many parts of the world including the USA (Quick & McFadyen, 2017). Violence against women is still disturbingly frequent. García-Moreno et al. (2013) estimates that globally 30% of women have experienced either physical or sexual violence by a partner at some point in time. The lifetime prevalence of sexual violence from a non-partner is estimated to be 7.2%.

In Turkey, the gender gap is particularly wide. According to The Global Gender Gap Report of World Economic Forum (2017), Turkey ranks 130th out of 153 countries on dimensions of economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and survival, political empowerment, indicating a very high level of gender inequality. In Turkey, lifetime prevalence of physical or sexual violence from a partner is 41.9%, while physical or sexual violence from outside of household is reported to be 4.4% according to TUIK (2008). Hostile sexism presents a particularly serious problem for women and has been shown to be related to belief in patriarchy and acceptance of violence against women (Sakallı-Uğur, 2001).

Benevolent sexism, as well as hostile sexism, continue to affect women's lives around the world. Research focusing on helping behavior in short-term encounters with strangers indicates that women are more likely to receive help than men (Eagly & Crowley, 1986), meanwhile, women may be devalued for accepting the help (Piliavin & Unger, 1985, as cited in Kilianski & Rudman, 1998). Viki, Abrams, and Hutchison (2003) have found that individuals who endorse stronger benevolent sexist attitudes are more likely to support paternalistic chivalry, in

which women are treated by men with consideration and courtesy; but at the same time, they are also restricted in the roles that they may have in relationships.

1.1.2.3. Ambivalent Sexism

Racial and ethnic groups can avoid interpersonal relations, even casual encounters, across groups. In the case of gender, avoidance of interpersonal relations across groups is not possible. Because of the interdependence between sexes (Fiske & Stevens, 1993; as cited in Glick & Fiske, 1997), sexist men are very likely to possess affection towards women. Although sexist men may want to restrict women to certain roles, few of them want to banish women totally from their lives (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Therefore, stereotypes about women are complex because they contain both negative and positive judgments producing both openly subordinating as well as chivalrous attitudes towards them. Mixed stereotypes reveal 2 dimensions: Competency vs likability/warmth.

Glick and Fiske (2001) have suggested that ambivalent sexism originates from holding hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs simultaneously. Hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs entail opposite evaluations of and feeling toward women, therefore holding these two sexist beliefs simultaneously creates an ambivalence. A person may hold both hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs and still can view his approach entirely consistent (e.g. “Women are not competent at many domains of work.” and “Women should be cherished by men.”)

Sexist individuals may have ambivalent attitudes toward women without necessarily feeling inconsistent because sexist ambivalence usually takes the form of dividing women into subcategories (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Ambivalent sexists hold polarized views of women expressed as hostile and benevolent sexism. For example, businesswomen are seen as “competent” but also “cold and aggressive” because their high status/power poses a threat of competition. On the other hand, wives/mothers are seen as “warm” but “incompetent”. In other words, hostile sexism is directed at women who challenge traditional gender roles and benevolent sexism is directed towards traditional women (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997). Furthermore, ambivalent sexist people may not consider their attitudes toward women as prejudicial because they dislike only certain types of women.

Nevertheless, ambivalent sexists can consciously experience conflict with particular women. Females who simultaneously fit into liked subcategories on one dimension while fitting into a disliked subcategory on another probably arouse a conflict. An ambivalent sexist man's feelings and attitudes toward his feminist daughter can be an example of a conflicted form of sexist ambivalence. Therefore, sexist ambivalence may be observable in both conflicted and unconflicted forms.

1.1.2.4. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

Glick and Fiske (1996) developed the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), a self-report measure composed of hostile and benevolent sexism subscales. Their factor analysis confirmed the existence of benevolent and hostile sexism factors. The positive correlation appeared between the two subscales, indicating that these two constructs are associated aspects of sexism. In different applications of ASI across many nations, hostile and benevolent sexism were positively and significantly correlated and found to be quite prevalent (Glick et al. 2000; Glick & Fiske, 2001). Cross-cultural differences were found systematic and predictable, and both hostile and benevolent sexism were related to national gender inequality indices.

1.1.3. Roots of Sexism: Patriarchy

Glick and Fiske (1996) have proposed that benevolent and hostile sexism have biological and social roots. Even though there are biological differences between sexes; institutions of patriarchy and paternalism have had a significant impact on gender relations.

Patriarchy is the institutionalization and manifestation of male dominance over females in the family and in the larger society. Even though women are not totally powerless, men hold power to a much larger extent in the important institutions of the society, and women are deprived of such power. Historically, patriarchy has taken various forms and modes and has changed in structure and function (Lerner, 1986, p. 239)

Patriarchy describes institutionalization of male dominance, and paternalism describes a particular mode of patriarchy. Paternalism, or paternalistic dominance, is the relationship of a dominant group to a subordinate group, in which

the dominance is mitigated by reciprocal rights and obligations. Usually, the dominant group is considered superior and the subordinate group is considered as inferior. The dominated group exchange unpaid labor for maintenance and submission for protection (Lerner, 1986, p. 239).

Patriarchy is a widespread phenomenon, still affecting social life across most cultures (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Even though patriarchy's defining elements are the male-centered and male-dominated structures, it is also a set of ideas and symbols embedded in the culture (Johnson, 2000). Patriarchal culture defines the nature of women, men, and humanity. It includes ideas about how social life is supposed to be, and how people are expected to feel and behave. It is about the standards of masculine toughness and protectiveness; feminine beauty and vulnerability. It is about devaluing of femaleness and femininity and valuing of maleness and masculinity. Even though people may experience patriarchy as external to them, like other social systems, it exists only through the lives of individuals (Johnson, 2000).

Many human cultures demonstrate male domination over women to a much larger extent compared to other primates. Smuts (1995) hypothesizes several reasons for this condition. One of them is that females in human societies have reduced access to social support from relatives and friends (Smuts & Smuts, 1993; as cited in Smuts 1995) through common practices of patrilocal residence (Ember, 1978) and male-male alliances (Foley, 1989). Another reason is the increased male control over resources especially through the advent of animal husbandry and agriculture (Smuts, 1995). The development of language allowed men to increase and consolidate their control over women because language enabled the creation of ideologies and laws of female subordinance/inferiority and male dominance/supremacy (Smuts, 1995).

Gender stereotypes do not only define how women and men are, but they also define how they should be (Burgess ve Borgida, 1999), and this also leads to a perception of "ideal masculinity" in the society; portraying men as independent, ambitious, career-oriented and aggressive (Sakallı &Türkoğlu; 2019). This prescriptive aspect of gender stereotypes has an ideological motivation aiming to

maintain and perpetuate the hierarchical gender structure (Burgess & Borgida, 1999); they also lead to discrimination and punishment against those who violate them (Atay, 2004; Rudman & Fairchild, 2004; Rudman & Phelan, 2008; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Phelan, & Nauts, 2012).

Research has shown that men endorse traditional gender roles and the status quo more so than women (Pratto, Stallworth, Sidanius, & Siers, 1997). Those men who endorse traditional gender roles may feel "sex role strain" if their own performance as men does not match the standards set by society as ideal masculinity (Garnets & Pleck, 1997). Vandello and Bosson (2013) argue that manhood is a precarious social status. Womanhood is viewed more as a result of a permanent, natural, and biological developmental transition; whereas manhood must be earned and when earned, tenuously held. Because of this, men are more likely to experience anxiety about their gender status compared to women, particularly if their gender status is challenged. This anxiety may cause a variety of maladaptive and risky behaviors to protect or regain manhood. Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, and Weaver (2008) have found that college students endorsed statements and proverbs about the tenuous, uncertain, and easily lost qualities of manhood more than of womanhood. Moreover, when men's masculinity is threatened, they tend to take greater financial risks (Weaver, Vandello, & Bosson, 2013); aggressive acts are also viewed as a means of restoring threatened manhood (Bosson, Vandello, Burnaford, Weaver, & Wasti, 2009; Weaver, Vandello, Bosson, & Burnaford, 2010). Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard (1985) demonstrated men who identified as more masculine on the Bern Sex Role Inventory were more likely to abuse their dating partners. Similarly, Jenkins and Aube (2002) have found that endorsing the traditional male role predicts greater male aggression.

1.1.4. Consequences of Sexism

The impact of hostile sexism is blatant as it hurts women through lack of support for or opposition to women's rights and direct discrimination. Hostile sexism has been found to be positively associated with legitimization of wife abuse (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira, & Souza, 2002), self-confessed inclination to acquaintance rape (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003), and negative

evaluation of female candidates for managerial positions and lower employment recommendation for them (Masser & Abrams 2004).

Understanding how viewing women as morally pure beings who need to be protected and cherished have a negative effect on women can be more challenging. Benevolent sexism may even provide immediate rewards to women. However, research has shown that benevolent sexism also has detrimental outcomes both in the short and long term. For example, Dardenne, Dumont & Bollier (2007) have demonstrated that benevolent sexism had can hurt women's performance on a cognitive task. The performance of women decreased significantly when benevolent sexism was expressed, while hostile sexism did not impair women's performance. Hostile sexism had an overt quality and was easily detected as a prejudice without ambiguity, and therefore, did not interfere with women's performance. On the other hand, benevolent sexism had a positive tone, appeared benign and not easily identified as prejudice, and thus was able to create mental intrusions and self-doubt interfering with task performance. Similarly, Barreto and Ellemers (2005) have found that when people, both men and women express hostile sexism, they are more likely to be perceived as holding sexist attitudes than when expressing benevolent sexism.

Paynter and Leaper (2016) found that benevolent and hostile sexism to be positively associated with participants' endorsement of double standards for men and women in the dating and courtship scenarios. Among the other variables correlating with endorsement of double standards, for both women and men, benevolent sexism was found as the only variable with a large effect size. The association of hostile sexism to backing of double standards was substantially stronger among men, compared to women. Thus, endorsing double standards seems to be more likely among women who believe that men should be protecting and cherishing women and among men who value the role of man as the protector or the dominant one. On the other hand, women who reject benevolent sexism have been found to be skeptical of their partner's motives when they impose protective restrictions on them (Moya, Glick, Exposito, de Lemus, & Hart, 2007).

Women who endorse benevolent sexism are prone to be receptive of a justification based on their "vulnerability as a woman" and they are inclined to miss a career opportunity due to paternalistic protection. Good and Rudman (2010) investigated the impact of hostile and benevolent sexism on job interview context. Their findings have demonstrated that participants who viewed favorably the interviewers who endorse benevolent or hostile sexist attitudes, also attributed less competence to the female applicant and perceived her as less deserving of the job.

Benevolent sexism seems to be dangerous due to its subtle nature. Women can easily recognize hostile sexism, but it is harder to detect benevolent sexism. Moreover, when women do not perceive the connection between these two constructs, they are more likely to disapprove of hostile sexism and more likely to approve of benevolent sexism (Kilianski & Rudman, 1998). On the other hand, benevolent sexist practices may also foster hostile sexism. By enacting the role of protector and provider towards women, men may feel more entitled to dominate women (Siegel, 1996 as cited in Kilianski & Rudman 1998). Montañés et al. (2012) have found that adolescent women who endorse benevolent sexist beliefs tend to show lower academic aspirations and focus more on traditionally feminine goals. More focus on traditional goals instead of academic goals limit female adolescents' future possibilities in non-traditional roles by lowering their academic achievements in the present. Academic achievements and career development would provide women with means for obtaining financial resources, which is considered as a critical power base in gender relations (Pratto & Walker, 2004). Therefore, female adolescents' endorsement of benevolent sexism has demonstrated as contributing to the maintenance of male dominance over women.

Several theories emphasize that benevolent stereotypes have a crucial role in the justification of the status quo, even for the members of the subordinated groups. Jost and Kay (2005) have found that system justification was enhanced only in response to benevolent stereotypes; exposure to stereotypes attributing more agency to men did not lead to trigger an increase in system justification. Moreover, subordinated groups may more smoothly agree on their status when dominant ones act benevolently towards them (Rudman & Heppen 2003).

Similarly, Becker and Wright (2011) have found that exposing women to hostile sexism increases women's engagement in collective action for social change, while exposure to benevolent sexism undermines it.

1.1.5. How Women React in the Face of Sexism

When faced with sexism, women can respond in a variety of ways. Humor, sarcasm, cognitive coping strategies, communicating displeasure through nonverbal cues, or directly confronting the behavior are some of the ways. Gervais, Hillard, and Vescio (2010) have found that confronting sexism is associated with positive outcomes such as self-esteem, competence, and empowerment, however, most women keep their silence in the face of sexism (Swim & Hyers, 1999). Confronting sexist behavior also has costs and these costs can operate as barriers to confronting such behavior. People observing confrontations of discrimination often attribute undesirable personality traits to the confronter, even when discrimination is blatant (Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003). Overlooking discrimination is notably pronounced in cases of sexism, with both women and men perceiving sexist attitudes incidents as less serious than other types of discrimination (Czopp, Monteith, & Mark, 2006; Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Female confronters of sexism are often perceived as overreacting and interpersonally cold (e.g., Becker, Glick, Ilic, & Bohner, 2011; Czopp & Monteith, 2003) and they are less liked by men (Dodd, Giuliano, Boutell, Moran, 2001). When the claims of sexism come from women, they are more likely to be discounted by the observers (Drury & Kaiser, 2014).

1.2. INTERVENTIONS ON SEXISM

1.2.1. Previous Intervention Research

As both hostile and benevolent sexism have adverse effects on women, reducing their prevalence is critical. Compared to research on reducing other forms of prejudice and on confronting sexism, research on interventions attempting to reduce sexism is rare (Becker, Zawadzki, & Shields, 2014). Moreover, mechanisms that can be successfully used to reduce other forms of prejudice, for instance, intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), may not simply be adapted to the case of sexism because men and women are already in continuous close contact. A

few existing studies (Good & Woodzicka, 2010; Becker & Swim, 2011; Shields, Zawadzki, & Johnson, 2011; Becker & Swim, 2012; Case, Hensley, & Anderson, 2014; Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2014; De Lemus, Navarro, Velasquez, Ryan, & Megias, 2014) investigated different methods such as informing the participants or providing experiential learning about the nature, prevalence, and results of the sexism through essays, videos, diaries, workshops or discussion groups.

Good and Woodzicka (2010) evaluated the effectiveness of an educational intervention in reducing the approval of benevolent sexism by undergraduate participants, across two studies. The intervention was aimed at stimulating awareness about benevolent sexism, generally unrecognized as a form of prejudice. The intervention was in the form of a brief essay about the nature of sexism. The studies also used a corresponding essay in length on insomnia as a control condition. Pretest and posttest hostile and benevolent sexism scores were acquired through ASI. In study 1, 59 participants were asked to rate their liking of non-sexist, benevolent sexist, and hostile sexist profiles after reading one of the essays. In study 2, the purpose of the study was more disguised and instead of the profile rating, 224 participants were asked to read complaints of company employees as if they were on a large company disciplinary board. After reading the complaints containing benevolent sexist acts, the participants were asked to rate the severity of the incidents and the extent to which the described situations represent bias, prejudice, and discrimination.

Findings of the two studies conducted by Good and Woodzicka (2010) have revealed that reading a brief educational essay about sexism was sufficient to significantly reduce the undergraduate participants' benevolent sexist attitudes. In Study 1, reading the intervention essay significantly reduced both women's and men's appreciation of a benevolent sexist profile. In Study 2, in which the true purpose of the study was more disguised, only women's appreciation of the benevolent sexist incident decreased, whereas men's did not change. The researchers explained the gender difference with the possibility of the men's

inexperience as a target of benevolent sexism themselves or with their identification with the male boss who conducts the discriminatory acts rather than with the female accuser. They also stated that men may be expressing disapproval of benevolent sexism out of a need to appear socially desirable, rather than due to a genuine disapproval of the construct.

Becker and Swim (2012) conducted two studies to investigate the effect of learning about the adverse impact of benevolent sexism. The results indicate that when participants are informed about its adverse effects, they are more inclined to reject benevolent sexist attitudes and to rate less desirable and more sexist a benevolent sexist profile. Information about the pervasiveness of the construct had a less critical impact on the reduction of the endorsement of benevolent sexism. Information about the adverse effects of benevolent sexism also leads to rejecting modern sexist attitudes more, when information about the pervasiveness of the benevolent sexism is provided. When the information regarding the pervasiveness of the benevolent sexism is not provided, rejection of the modern sexist attitudes did not increase. With the findings of Becker and Swim (2012), it is possible to deduce that if benevolent sexism was perceived as damaging but not particularly pervasive, the participants were more likely to continue to consider discrimination as an exception in an otherwise egalitarian society.

Using a different approach, Shields, Zawadzki, and Johnson (2011) have introduced the Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation in the Academy (WAGES-Academic), a simulation of the effects of unrecognized bias in the academic workplace providing an experiential learning process for the participants. At the beginning of the workshop, the participants are randomly divided into two teams to play a board game. During the game, one of the teams receives seemingly innocuous advantages; the advantages are individually small but create a noticeable disparity in the long run. After the game, all participants are invited to engage in a facilitated and structured group discussion about the nature and the impact of the unconscious biases. With this workshop, participants become aware of their bias and learn that accumulation of seemingly minor biases interfere with the

advancement in the work-life, that gender-relevant factors are usually influential in different ways in the workplace, and that gender-related stereotypes may impair the ability to recognize bias and in the long-run, these lead to gender inequality in professional life. This research has demonstrated that WAGES-Academic increases knowledge of gender inequity immediately after the participation and 1 week later (Shields, Zawadzki, & Johnson, 2011), leads to increased recognition of harm of the seemingly minor sexist incidents in everyday life (Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2014). The greater effect of WAGES compared to providing information directly was due to WAGES's quality of creating less reactance and increased feeling of self-efficacy (Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2012; Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2014).

Using the diary method, another intervention research was conducted by Becker and Swim (2011) in the United States and Germany. Women's endorsement of benevolent sexist, modern sexist and neo-sexist attitudes were reduced by keeping diaries on daily encounters with sexism, across two countries and three studies. Raising sensitivity about sexism through diaries was sufficient for women to change their attitudes toward sexism, while for men keeping diaries on sexist incident encounters were not sufficient. The researchers state that they expected men to remain unaffected from the act of keeping diaries because of men's interest in maintaining their higher status in the society. Men's empathy needed to be increased for the target of the sexist incident to reduce men's endorsement of neo-sexist and modern sexist attitudes; still, their benevolent sexist attitudes remained unaffected.

De Lemus, Navarro, Velasquez, Ryan, and Megias (2014) carried out three intervention studies in Argentina, Spain, and El Salvador. Their intervention was a 20-hour training program with a series of workshops containing short lectures on sexism, small-group practical assignments, and large-group discussions. The content of the program was based on the power and gender model developed by Pratto and Walker (2004). The findings of all three studies have shown a reduction in hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes.

Case, Hensley, and Anderson (2014) conducted two intervention studies to investigate the effectiveness of the interventions on raising awareness of heterosexual (study 1) and male privilege (study 2) among college students. In study 1 the participants were mainly members of the dominant, heterosexual group learning about their own privilege; in study 2 most of the participants were women learning about the privileges of men. Interventions were composed of reading a list of heterosexual or male privilege and reflective writing or watching a video on the same subjects, discussing the ways that these privileges bring advantages, and reflective writing. Interventions were successful in increasing awareness about male and heterosexual privilege (study 1 and study 2) and reducing the endorsement of modern sexist attitudes (study 2). On the other hand, both interventions failed to decrease the endorsement of benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes.

Previous research has demonstrated that men can be less affected by the interventions' on sexism compared to women (Becker and Swim, 2011; Good and Woodzicka, 2010). On the other hand, some intervention studies were more successful at increasing men's knowledge of gender inequality (Zawadzki, Shields, Danube, & Swim, 2012), increasing recognition of seemingly minor sexist incident's harm (Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2014) and reducing men's endorsement of neo-sexist and modern sexist attitudes (Becker & Swim, 2011). The greater impact seems to be the result of experiential learning's quality of creating less reactance and increased feeling of self-efficacy (Zawadzki, Danube, & Shields, 2012; Cundiff, Zawadzki, Danube, and Shields, 2014) or the increased empathy for the victim of the discrimination (Becker & Swim, 2011).

1.2.2. How Can the Impact on Men Be Enhanced?

The previous studies have shown that interventions on sexism can be more successful on men if the empathy for the victim of the discrimination was encouraged (Becker & Swim, 2011) or the when the person that confronts a sexist behavior is a man (Czopp & Monteith, 2003). The theory of minority social influence would also predict that non-sexist men, as single minorities, may be more successful in affecting the sexist attitudes of men (Moscovici & Nemeth, 1974).

Even though women are more likely to confront sexist behavior compared to men, men are more likely to be perceived as legitimate than women when they confront sexist behavior. As men are not already stereotyped as hypersensitive and they are not direct beneficiaries of the reduction in sexism, their confrontation is perceived as carrying more objectivity (Drury & Kaiser, 2014). Therefore, men can operate as allies while confronting sexism and, perhaps, during the interventions about sexism, especially with men.

1.2. CURRENT STUDY

Benevolent sexism is not widely recognized as sexism. An educational intervention informing the participants about the nature of benevolent sexism and its relation to hostile sexism can be successful at reducing benevolent sexist attitudes and approval of benevolent sexist acts. Interventions that are practical and easy to administer are more likely to be used to address a large body of people. Educational interventions are among these practical interventions. The educational intervention study designed by Good and Woodzicka (2010) can be utilized in work and school settings, and their findings have shown its success.

Interventions are often more successful at reducing women's benevolent sexist attitudes, while they can fail to reduce men's approval of benevolent sexism (Good & Woodzicka, 2010; Becker and Swim, 2011). Possible ways of improving the effectiveness of these interventions on men should be investigated. Hence, in the present study, an educational intervention similar to the one used by Good and Woodzicka (2010) is used to increase awareness of benevolent sexism; in addition, a possible way of improving the effectiveness of the intervention on men is also investigated. This study focuses on whether a single minority, in this case, a non-sexist male researcher, can increase the effect of this intervention on men.

1.3.1. Research Questions

1. Can a single minority, in this case male researcher, increase the effect of a simple educational intervention on men in reducing acceptance of benevolent sexism?

2. Previous studies have shown that women are not affected by the gender of confronter during confrontations about sexism (Drury & Kaiser, 2014). Another research question focuses on whether women will present the pattern expected by Drury and Kaiser (2014) and Good and Woodzicka (2010), that of reduced acceptance of benevolent sexism regardless of the sex of the researcher.

1.3.2. Hypotheses:

1. Men's benevolent sexism levels will be significantly lower in the intervention condition with a reference to a male researcher, compared to control conditions and the intervention condition with a reference to a female researcher.

2. Women's benevolent sexism scores will be significantly lower in both intervention conditions compared to control conditions.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1. PARTICIPANTS

The sample of the present study was composed of undergraduate students. Participation in the study was voluntary and occurred in an online platform, Qualtrics. Some of the participants were reached with the introduction of the study to the preparation school students of Bilgi University and the rest of the participants were reached with the snowballing technique from different universities across İstanbul and Turkey. The data collection occurred in two different periods. In the first period, only the university preparation school students participated. As the number of participants could not reach a number to conduct the necessary analyses, all undergraduate students were invited to the study in the second period. The study was conducted in Turkish and required advanced comprehension skills in Turkish; thus three participants who resided in Turkey for less than five years in their lifetime were excluded from the analysis due to possible language barriers.

460 participants started the study, but 231 chose to withdraw before completing it. In total, 229 number of participants, with ages ranging from 18 to 35 (mean age = 21.51, SD = 3.11) , completed the study. 145 participants (63%) were female (mean age = 21.56, SD = 2.90)) and 78 participants (34%) were male (mean age = 21.31, SD = 3.48). 1 participant identified their gender as “other”, and 5 participants did not specify their gender. 182 of the participants (79%) described themselves as “heterosexual”, 15 (7%) as bisexual, and 8 (3%) as homosexual. 7 (3%) of the participants identified their sexual orientation as “other”, and 17 (7%) participants did not specify their sexual orientation.

The participants were from diverse universities across Turkey and a diversity of majors. Additionally, 126 of the students (55%) were in their first year at the university, 26 of them (11%) were in the second year, 20 of them (9%) were in the third year, 36 of them (16%) were in their fourth year and 21 of them (9%)

were at their fifth or more years. Participants' parental education levels are demonstrated in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1.

The Distribution of Parental Education Level of the Participants

	Parental Education Level					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Maternal Education	5	44	23	73	74	10
Paternal Education	2	23	24	78	85	17

Note. 1. No school experience, 2. Primary School, 3. Secondary School, 4. High school, 5. Undergraduate Education, 6. Graduate Education

2.2. INSTRUMENTS

2.2.1. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

The Turkish version of The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1996), Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002) was used to measure participants' hostile and benevolent sexism scores following the intervention. The ASI includes two 11-item scales, one measuring benevolent sexism (BS) (e.g., "Women should be cherished and protected by men") and the other hostile sexism (HS) (e.g., "Women are too easily offended"). Responses are measured on a 6-point scale from 0 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). There are no reverse items. The Cronbach's Alpha for the original version of ASI was in between .83 and .92 across the studies that have been conducted to assess the measure's reliability. The overall ASI score was correlated well with other sexism scales; Modern Sexism .57 (Swim et al. 1995), Rape Myth Acceptance .54 (Burt, 1980). The Cronbach's Alpha for the Turkish version of ASI was computed as .85, test-retest reliability coefficient was .87. It was correlated .60 with the sex-role stereotyping of Burt (1980).

2.2.2. Intervention and Control Condition Essays

In the present study, the Turkish translation of intervention and control essays of Good and Woodzicka (2010) were used. Only the researcher names in the intervention and control essays were different. In one of the intervention and control conditions the researcher name was a female name. In the other intervention and control conditions the researcher name was a corresponding male name. Thus, there were four conditions: Intervention condition with a female researcher (IntA), intervention condition with a male researcher (IntB), Control condition with a female researcher (ContA), Control condition with a male researcher (ContB). Immediately after the essays, one question was asked in order to see whether the participants received the intervention or not.

Intervention essay includes one-and-a-half-page description of benevolent sexism (BS) and hostile sexism (HS) and relevant research findings regarding their systemic negative consequences. (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 2001). Control essay describes the nature of insomnia. The control reading was the same length and format as the intervention reading.

2.2.3. Demographic Information Form

The Demographic form includes information about birth year, birth place, gender, sexual orientation, major, university name, prior college experience, ethnicity, nationality, years lived in Turkey, income, maternal and paternal education.

2.3. PROCEDURE

The study was introduced as targeting to examine young people's attitudes towards gender roles, based on voluntary participation on an online platform, Qualtrics. The informed consent form included the information that the participants would be debriefed about the study after the data-collection process.

After giving informed consent, participants were assigned to one of the four conditions of the study containing a different essay. Assignment to different conditions was randomized by Qualtrics. The participants were asked to read essays carefully and the essays were followed by a question regarding the information given in the essays. Later, ASI scores were obtained and the demographic form was

filled. The procedure took approximately 10 minutes. The participants who gave their email addresses to receive debriefing were debriefed after the data-collection process.

2.4. DATA ANALYSIS

In this study, there were two independent variables: (1) Essay type, intervention essay on sexism, or control essay on insomnia. (2) Researcher gender identified in the essays. For each type of essay, there were two conditions, one with a female, another with a male researcher name. There was also a subject variable: participant gender. The dependent variable was the benevolent sexism levels of the participants, measured by the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, Benevolent Sexism Scale.

Initially, descriptive statistics were investigated. A two-way between subjects Analysis of Variance was conducted on male participants to examine whether reading a non-sexist male researcher conducting research on sexism could be more effective than reading a non-sexist female researcher conducting research on sexism. Another two-way between subjects Analysis of Variance was conducted on female participants to investigate the effects of the intervention and control essays. Two independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the benevolent and hostile sexism scores of men and women. Lastly, the participants' demographic variables' association with the participants' hostile and benevolent sexism scores were investigated.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The findings of the present study will be reported in 4 sections. First, descriptive statistics of the scales and study variables will be presented. Second, the findings of analyses demonstrating the effects of essay type and researcher gender on men's benevolent sexism will be given. Thirdly, the results of analyses showing the effects of essay type and researcher gender on women will be given. In the last section, the findings of independent samples t-test for gender on benevolent and hostile sexism will be given.

3.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Before the testing of the hypotheses, descriptive statistics were investigated. Reliability scores of the scales and scale scores were computed. The number of participants who answered the questions following the essays correctly and wrongly was also investigated.

Reliability scores for Ambivalent Sexism Inventory scales were computed. Cronbach's alpha score for benevolent sexism was .85 and for hostile sexism it was .92. As expected, Hostile Sexism and Benevolent sexism scores were significantly correlated for the women (r = .641, n = 145, p < .001), men (r = .495, n = 78, p < .000), and the total sample (r = .600, n = 229, p < .001).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory scale scores were computed. The maximum, minimum, mean, and standard deviation scores for benevolent and hostile sexism scores of the study are shown in Table 3.1., for women, men, and total.

Table 3.1.

Descriptive Statistics of Benevolent and Hostile Sexism Scores

		Mean	Std	Min	Max
Female	BS	2.49	.94	1	5.45
	HS	2.37	1.00	1	4.91
Male	BS	2.87	.90	1.18	4.82
	HS	3.57	.99	1.18	5.27
Total	BS	2.63	.93	1	5.45
	HS	2.79	1.14	1	5.27

Note. BS indicates Benevolent Sexism Scores; HS indicates Hostile Sexism Scores

The number of participants who answered the questions following the essays in a correct or wrong way was also investigated. 58 of the participants (25%) were not able to answer the question following the essay correctly. The distribution of wrong answers to the independent and subject variable conditions was shown in Table 3.2., 3.3., and 3.4.

Table 3.2.

Distribution of Correct and Wrong Answers over Participant Gender

	Gender of the Participants				
	Women	Men	Other	Not Identified	Total
Correct	118	49	0	4	171
Wrong	27	29	1	1	58
Total	145	78	1	5	229

Table 3.3.

Distribution of Correct and Wrong Answers over Researcher Gender Variable

	Gender of the Researcher in the Essays		
	Female Researcher	Male Researcher	Total
Correct	80	91	171
Wrong	36	22	58
Total	116	113	229

Table 3.4.

Distribution of Correct and Wrong Answers over Essay Type Variable

	Essay Type		
	Intervention Essay	Control Essay	Total
Correct	66	105	171
Wrong	41	17	58
Total	107	122	229

One participant who did not prefer to identify their gender and another participant who identified their gender as “other” were excluded from the analyses, to limit the category numbers of the subject variable in the analyses.

3.2. EFFECTS OF ESSAY TYPE AND RESEARCHER GENDER ON MEN

The first hypothesis of the current study states that men's benevolent sexism scores will be significantly lower in the intervention condition with a reference to a male researcher, compared to control conditions and the intervention condition with a reference to a female researcher. In order to test this hypothesis, a two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted. Firstly, assumptions of the ANOVA were checked. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test the dependent variable, benevolent sexism, scores were distributed approximately normally across all conditions ($p > .05$). There were no significant outliers. According to the Levene's test, homogeneity of variances for each combination of the conditions was reached ($p > .05$).

According to the results of two-way between subjects ANOVA, there was not a main effect of researcher gender $F(1, 76) = 0.316$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$. Mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the essay with a female researcher ($M = 2.80$, $SD = .81$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the essay with a male researcher ($M = 2.90$, $SD = .97$). There was not a main effect of essay type $F(1, 76) = 0.424$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .006$. The mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the intervention essay ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .88$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the control essay ($M = 2.89$, $SD = .94$). There was no significant interaction effect.

Since the number of participants who did not receive the treatment was very high a further analysis was required. Another two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to see the effect of essay type and researcher gender in the essay on the benevolent sexism scores of men who correctly answered the question regarding the essay they read. Firstly, assumptions of the ANOVA were checked. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test the dependent variable, benevolent sexism, scores were

distributed approximately normally across all conditions ($p > .05$). There were no significant outliers. According to the Levene's test, homogeneity of variances for each combination of the conditions was reached ($p > .05$).

According to the results of two-way between subjects ANOVA, there was not a main effect of essay type $F(1, 47) = .306$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .007$. The mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the intervention essay ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 1.12$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the control essay ($M = 2.76$, $SD = .93$). There was not a main effect of researcher gender $F(1, 47) = 0.657$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .015$. Mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the essay with a female researcher ($M = 2.67$, $SD = .79$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the essay with a male researcher ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.10$). There was no significant interaction effect.

The findings of these analyses failed to support the first hypothesis of the current study.

3.3. EFFECTS OF ESSAY TYPE AND RESEARCHER GENDER ON WOMEN

The second hypothesis of the present study claims that women's benevolent sexism scores will be significantly lower in both intervention conditions compared to control conditions. A two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to test this hypothesis. Firstly, assumptions of the ANOVA were checked. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test the dependent variable, benevolent sexism, scores were not normally distributed in control essay, male researcher conditions ($p < .05$); benevolent sexism scores were distributed approximately normally across other conditions ($p > .05$). There were no significant outliers. According to the Levene's test, homogeneity of variances for each combination of the conditions was reached ($p > .05$).

According to the results of two-way between subjects ANOVA, there was not a main effect of researcher gender $F(1, 144) = 0.307$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .002$. Mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the essay with a female researcher ($M = 2.54$, $SD = .96$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the essay with a male researcher ($M = 2.45$, $SD = .91$). There was not a main effect of essay type $F(1, 144) = 0.100$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$. The mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the intervention essay ($M = 2.47$, $SD = .96$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the control essay ($M = 2.52$, $SD = .92$). There was no significant interaction effect.

Since the number of participants who did not receive the treatment was very high a further analysis was required. Another two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to see the effect of essay type and researcher gender in the essay on the benevolent sexism scores of women who correctly answered the question regarding the essay they read. Firstly, assumptions of the ANOVA were checked. According to the Shapiro-Wilk test the dependent variable, benevolent sexism, scores were not normally distributed in all conditions except with intervention essay conditions ($p > .05$). There were no significant outliers. According to the Levene's test, homogeneity of variances for each combination of the conditions was reached ($p > .05$).

According to the results of two-way between subjects ANOVA, there was not a main effect of essay type $F(1, 117) = 2.677$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .023$. The mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the intervention essay ($M = 2.18$, $SD = .77$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the control essay ($M = 2.43$, $SD = .92$). There was not a main effect of researcher gender $F(1, 117) = 0.068$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .001$. Mean of the participants' benevolent sexism scores who read the essay with a female researcher ($M = 2.31$, $SD = .88$) was not significantly different than the mean of the sexism scores of participants' benevolent sexism scores who read

the essay with a male researcher (*M* = 2.34, *SD* = .87). There was no significant interaction effect.

The findings of these analyses failed to support the second hypothesis of the current study.

3.4. BENEVOLENT AND HOSTILE SEXISM SCORES OF WOMEN AND MEN

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the benevolent sexism scores of men and women. The analysis revealed that men and women's benevolent sexism scores were significantly different, t(218) = -2.730, p = .007. Women's benevolent sexism scores (M = 2.50, SD = .93) were significantly lower than men's benevolent sexism scores (M = 2.86, SD = .91).

Another independent iamples t-test was conducted to compare the hostile sexism scores of men and women. The analysis revealed that men and women's hostile sexism scores were significantly different, t(218) = -8.242, p < .001. Women's hostile sexism scores (M = 2.38, SD = 1.00) were significantly lower than men's hostile sexism scores (M = 3.55, SD = 1.00).

The association of female and male participants' hostile and benevolent sexism scores with the participants' demographic information was investigated. The correlations are shown in Table 3.5. For men, hostile sexism scores were significantly and negatively correlated with age (r = -0.319, n = 78, p = .004) and years spent in the university (r = -0.358, n = 78, p = .001). For women, hostile sexism scores were significantly and negatively correlated with years spent in the university (r = -0.231, n = 145, p = .005).

Table 3.5.

Participants' BS and HS scores correlations with demographic variables by gender

		Demographic Variables			
Gender	Sexism Type	Age[a]	Year in College[a]	Maternal Ed. Level[b]	Paternal Ed. Level[b]
Female	BS	-0.098	-0.086	0.098	.027
	HS	-0.16	-0.231**	0.075	-0.063
Male	BS	0.058	-0.081	-0.033	0.121
	HS	-0.319**	-0.358**	0.077	0.067

Note. **: $p < .01$; a: Pearson Correlation; b: Spearmen Correlation; BS indicates Benevolent Sexism; HS indicates Hostile Sexism

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The major objective of the present study was to explore a possible way of increasing the effectiveness of an educational essay, used by Good and Woodzicka (2010), on men to decrease their endorsement of benevolent sexist attitudes. The intervention was hypothesized to be more effective on men if they believed that the research on sexism was conducted by a man. The intervention was expected to be effective on women without any effect of the researcher gender. In the following section, the results of the current study will be discussed in the context of the previous literature, limitations will be presented, and future directions will be suggested.

4.1. EFFECTS OF GENDER, RESEARCHER GENDER, AND ESSAY TYPE ON BENEVOLENT SEXISM

The results of the two-way between subjetcs ANOVA tests revealed that independent variables of researcher gender and essay type did not have a significant impact on benevolent sexism scores of either female or male participants. The findings of independent samples t-test showed that participant gender had a significant effect on benevolent sexism scores of the participants; the female participants had significantly lower levels of benevolent sexist scores than the male participants.

The intervention was not effective on men to reduce their benevolent sexism scores when the researcher was a man. The first hypothesis of the study was rejected based on this finding. The intervention was also not effective on men when the researcher was a woman. Moreover, the intervention was not effective for women to decrease their endorsement of benevolent sexism regardless of the gender of the researcher. Thus, the second hypothesis of this study was also rejected.

The independent variables, essay type, or researcher gender, did not have a significant impact on the benevolent sexism levels of the participants. Only the gender of the participants had a significant effect and it is a subject variable,

reflecting natural levels of sexism of the participants independent from the study. The study may have measured mainly the preexisting levels of sexism.

There is a lack of studies in the literature that compares face-to-face and online educative interventions on sexism, making it harder to predict whether the participants pay similar levels of attention in a real setting and in the online platform. In the current study, a simple question regarding the essays was asked after the essays to see the participants who did not receive the intervention and probably did not understand the main message of the essays. When the participants who gave wrong answers were eliminated, the findings of the current study did not change significantly. Even though the validity of the questions is questionable because it was not tested before the study and there is a possiblity that some participants with true answers gave the true answers by chance, the failure to provide effective results seems to be due to the intervention's effectiveness on this sample because the participants who seemed to be receiving the treatment were not affected by the intervention as well. Moreover, effect sizes of the independent variables were very low despite the fact that the sample size of the current study was similar to or larger than the studies of Good and Woodzicka (2010).

Smith, Paul, and Paul (2007) have used gender name manipulation in two studies with 27 and 60 participants where participants evaluated identical resumes of two presidential candidates, one female, and one male, and they have found significantly different evaluations for each. In the resumes, the names of the candidates were written on tops of the resumes and the pronouns within the resumes matched the names. MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt (2014) have conducted an experiment with 72 participants in which assistant instructors used two different gender identities in online classes and they have found that students rated female assistant instructor in an online class more harshly in the class evaluations than the male assistant instructor, demonstrating gender bias. Even though these two studies used alteration of the gender of the names as their manipulation and found significantly different results for the two names as similar to the current study, their level of the salience of the names may be different. In the current study, researcher

names were included in the paragraphs only for once, without any marking of them, and this may limit the names' salience or they may not even have been noticed.

World Economic Forum The global gender gap report (2017) indicates that Turkey has a very high level of gender inequality as it ranks 130th out of 144 countries. According to the study of Glick and Fiske (2000), in which hostile and benevolent sexism scores from 19 nations were analyzed, Turkey seemed to have higher benevolent and hostile sexism scores than the USA, in which the original intervention study by Good and Woodzicka (2010) was conducted, even though the findings of Glick and Fiske (2000) should be considered with caution because the samples that they have used were not representative. Similarly, especially hostile sexism scores in the current sample were observed to be much higher than hostile sexism scores of the original sample used in Good and Woodzicka (2010). It could be possible that in countries with more prevalent sexist ideologies and inequality in terms of gender, a brief educative intervention may not be sufficient to create a significant change. It may be causing resistance in the participants, as Zawadzki, Danube, and Shields (2012) suggests that presenting only direct information on sexism causes resistance compared to an experiential intervention. An essay describing benevolent sexism as being indeed related to hostile sexism does not have much chance to reduce the benevolent sexism of participants who already have higher levels of hostile sexism or who live in conditions with very low gender equality. The hostile and benevolent sexism scores of the participants who have answered the questions regarding the essays were significantly higher than the ones who answered correctly; inattention to essays in a study on "young people's views regarding gender roles" may be a form of resistance.

Hostile and benevolent sexism scores were significantly and positively correlated, in line with the previous literature (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al.,2000; Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira, & Souza, 2002). Hostile sexism scores of men were significantly higher than the hostile sexism scores of women, as similar to the previous studies (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira, & Souza, 2002). On the other hand, benevolent sexism scores of women were

significantly lower than the benevolent sexism scores of men; this is conflicting with the previous studies in which women scored higher on benevolent sexism than men (Sakalli-Uğurlu, & Glick, 2003) or scored similarly (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira, & Souza, 2002). The samples of the Sakalli-Uğurlu and Glick (2003) and Glick et al. (2002) included both student and non-student Turkish adult samples. The present sample included only student participants. The difference in the sampling can lead to different benevolent sexism scores. Moreover, conflicting with the previous studies, no association was found between parental education level and the benevolent and hostile sexism scores (Montañés et al, 2012; Direk & Irmak, 2017). Contrary to the findings of Direk and Irmak (2017), in the current study, years spent in the university were negatively correlated with hostile sexism scores for women and men. For men, hostile sexism scores were also found to be negatively correlated with age. However, the findings regarding age and years spent in college should be considered with caution because most of the participants werein the first year of their undergraduate education and 52% of the participants aged 20 or lower even though the mean of the age of the participants were 21.52. Therefore, the sample clustered around certain ages and college experience rather than scattering equally at different ages and years.

4.2. LIMITATIONS

In the current study, the researcher's gender was predicted to affect the male participants' response to the intervention. No such effect was found. However, it is hard to know whether the gender of the sexism researcher would not make any difference for the participants or whether they did not notice the researcher's name, since no pilot study was conducted before the present study regarding this issue. The study could be more conclusive about the effect of the manipulation of the researcher's gender.

The present study aimed to examine how the intervention affects women and men, but the male participant number was almost half of the female participants. The low number of male participants created low numbers in the cells during the analysis and this created less credible results. Moreover, in this study,

the attrition rate was very high. Even though it was reported to be common among online interventions (Eysenbach, 2005), approximately half of the participants did not complete the study. The fact that there was no incentive such as extra credit for participation may have played a role in this.

4.3. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The present study focused on reducing men's benevolent sexism. However, no factor that was investigated was found to reduce men's benevolent sexism. Women's benevolent sexism levels were lower than men's, but again no factor reduced their sexism level further. On the other hand, as years spent in a university increased, both men's and women's hostile sexism scores were observed to be dropping. Similarly, as their age increased men's hostile sexism scores decreased. Investigating the factors that are associated with a decrease in benevolent and hostile sexism scores can help design more effective interventions. If providing solely information in the intervention is creating resistance in the participants in this culture, more experiential (Shields, Zawadzki, & Johnson, 2011) or empathy-oriented interventions (Becker & Swim, 2011) may be more effective.

CONCLUSION

The brief educational intervention used in the current study did not have a significant effect on both female and male participants of this study. A different method in the intervention can be more effective. The findings regarding the researcher's gender remain inconclusive, because whether the participants noticed the researcher's name is unclear. Only the gender variable had a significant effect. It reflected the participants' natural levels of hostile and benevolent sexism. Women's both hostile and benevolent sexism scores were significantly lower than the men's.

REFERENCES

Abrams, D., Viki, G., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 84*(1), 111-125. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111

Atay, T. (2004). Erkeklik en çok erkeği ezer. *Toplum ve Bilim, 101*, 11-30.

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

Becker, J., & Swim, J. (2011). Seeing the Unseen. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 227-242. doi: 10.1177/0361684310397509

Becker, J., & Swim, J. (2012). Reducing Endorsement of Benevolent and Modern Sexist Beliefs. *Social Psychology, 43*(3), 127-137. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000091

Becker, J., & Wright, S. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 101*(1), 62-77. doi: 10.1037/a0022615

Becker, J., Zawadzki, M., & Shields, S. (2014). Confronting and Reducing Sexism: A Call for Research on Intervention. *Journal Of Social Issues, 70*(4), 603-614. doi: 10.1111/josi.12081

Bernard, J., Bernard, S., & Bernard, M. (1985). Courtship Violence and Sex-Typing. *Family Relations, 34*(4), 573. doi: 10.2307/584021

Blanchard, F., Crandall, C., Brigham, J., & Vaughn, L. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. *Journal Of Applied Psychology, 79*(6), 993-997. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993

Blee, K., & Jackman, M. (1994). The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations. *Contemporary Sociology, 23*(6), 792. doi: 10.2307/2076034

Bosson, J., Vandello, J., Burnaford, R., Weaver, J., & Arzu Wasti, S. (2009). Precarious Manhood and Displays of Physical Aggression. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(5), 623-634. doi: 10.1177/0146167208331161

Brandt, M. (2011). Sexism and Gender Inequality Across 57 Societies. *Psychological Science, 22*(11), 1413-1418. doi: 10.1177/0956797611420445

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, And Law, 5*(3), 665-692. doi: 10.1037/1076-8971.5.3.665

Case, K., Hensley, R., & Anderson, A. (2014). Reflecting on Heterosexual and Male Privilege: Interventions to Raise Awareness. *Journal Of Social Issues, 70*(4), 722-740. doi: 10.1111/josi.12088

Cundiff, J., Zawadzki, M., Danube, C., & Shields, S. (2014). Using Experiential Learning to Increase the Recognition of Everyday Sexism as Harmful: The WAGES Intervention. *Journal Of Social Issues, 70*(4), 703-721. doi: 10.1111/josi.12087

Czopp, A., & Monteith, M. (2003). Confronting Prejudice (Literally): Reactions to Confrontations of Racial and Gender Bias. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(4), 532-544. doi: 10.1177/0146167202250923

Czopp, A., Monteith, M., & Mark, A. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 90*(5), 784-803. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.7

Dardenne, B., Dumont, M., & Bollier, T. (2007). Insidious dangers of benevolent sexism: Consequences for women's performance. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 93*(5), 764-779. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.764

de Lemus, S., Navarro, L., J. Velásquez, M., Ryan, E., & Megías, J. (2014). From Sex to Gender: A University Intervention to Reduce Sexism in Argentina, Spain, and El Salvador. *Journal Of Social Issues, 70*(4), 741-762. doi: 10.1111/josi.12089

Direk, N., & Irmak, B. (2017). Attitudes of Medical Students towards Gender Roles at Dokuz Eylul University School of Medicine. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi, 31*(3), 121-128. doi: 10.5505/deutfd.2017.93064

Dodd, E., Giuliano, T., Boutell, J., & Moran, B. (2001). 19. Dodd, E. H., Giuliano, T. A., Boutell,Respected or rejected: Perceptions of women who confront sexist remarks. *Sex Roles, 45*(7/8), 567-577. doi: 10.1023/a:1014866915741

Drury, B., & Kaiser, C. (2014). Allies against Sexism: The Role of Men in Confronting Sexism. *Journal Of Social Issues, 70*(4), 637-652. doi: 10.1111/josi.12083

Eagly, A., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*(3), 283-308. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.100.3.283

Eagly, A., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist, 54*(6), 408-423. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.54.6.408

Ember, C. (1978). Myths about Hunter-Gatherers. *Ethnology, 17*(4), 439. doi: 10.2307/3773193

Eysenbach, G. (2005). The Law of Attrition. *Journal Of Medical Internet Research, 7*(1), e11. doi: 10.2196/jmir.7.1.e11

Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). *What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Foley, R. A. (1989). The evolution of hominid social behaviour. *Comparative socioecology,* 473-494.

García-Moreno, C., Pallitto, C., Devries, K., Stöckl, H., Watts, C., & Abrahams, N. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women.* Geneva: WHO Press.

Garnets, L., & Pleck, J. (1979). Sex Role Identity, Androgyny, and Sex Role Transcendence: A Sex Role Strain Analysis. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 3*(3), 270-283. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1979.tb00545.x

Gervais, S., Hillard, A., & Vescio, T. (2010). Confronting Sexism: The Role of Relationship Orientation and Gender. *Sex Roles, 63*(7-8), 463-474. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The Two Faces of Adam: Ambivalent Sexism and Polarized Attitudes Toward Women. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(12), 1323-1334. doi: 10.1177/01461672972312009

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 21*(1), 119-135. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109-118. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.56.2.109

Glick, P., Fiske, S., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., Abrams, D., & Masser, B. et al. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 79*(5), 763-775. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763

Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M., & Souza, M. (2002). Ambivalent Sexism and Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology Of Women Quarterly, 26*(4), 292-297. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068

Good, J. J., & Woodzicka, J. A. (2010). Reducing approval of benevolent sexism: An educational intervention. *The New School Psychology Bulletin, 7*(1).

Graf, N., Brown, A., & Patten, E. (2018). The narrowing, but persistent, gender gap in pay. *Pew Research Center, April, 9*. Retrieved 26 May 2020, fromhttp://leametz.pbworks.com/f/Gender%20pay%20gap%20has%20narrowed%2C%20but%20changed%20little%20in%20past%20decade.pdf

Guttentag, M., & Secord, P. F. (1983). *Too many women?: The sex ratio question.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Good, J., & Rudman, L. (2009). When Female Applicants Meet Sexist Interviewers: The Costs of Being a Target of Benevolent Sexism. *Sex Roles, 62*(7-8), 481-493. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9685-6

Hyers, L. (2007). Resisting Prejudice Every Day: Exploring Women's Assertive Responses to Anti-Black Racism, Anti-Semitism, Heterosexism, and Sexism. *Sex Roles, 56*(1-2), 1-12. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8

Jenkins, S., & Aubé, J. (2002). Gender Differences and Gender-Related Constructs in Dating Aggression. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(8), 1106-1118. doi: 10.1177/01461672022811009

Johnson, A. G. (2000). Patriarchy, the system: An it, not a he, a them, or an us. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumfeld, C. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zuniga (Eds.). *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 332-337)

Jost, J., & Kay, A. (2005). Exposure to Benevolent Sexism and Complementary Gender Stereotypes: Consequences for Specific and Diffuse Forms of System Justification. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 88*(3), 498-509. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498

Kaiser, C., & Miller, C. (2001). Stop Complaining! The Social Costs of Making Attributions to Discrimination. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(2), 254-263. doi: 10.1177/0146167201272010

Kaiser, C., & Miller, C. (2003). Derogating the Victim: The Interpersonal Consequences of Blaming Events on Discrimination. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6*(3), 227-237. doi: 10.1177/13684302030063001

Kilianski, S., & Rudman, L. (1998). Wanting it both ways: Do women approve of benevolent sexism? *Sex Roles, 39*(5/6), 333-352. doi: 10.1023/a:1018814924402

Lerner, G. (1986). *The creation of patriarchy* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press, USA.

MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. (2014). What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(4), 291-303. doi: 10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4

Masser, B., & Abrams, D. (2004). Reinforcing the Glass Ceiling: The Consequences of Hostile Sexism for Female Managerial Candidates. *Sex Roles, 51*(9-10), 609-615. doi: 10.1007/s11199-004-5470-8

Montañés, P., de Lemus, S., Bohner, G., Megías, J., Moya, M., & Garcia-Retamero, R. (2012). Intergenerational Transmission of Benevolent Sexism from Mothers to Daughters and its Relation to Daughters' Academic

Performance and Goals. *Sex Roles, 66*(7-8), 468-478. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-0116-0

Moscovici, S., & Nemeth, C. (1974). Social influence: II. Minority influence. In C. Nemeth, Social psychology: *Classic and contemporary integrations.*

Moya, M., Glick, P., Expósito, F., de Lemus, S., & Hart, J. (2007). It's for Your Own Good: Benevolent Sexism and Women's Reactions to Protectively Justified Restrictions. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(10), 1421-1434. doi: 10.1177/0146167207304790

Nadler, E., & Morrow, W. (1959). Authoritarian Attitudes toward Women, and their Correlates. *The Journal Of Social Psychology, 49*(1), 113-123. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1959.9921970

Napier, J., Thorisdottir, H., & Jost, J. (2009). The Joy of Sexism? A Multinational Investigation of Hostile and Benevolent Justifications for Gender Inequality and Their Relations to Subjective Well-Being. *Sex Roles, 62*(7-8), 405-419. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9712-7

Paynter, A., & Leaper, C. (2016). Heterosexual Dating Double Standards in Undergraduate Women and Men. *Sex Roles, 75*(7-8), 393-406. doi: 10.1007/s11199-016-0628-8

Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, L. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Piliavin, J. A., & Unger, R. K. (1985). The helpful but helpless female: Myth or reality. *Women, gender, and social psychology,* 149-189.

Pratto, F., Stallworth, L., Sidanius, J., & Siers, B. (1997). The gender gap in occupational role attainment: A social dominance approach. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 72*(1), 37-53. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.72.1.37

Pratto, F., & Walker, A. (2004). The Bases of Gendered Power. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (p. 242–268). Guilford Press..

Quick, J., & McFadyen, M. (2017). Sexual harassment: Have we made any progress? *Journal Of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 286-298. doi: 10.1037/ocp0000054

Rasinski, H., & Czopp, A. (2010). The Effect of Target Status on Witnesses' Reactions to Confrontations of Bias. *Basic And Applied Social Psychology, 32*(1), 8-16. doi: 10.1080/01973530903539754

Ridgeway, C. L. (1992). *Gender, interaction, and inequality*. New York: Springer.

Rudman, L., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to Counterstereotypic Behavior: The Role of Backlash in Cultural Stereotype Maintenance. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 87*(2), 157-176. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157

Rudman, L., & Heppen, J. (2003). Implicit Romantic Fantasies and Women's Interest in Personal Power: A Glass Slipper Effect*? Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(11), 1357-1370. doi: 10.1177/0146167203256906

Rudman, L., & Phelan, J. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. *Research In Organizational Behavior, 28*, 61-79. doi: 10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.003

Rudman, L., Moss-Racusin, C., Phelan, J., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(1), 165-179. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008

Sakallı, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: The effects of patriarchy, sexism and sex difference. *Sex Roles, 44* (9/10), 599-611.

Sakalh-Uğurlu, N., & Glick, P. (2003). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women who engage in premarital sex in Turkey. *Journal Of Sex Research, 40*(3), 296-302. doi: 10.1080/00224490309552194

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., & Türkoğlu, B. (2019). "Erkek" Olmak ya da Olmamak: Sosyal Psikolojik Açıdan Erkeksilik/Erkeklik Çalışmaları. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 22*(44). doi: 10.31828/tpy1301996120190516m000014

Shields, S. A., Zawadzki, M. J., & Johnson, R. N. (2011). The impact of the Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation in the Academy (WAGES–Academic) in demonstrating cumulative effects of gender bias. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 4*(2), 120.

Sigel, R. S. (1996). *Ambition and accommodation: How women view gender relations.* University of Chicago Press.

Smith, J., Paul, D., & Paul, R. (2007). No Place for a Woman: Evidence for Gender Bias in Evaluations of Presidential Candidates. *Basic And Applied Social Psychology, 29*(3), 225-233. doi: 10.1080/01973530701503069

Smuts, B. (1995). The evolutionary origins of patriarchy. *Human Nature, 6*(1), 1-32. doi: 10.1007/bf02734133

Smuts, B. B., & Smuts, R. W. (1993). Male aggression and sexual coercion of females in nonhuman primates and other mammals: evidence and theoretical implications. *Advances in the Study of Behavior, 22*(22), 1-63.

Swim, J., & Hyers, L. (1999). Excuse Me—What Did You Just Say?!: Women's Public and Private Responses to Sexist Remarks. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology, 35*(1), 68-88. doi: 10.1006/jesp.1998.1370

Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (2009). Sexism.

The Global Gender Gap Report 2017. (2017, November 2). Retrieved May 26, 2020, from https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-gender-gap-report-2017

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TUIK). (2008). Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet İstatistikleri. Retrieved May 26, 2020, from https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/kadinasiddetdagitim/kadin.zul

Twenge, J. (1997). Changes in masculine and feminine traits over time: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles, 36*(5-6), 305-325. doi: 10.1007/bf02766650

Vandello, J., & Bosson, J. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity, 14*(2), 101-113. doi: 10.1037/a0029826

Vandello, J., Bosson, J., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R., & Weaver, J. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1325-1339. doi: 10.1037/a0012453

Viki, G., Abrams, D., & Hutchison, P. (2003). The "true" romantic: Benevolent sexism and paternalistic chivalry. *Sex Roles, 49*(9/10), 533-537. doi: 10.1023/a:1025888824749

Wade, C. A. R. O. L. E., & Tavris, C. A. R. O. L. (1994). The longest war: Gender and culture. *Psychology and culture*, 121-126.

Weaver, J., Vandello, J., & Bosson, J. (2013). Intrepid, imprudent, or impetuous? The effects of gender threats on men's financial decisions. *Psychology Of Men & Masculinity, 14*(2), 184-191. doi: 10.1037/a0027087

Weaver, J., Vandello, J., Bosson, J., & Burnaford, R. (2009). The Proof is in the Punch: Gender Differences in Perceptions of Action and Aggression as Components of Manhood. *Sex Roles, 62*(3-4), 241-251. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9713-6

Zawadzki, M., Danube, C., & Shields, S. (2012). How to Talk about Gender Inequity in the Workplace: Using WAGES as an Experiential Learning Tool to Reduce Reactance and Promote Self-Efficacy. *Sex Roles, 67*(11-12), 605-616. doi: 10.1007/s11199-012-0181-z

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

Araştırmayı Destekleyen Kurum:	İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi
Araştırmacının Adı:	Ayşenur Dilara Düven Kaan
Araştırmacının E-mail Adresi:	aysenur.duven@gmail.com
Araştırmanın Danışmanı:	Hale Bolak Boratav
Danışmanın E-mail Adresi:	Hale.boratav@bilgi.edu.tr

Bu araştırma, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Ayşenur Dilara Düven Kaan tarafından Hale Bolak Boratav danışmanlığında yürütülmektedir. Bu araştırmanın amacı, gençlerin cinsiyet rollerine dair tutumlarını incelemektir.

Bu araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz takdirde, yaklaşık 10 dakika sürecek bir çalışmaya katılmanız beklenecektir. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen, kısa bir metni okumanız ve bütün soruları eksiksiz cevaplamanızdır.

Bu araştırma bilimsel bir amaçla yapılmakta ve verilen tüm bilgilerin gizliliği esas alınmaktadır. Sizden kimlik bilgisi olarak araştırma dönemi bitiminde size araştırma hakkında bilgilendirilme yapılabilmesi için sadece e-mail adresiniz istenecek ve adresiniz araştırma için verdiğiniz bilgilerle eşleştirilmeyecektir. Verdiğiniz tüm bilgiler şifre ile korunmakta olan bir bilgisayarda saklanacaktır.

Araştırma bulgularının sunumu ve raporlamasında elde edilen bilgiler toplu olarak değerlendirilecek ve bilimsel yayınlarda kullanılacaktır.

Bu araştırmaya katılmak tamamen isteğe bağlıdır ve katılmanın üzerinizde herhangi bir olumsuz etki yaratması beklenmemektedir. Katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz takdirde çalışmanın herhangi bir aşamasında herhangi bir sebep göstermeden araştırmadan çekilme hakkına sahipsiniz. Araştırmadan çekildiğiniz durumda verdiğiniz bilgiler değerlendirmeye alınmayacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili bilgi almak, soru sormak veya yorumlarınızı paylaşmak isterseniz, araştırmacı ile aysenur.duven@gmail.com adresinden iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum. Bana anlatıları ve yukarıdaki açıklamaları anladım. Çalışmaya katılmayı ve verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayınlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. ___

Appendix B: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

Lütfen aşağıdaki her bir ifade **ile ne derece hemfikir olduğunuzu** verilen ölçekteki sayılardan **uygun olanını daire içine alarak** belirtiniz.	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Biraz katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1. Ne kadar başarılı olursa olsun bir kadının sevgisine sahip olmadıkça bir erkek gerçek anlamda bütün bir insan olamaz.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Gerçekte birçok kadın "eşitlik" arıyoruz maskesi altında işe alınmalarda kendilerinin kayırılması gibi özel muameleler arıyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Bir felaket durumunda kadınlar erkeklerden önce kurtarılmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Birçok kadın masum söz veya davranışları cinsel ayrımcılık olarak yorumlamaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Kadınlar çok çabuk alınırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Karşı cinsten biri ile romantik ilişki olmaksızın insanlar hayatta gerçekten mutlu olamazlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Feministler gerçekte kadınların erkeklerden daha fazla güce sahip olmalarını istemektedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Birçok kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.	1	2	3	4	5	6

9. Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Birçok kadın erkeklerin kendileri için yaptıklarına tamamen minnettar olmamaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindeler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkeklere karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. İyi bir kadın erkeği tarafından yüceltilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Erkeklere cinsel yönden yaklaşılabilir olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6

20. Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Feministler erkeklere makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkine sahiptirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C: Intervention and Control Essays

Intervention Essay

Birçok insan cinsiyetçiliğin kadınlara yönelik olumsuz ve ayrımcı inançlar olduğuna inanır. Araştırmacılar aynı zamanda 'korumacı cinsiyetçilik' adını verdikleri, daha az göze çarpan bir cinsiyetçilik tipinin de olduğunu da öne sürdüler. Korumacı cinsiyetçilik, kadınlarla ilgili görece olumlu görüşler içeren, ancak nihayetinde yine kadınların erkeklerden aşağı konumlandırıldığı bir tutumdur. Aşağıda, psikolog (Semih/Sevil Güngör) cinsiyetçilik konusundaki araştırma sonuçlarının bir özeti yer almaktadır. Lütfen dikkatle okuyunuz.

Cinsiyetçilik, bir kişiye karşı onun cinsiyeti sebebiyle önyargılı olmak veya ayrımcı davranışta bulunmak olarak tanımlanır. Genellikle olumsuz çağrışımları vardır ve kadınlara karşı önyargıyı tanımlamak için kullanılır. Son çalışmalarda araştırmacılar cinsiyetçiliğin iki türünü tanımladılar: düşmanca ve korumacı. Düşmanca cinsiyetçilik, 'cinsiyetçilik' dendiği zaman tipik olarak akla gelen türdür. Bu tutum, kadınların erkeklerden aşağı olduğu, kadınların daha düşük bir zekaya ve yetkinliğe sahip olduğu, ve kadınların erkekleri kontrol etmeye çalıştıkları inançlarını içerir. Korumacı cinsiyetçilik ise kadınların erkeklerden daha saf ve ahlaki olarak üstün oldukları, erkeklerin ise kadınları korumaları, desteklemeleri ve hayran olmaları gerektiğini öne süren görece olumlu inançlar içerir. Korumacı cinsiyetçilik bir kadın için bireysel olarak faydalı görünebilir, ama aslında olumsuzdur. Bunun nedeni, her iki tür cinsiyetçiliğin de temelinde kadınlığın daha zayıf olan cins olduğu; ve kadınların toplumda esas olarak ev içi roller almaları gerektiği inançlarının bulunmasıdır. Bir kadının ağır şeyleri taşımak zorunda kalmaması için onun yerine ağır bir eşyasını taşıyan bir erkek ona olumlu anlamda yardım etmektedir, ama aynı zamanda kadınların, zayıf cins olarak, kendi eşyalarını kaldırıp taşıyamayacağı fikrini de desteklemektedir. Korumacı cinsiyetçi tutumlara sahip olanlar kadınları korumak isterler, kadınların anne ve eş olarak rollerine saygı duyarlar ve onlara hayrandırlar, kadınları romantik aşkın nesneleri olarak idealize ederler. Düşmanca cinsiyetçi tutumlara sahip olanlar ise kadınların güçlü

pozisyonlarda olmaya uygun olmadıklarını düşünürler, kadına karşı şiddet konusunda daha hoşgörülüdürler, ve tanıdık tecavüzünde mağduru suçlamaya daha eğilimlidirler.

Bu iki tür cinsiyetçilik birbirinden tamamen farklı bireyleri tanımlıyormuş gibi görünebilir, ama aslında bu iki tür arasında güçlü bir ilişki vardır. Dolayısıyla daha düşmanca cinsiyetçi olan insanlar aynı zamanda korumacı cinsiyetçiliğe de yatkındırlar. Bu nasıl olabilir? Cinsiyetçiler kadınlara bir bütün olarak bakmaktansa, kadınları alt türlere ayırırlar. Korumacı cinsiyetçilikte geleneksel kadınlar hakkında olumlu tutumlar mevcuttur (ev hanımları, anneler, eşler, iyi kızlar), düşmanca cinsiyetçilikte ise geleneksel olmayan kadınlar hakkında olumsuz tutumlar vardır (kariyer kadınları, feministler, "yollu"lar, sporcular, lezbiyenler). İlişkiyi görüyor musunuz? Geleneksel beklentilere uyan bir kadın bir erkekte muhtemelen korumacı tür cinsiyetçilik uyandırırken, geleneksel normlara uymayan bir kadın aynı adamda muhtemelen düşmanca tür cinsiyetçilik de uyandırır. Korumacı cinsiyetçilik kadınların geleneksel kadın kalıbına uymalarını ödüllendirirken, düşmanca cinsiyetçilik kadınların bu geleneksel kadın rolüne uymamalarını cezalandırır.

Birçok kadın düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin kadın haklarına ve cinsiyet eşitliğine zarar verdiğini düşünerek açıkça düşmanca olan cinsiyetçiliği onaylamaz. Ancak, birçok kadın korumacı cinsiyetçiliği onaylar. Bunun nedeni korumacı cinsiyetçiliğin kadınlara eş ve anne olarak "doğru" rolleri oynadıkları sürece koruma, maddi imkan, aşk gibi gerçek yararlar sağlaması olabilir. Dolayısıyla korumacı cinsiyetçilik kadınları geleneksel kalıplara uyum sağladıkları için ödüllendirerek, mevcut düzenin devamını sağlar ve sosyal değişimi engeller. Önde gelen iki cinsiyetçilik araştırmacısının sözleriyle:

"Erkeklerce tanımlanan rol ve ihtiyaçları kabullenerek uyum sağlayan kadınların idealize edilmeleri ile erkek güç ve otoritesine başkaldıranların şeytanlaştırılmaları birbirini tamamlayarak, birçok toplumda kadınların hala etkin bir toplumsal kontrol yakalamalarının önüne geçmektedir'

Control Essay

İnsomnia, mutluluk veya kaygı gibi duyguların uç noktalarını içeren günlük durumlardan kaynaklanır. İnsomnia teriminin kelimesi kelimesine tercümesi "hiç uyuyamama" olsa da, birçok insan tarafından uykuda dalmadaki veya uykuyu devam ettirmedeki zorluklar için kullanılır. Bunun sonucu ertesi gün her zamanki gibi bir işlevsellik gösterememektir. Türkiye'deki yetişkinlerin üçte biri uyku sorunları yaşadığını, altıda biri sorunun oldukça ciddi boyutlarda olduğunu söylemektedir. İnsomnia etkiledikleri konusunda sınır tanımaz – genç veya yaşlı, kadın veya erkek herkesi etkileyebilir. Uyku uzmanı (Semih/Sevil Güngör) insomnianın üç tipi arasında bir ayrım yaparlar: geçici, kısa süreli ve kronik. Geçici insomnia bir veya iki gecelik uyku sorunu deneyimidir. Muhtemelen herkes arada bir bunu deneyimler. Geçici insomnia deneyimleyen insanlar ertesi gün genellikle yorgunluktan, odaklanmadaki güçlükten ve asabiyetten yakınırlar. Farklı bir yatakta uyumak bile geçici insomniaya yol açabilir. Birçok insan hastanede stresli bir yatış veya arkadaşların evine hoş bir ziyaret, tatil için evden uzaktaki ilk gecelerinde her zamanki gibi iyi uyuyamazlar. Kısa dönemli insomnia iki-üç hafta devam eden uyku sorunlarını kapsar. Burada genellikle sebep okulda, işte veya evde yaşanan strestir: notlar hakkında endişelenme, ebeveynlerin yaklaşan boşanmasını öğrenme veya ailede birinin ciddi bir hastalığının olması veya ölümü gibi tüm olaylar kısa dönemli insomniayı tetikleyebilir.

Kronik insomnia üç haftadan uzun süren uyku sorunlarıdır. İnsomnianın bu türü birçok sebebi olabilecek karmaşık bir bozukluktur ve ülkemizde 8 milyonun üzerinde insanı etkilemektedir. Birçok insan bu durumun sebebinin stres olduğunu düşünse de, stimulan/uyarıcı kullanımı da sorumlu olabilir. Geçici ve kısa süreli insomniada sebepleri belirlemek daha kolaydır. Kronik insomnia için durum böyle değildir, yıllarca sürebilir ve uykuyu birçok veya her gece bozabilir. Farklı saat kuşakları arası hızlı yolculuk uyku ve uyanıklık zamanlamalarını düzenleyen içsel saati bozabilir. Bunun sonucunda ortaya çıkan geceleri uyuyamama ve gündüzleri uyanık kalamama sorunlarına jet lag denir, ama aslında bu bir insomnia türüdür.

İnsomniada stres özellikle ergenler, 20'li ve 30'lu yaşlarlarındaki insanlar için mutlaka önemli bir rol oynar, ama asla tek suçlu değildir.

Daha önce bahsedildiği gibi, uyarıcılar da insomnia vakalarında sorumludur. Uyku vaktine yakın kafein kullanımı uykuya dalışı etkilemese de, sonrasında uykudan uyanmaları tetikleyebilir. Kafein ve kafeinle ilişkili maddeler alkolsüz içecekler, çikolata, kahve ve demli çayda bulunur. Nikotin de bir stimulandır ve sigara içenlerin içmeyenlere kıyasla uykuya dalmasının daha uzun sürdüğü ve uykularının daha hafif olduğu gösterilmiştir. Nikotin reçetesiz kilo verme ilaçları, astım ve soğuk algınlığı ilaçları gibi birçok yaygın olarak kullanılan ilaçta bulunmaktadır. Alkol bazen uykuya geçişi kolaylaştırmak içi kullanılsa da gece boyunca uykuyu daha kırılgan hale getirebilir. Uyku ilaçları insomnia için çare olarak düşünülür, ancak öyle değillerdir. Uyku ilaçları her gece kullanıldığında, vücudun zamanla ilaçlara alışması sebebiyle birkaç hafta sonra etkinliklerini kaybederler. Bu ilaçların ani şekilde kesilmesi insomnianın daha ağır bir şekilde nüksetmesine yol açar. Bu sorun hiçbir ilacın tüketilmediği noktaya gelene dek ilaç miktarının tedrici olarak azaltılmasıyla düzelebilir.

Intervention Question

Az önce okuduğunuz yazıda aşağıdakiler maddelerden hangisinden bahsedilmemiştir?

A) Düşmanca cinsiyetçilik, "cinsiyetçilik" dendiği zaman tipik olarak akla gelen cinsiyetçilik türüdür.

B) Korumacı cinsiyetçilik bir kadın için bireysel olarak faydalı görünebilir, ama aslında olumsuzdur.

C) Düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin ve korumacı cinsiyetçiliğin temellerinde kadınların daha zayıf olduğu ve toplumda daha domestik roller almaları gerektiği inançları bulunur.

D) Korumacı cinsiyetçilik kadınların geleneksel kadın kalıbına uymasını ödüllendirirken, düşmanca cinsiyetçilik kadınların bu geleneksel kadın kalıbına uymamasını cezalandırır.

E) Bir kişi aynı anda hem düşmanca cinsiyetçilik hem de korumacı cinsiyetçilikte yüksek olamaz.

Control Question

Az önce okuduğunuz yazıda aşağıdakiler maddelerden hangisinden bahsedilmemiştir?

A) İnsomnia terimi, birçok insan tarafından uykuya dalmadaki veya uykuyu devam ettirmedeki zorluklar için kullanılır.

B) İnsomnianın üç tipi vardır: geçici, kısa süreli ve kronik.

C) Uyku vaktine yakın kafein kullanımı uykuya dalışı etkilemese de, sonrasında uykudan uyanmaları tetikleyebilir.

D) Uyku ilaçları her gece kullanıldığında, vücudun zamanla ilaçlara alışması sebebiyle birkaç hafta sonra etkinliklerini kaybederler.

E) Yapılan son araştırmalar süt ürünlerinde bulunan bazı maddelerin de insomniaya sebep olabileceğini göstermiştir.