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Abstract

Although women have made great strides in society working to close the gender gap, sexism still exists that may impact women’s psychological wellness. The current research examines the relationship between sexist attitudes toward women, stigma consciousness, and psychological well-being among 235 female participants from a medium sized Southern city. Participants took part in the research by completing a cross-sectional survey about the health and well-being of women in exchange for class credit or cash.

The primary hypothesis was that stigma consciousness would serve as a mediator of the relationship between sexist attitudes toward women and psychological well-being. Results indicated a positive relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being and a negative relationship between hostile sexism and stigma consciousness. However, the relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being was not significant. Therefore, stigma consciousness did not serve as a mediator between sexism and psychological well-being. This not significant relationship is explained in accord with past research. Possible reasons for the positive relationship between holding more sexist views toward women and having greater psychological well-being are discussed.
Ambivalent Sexism and Psychological Well-being Among Women:

Examining the Role of Stigma Consciousness

The recent U.S. election season of 2012 highlighted women’s rights issues including views on abortion and equal pay. With these issues at the forefront, it is crucial that we focus on how these important women’s social subjects relate to their psychological well-being. Sexism refers to any type of discrimination, prejudice, or stereotypes based on sex; sexism is most commonly thought of as this discrimination, prejudice, or stereotyping against women. With more women being elected into Congress than ever before and the glass ceiling that prevents women from advancing seemingly breaking, it seems as though women are making strides in gaining equality; but in fact, issues of sexism are still pervading society. Past research suggests that sexism can have negative effects on women’s psychological well-being (Torregrosa, 2012). Women who are more aware of the discrimination they face based on their sex may be more negatively affected than those who are less aware of this discrimination. Being able to determine whether a relationship exists among stigma consciousness, perceptions of sexism, and psychological well-being can have important future implications. For example, research by Overall, Sibley, and Tan (2011) found that women who endorse sexist viewpoints, especially benevolent sexism, have less agency in romantic relationships. This not only means that women are unable to advocate for themselves, but they also view themselves as less successful than their male romantic partner.

Psychological Well-being and Sexism Toward Women

Understanding psychological well-being is important for understanding what contributes to positive psychological health. The concept of psychological well-being
was first coined by Carol Ryff (1989) in her effort to integrate earlier theories about general mental wellness. The six main components of psychological well-being that Ryff describes include: self-acceptance (i.e., maturity, feeling good about the self), positive relations with others (i.e., quality relationships), autonomy (i.e., independence), environmental mastery (i.e., choosing appropriate environments to thrive), purpose in life (i.e., clear direction in life), and personal growth (i.e., continuing to change and develop over time without reaching a stopping point). According to Ryff and colleagues (Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 1996; Schmutte & Ryff, 1997) these six components form psychological functioning which in turn leads to psychological well-being. Ryff’s development of psychological well-being contributes to the eudemonic view of well-being. According to this perspective, psychological well-being is achieved when one lives in the most positive way possible. Optimizing each subgroup (i.e., having positive relationships with others) leads to the most happiness (Vázquez et al, 2009). It is especially important to understand what contributes to overall psychological well-being for different subgroups of society, such as women, to be able to create specific intervention and prevention programs that target that group.

Discrimination, prejudice, or stereotyping against women on the basis of their gender, sexism, can be a negative influence on psychological well-being. Sexism does not just have to be against women; men can experience sexism as well. However, the way in which this discrimination, prejudice, and stereotyping of women pervades society opens up the need for research of sexism against women. Men, because of their dominant status, receive a type of privilege, or power, that women do not have (McIntosh, 1988). Women are held back in their careers by the “glass ceiling” that prevents them from
advancing; these same women are expected to work the “second shift”: taking care of their household duties after a full day of work (Hochschild, 1989). Regardless of education level, women make less money than their male counterparts (Thompson, 2009). Clearly, sexism against women exists in our society; it is important to understand how this sexism impacts women’s well-being.

In the proposed research, two types of sexism will be examined. One type of sexism discussed by Peter Glick and Susan Fiske (e.g., 1997) is hostile sexism. This form of sexism is what comes to most minds when thinking about sexism in general as it describes a more patriarchal viewpoint promoting traditional gender roles, such as caring for children in the home, and female objectification. Hostile sexists tend to oppose women who do not follow traditional gender roles, like career women and feminists. Napier, Thorisdottir, and Jost (2010) add to this view of hostile sexism with their position that hostile sexists view women as manipulative of situations by accusing men of discrimination to gain power over them.

On the other hand, benevolent sexism refers to a different, more paternalistic side of sexism that is often less salient to many (even those that oppose hostile sexism). In benevolent sexism, women are placed on a pedestal in which they must care for men who are dependent upon them and focuses on a more romantic type of sexual relationship. Benevolent sexists tend to be in favor of women who abide by traditional gender roles, like homemakers, but do not necessarily oppose women who do not follow these roles. While it may seem as though benevolent sexism can be protective for women, in fact this type of sexism characterizes women as less capable and competent than men and stifles their advancements to become equal with men.
The combination of the two types of sexism—hostile and benevolent—creates the measure of ambivalent sexism, in which individuals combine both seemingly conflicting viewpoints about women to form one new type of sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1997). In their analysis of data from the third and fourth waves of the World Values Survey along with the United Nations Development Programme’s Gender Empowerment Measure, Napier et al. (2010) found a positive correlation between benevolent and hostile sexism, especially among women.

When the two factors of ambivalent sexism, hostile and benevolent sexism, are separated, benevolent sexism may be perceived as serving as a protective factor for women. Though women are classified as being different from men, benevolent sexism gives women an important role to uphold in the home. If women are successful at maintaining traditional gender roles, then they may be thought of in a positive light and be protected from criticism. Women may endorse benevolent sexism because it holds them to be revered by men and feels more positive than hostile, more direct types of sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Both men and women may have difficulty distinguishing the negative aspects of benevolent sexism, allowing it to remain active in our society (Kilianksi & Rudman, 1998).

The effects of benevolent, hostile, and ambivalent sexism can be harmful for psychological well-being. Work by Calogero and Jost (2011) suggests a causal connection between exposure to benevolent sexism and ambivalent sexism and women’s self-criticism. In this experiment, male and female participants were primed with benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, ambivalent sexism, or no sexism during an ostensible proofreading task; participants later answered questionnaires that revealed this
relationship. The proofreading task asked participants to first respond to items that they believed would be used to develop a new scale about attitudes and then were asked to edit the items. The items in the proofreading task were written to match one of the four priming conditions. The questionnaire, which participants believed to be part of a larger study about the health of college students, featured measures of state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and body shame. Women in both the benevolent sexism condition and ambivalent sexism condition reported higher levels of state self-objectification than women in the hostile sexism condition and control condition. The same results held true for measures of self-surveillance and body shame. These findings suggest that benevolent and ambivalent forms of sexism may pervade women’s thoughts in a more implicit manner than hostile sexism to impact self-esteem. When women endorse sexist views, they engage in self-stereotyping (Burkley & Blanton, 2009). In contrast, men’s scores on the measures of self-criticism remained consistently lower than women’s scores across all conditions, suggesting that the four measures of sexism used in this work do not have the same influence on men.

**Stigma Consciousness and Well-being Among Women**

As humans we have a natural tendency to categorize everything around us: locations, foods, school subjects, and even other people. This categorization leads to a hierarchy in which groups differ in their status levels based on particular attributes. According to Goffman (1963), stigma refers to a discrediting attribute. Being part of a devalued group, like being female, is a type of tribal stigma and may lead to different treatment and views by others. While being a member of a stigmatized group may be
harmful, it may not impact everyone equally; how aware one is of the stigma she faces will influence the impact it can have on well-being.

Stigma consciousness, like ambivalent sexism, can be related to stereotypes and discrimination felt by women, or members of the out-group. Stigma consciousness refers to individuals’ expectations of being stereotyped by others (Pinel, 1999). The Stigma Consciousness Questionnaire (SCQ) is a measure developed by Pinel that strictly measures stigma consciousness without including personal views about oneself and group membership, like views on sexism, which has been found to be associated with measures of self-esteem and self-evaluation (e.g., liking; Pinel, 1999). Further, Pinel’s (2004) work provides evidence for a positive relationship between stigma consciousness and perceived discrimination such that those that rate higher in stigma consciousness also perceive more discrimination based on their individual or group membership (such as women). Even though Pinel distinguishes between the two, many researchers use the two variables, stigma consciousness and perceived discrimination, interchangeably because of this correlation. Perceived sexism has been shown to be related to negative mental and physical health (e.g., McLeod & Owens, 2004). Knowing that the relationship between psychological well-being and stigma consciousness is present, it is important to further explore the relationship to be able to develop future programs to combat these problems.

It is important to note that just as men can experience sexism, men can also perceive discrimination. However, the reason that the present work focuses solely on stigma consciousness among women is because past research suggests that men who experience stigma or discrimination report different experiences than women (Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, 2002). For women, there tends to be an association
between stigma consciousness and more negative psychological well-being, whereas for men this association is not apparent.

Past research has examined the relationship between stigma consciousness and well-being in women. By in large, this research suggests that women who report perceived discrimination are more likely to report negative psychological outcomes such as distress, depressive symptoms, and anger (Grollman, 2012; Pavalko, Mossakowski, & Hamilton, 2003; Wang, Stroebe, & Dovidio, 2012). Pavalko, Mossakowski, and Hamilton (2003) used longitudinal data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Mature Women to determine whether there was a causal relationship between seeming discrimination at work and both physical and emotional health. Pavalko et al. found that women who had been recently discriminated against reported 30 percent higher levels of distress than women who had not recently been discriminated against. This research provides evidence for immediate negative impacts of stigma consciousness. Grollman (2012) used data from the Black Youth Culture Survey to research stigma consciousness among adolescents and young adults in Chicago. While the research primarily focused on perceived discrimination among those of multiple minority statuses, there was also information about women in general. Grollman found that there were more reports by women of gender-based discrimination than males; this discrimination was a significant predictor of worse psychological health (i.e., depressive symptoms). Gender-based discrimination highlights the role of privilege in society; those of the dominant group (i.e., males) have more privilege than females and do not face the same type of stigma associated with their gender.
This perception of stigma is negatively related to psychological well-being. Work by Wang, Stroebe, and Dovidio (2012) measured stigma consciousness after participants pretended to apply for a job in which a male was their interviewer. None of the women received job offers and were either blatantly told that women were not made for that job or received prejudice in a more ambiguous manner. Wang et al. found a positive relationship between stigma consciousness and well-being such that when the prejudice against women was subtle, women that rated higher on stigma consciousness had a stronger degree of perceived discrimination. This higher rating of stigma conscientiousness was correlated with higher ratings of anger. In some, this anger manifested itself into depressive symptoms, a sign of poor psychological well-being.

Of note, studies relating to stereotype threat, especially in women’s performance in male-dominated fields, contribute to the relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being. In a study by Brown and Pinel (2003), women that were more aware of the stigma they faced as women performed more poorly on a math test than women less aware of the stigma they faced in a high threat situation. These women that were high in stigma consciousness identified more with their gender than women with low stigma consciousness in a high threat situation. Poor performance impacted the participants’ self-esteem. The findings of this study suggest that while there is a positive relationship between gender identification and self-esteem, there is a negative relationship between stigma consciousness and self-esteem. This means that women who were more aware of the stigma they faced based on their gender had lower levels of psychological well-being.
Ambivalent Sexism and Stigma Consciousness

Ambivalent sexism is a tool that is used to keep women unaware of the stigma and inequality they face. Ambivalent sexism, therefore, serves a system-justifying function in which “benevolent and complementary forms of sexism increases support for the system among women… [and] such support extends to American society in general… that gender stereotypes rationalize the status quo” (Jost & Kay, 2005, p. 504).

Even though some women are finding themselves in positions of power more often now than ever before, they still experience sexism. Some men and women still hold views that women should stay home to take care of children or work primarily in more “nurturing” fields (e.g., teaching, nursing). In addition, many women, especially those that find themselves to be a gender minority in everyday life, are likely to be more aware of sexism, especially hostile sexism. Women who are more aware of the stigma they face may also be more prone to notice different forms of sexism in their lives (Jost & Kay, 2005).

Women’s level of ambivalent sexism may be associated with their perceptions of discrimination. Women who have goals or worldviews that are in line with benevolent sexism may not be aware of the discrimination they face as women because they are not challenging traditional gender roles. Women who do challenge traditional gender goals may be more opposed to sexism and more aware of ambivalent sexism and in turn more aware of their stigma. They are more aware that the “glass ceiling” exists due to types of benevolent sexism (Kilianski & Rudman, 1998). The “glass ceiling” holds women back in the career world from moving up into positions of power, whereas men ride a “glass elevator” that brings them quickly to the top. If women are aware of this sexism, they will
be able to see the effects of this inequality more clearly. Wang, Stroebe, and Dovidio (2012) have found that women who perceive discrimination based on their stigma are more aware of it in the cases of ambiguous discrimination verses blatant discrimination.

The effects of sexism and stigma consciousness can be seen in the workplace, especially for women in fields that are dominated by men. Research by Logel et al. (2009) suggests that women who viewed a male partner as more sexist performed worse on an engineering test. The reason for this poor performance may be related to social identity threat or stereotype threat in which women are aware of the stereotypes that men hold about their gender and perform more poorly because of this awareness (Logel et al, 2009). Ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness work together in a sense to help predict performance. This relationship may exist between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness to help predict psychological well-being.

Hypotheses

The aim of the proposed work is to examine the relationships among ambivalent sexism, stigma consciousness, and well-being. While much work has examined the relationship between stigma consciousness (i.e., perceived discrimination, perceptions of prejudice) and well-being (e.g., Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Crocker & Major, 1989), to date there has been much less focus on antecedent variables. With this in mind, the present work will examine ambivalent sexism as an antecedent variable of the relationship between stigma consciousness and well-being. Specifically, stigma consciousness is hypothesized to serve as a mediator of the relationship between women’s ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being.
In accord with past theory and research (Glick & Fiske, 1997; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Napier et al., 2010), it was predicted that there would be a positive correlation between benevolent sexism and hostile sexism. The relationship between sexist attitudes toward women and psychological well-being was hypothesized to be negative such that greater endorsement of sexist attitudes would be associated with less positive psychological well-being. This is in accord with past research (e.g. Burkley & Blanton, 2009) that has repeatedly shown that endorsing self-stereotypes is harmful for well-being (e.g., self-esteem).

The relationship between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness was hypothesized to be negative such that more ambivalent sexism would be associated with less stigma consciousness. That is, those that hold highly sexist attitudes toward women were predicted to be less aware of the stigma women experience.

It was predicted that the direct relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being would be at least partially mediated by stigma consciousness. Specifically, it was hypothesized that when stigma consciousness was entered into the model, the direct relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being would no longer be significant (see Figure A1).

Method

Participants

Data collection for this general study of overall health and well-being among women living in the Greater New Orleans area began in the spring of 2012. Participants were 206 female students at a private university and 31 female community residents living in a medium sized southern city. The majority of the university students
participated in partial fulfillment of course or extra credit. These students were recruited using the online Sona System that is used by the university to recruit research participants. The women from the community were recruited both online (e.g., via Craigslist) and at a local community arts market. These women were compensated for their participation with $20.

All participants self-identified as female. The age range for student participants was between 18 and 43 with a mean age of 18.9 (SD=1.944). One hundred students indicated an age of 18 (48.5%) and 69 students indicated an age of 19 (33.5%). The community participants ranged in age from 18 to 53 with a mean age of 21.6 (SD=6.362). Approximately 10.2% of students indicated an annual household income of $0 to $24,999, while approximately 44.2% of students reported an annual household income of at least $100,000. The rest of the participants fell somewhere within that range. The annual household income for the community members ranged from $0 to $24,999 (37.9%) to over $100,000 (34.5%). The 206 students included 6 African American/Black women (2.9%), 12 Asian women (5.8%), 2 Asian Indian women (1%), 162 Caucasian/White women (78.6%), 8 Hispanic/Latina Native women (3.9%), 2 American/American Indian women (1%), 10 Mixed Heritage women (4.9%), and 9 women who identified as “Other” (1.9%). The 29 community members (data for two participants was thrown out) included 7 African American/Black women (24.1%), 18 Caucasian/White women (62.1%), 1 Hispanic/Latina Native woman (3.4%), 2 Mixed Heritage women (6.9%), and 1 Asian Indian woman (3.4%). Students were either not working outside of the home (46.1%), working part-time (27.7%), working full-time (1.9%), recently left their work (2.4%), or indicated “Other” for employment status.
Community members were not working outside of the home (31%), working part-time (51.7%), or working full-time (10.3%).

**Design and Materials**

The data for this project were extracted from a larger study examining women’s well-being. The research design of this study was cross-sectional and did not involve any experimental manipulation; it relied solely on self-report measures. Most relevant to the present proposal, participants completed measures of ambivalent sexism, stigma consciousness, psychological well-being, and a series of demographic questions.

**Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI).** The ambivalent sexism inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) contained 22 items representing benevolent sexism such as “No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman,” and items representing hostile sexism such as “Women are too easily offended,” and “Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them” (see Appendix A for full inventory). Participants rated their answers on a scale from 1, strongly disagree, to 6, strongly agree. Fields, Swan, and Kloos (2010) have shown this scale shows a positive correlation between benevolent and hostile sexism ($r=0.56$, $p<0.001$) and that this scale has high internal consistency, with an Alpha of .93 for hostile sexism and an Alpha of .88 for benevolent sexism. Work by Greenwood and Isbell (2002) indicates that the ASI scale has adequate internal consistency, with an Alpha of .8.

**Stigma Consciousness Questionnaire (SCQ).** The stigma consciousness measure with 10 items was adapted from the Stigma Consciousness Questionnaire (Pinel, 1999). Sample items include: “Stereotypes about women have not affected me personally,” “I never worry that my behaviors will be viewed as stereotypically female,”
and “Most men do not judge women on the basis of their gender” (see Appendix B). Items were rated on a Likert scale with a rating of “1” being strongly disagree and a rating of “7” as strongly agree. Wang et al. (2012) showed that this scale has adequate internal consistency, with an Alpha of .81.

**Psychological well-being (PWB).** The psychological well-being measure was taken from Ryff (1989) with measures on a 7-point Likert scale from almost never to almost always (see Appendix C for all items). The 18 items represented the different subscales of Ryff’s Psychological Well-being Inventory: positive relations with others (“I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.”), environmental mastery (“In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.”), autonomy (“I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.”), self-acceptance (“When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.”), purpose in life (“I live one day at a time and don’t really think about the future.”), and personal growth (“I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.”). Past research (Molix & Bettencourt, 2010; Schmutte & Ryff, 1997) has shown that this scale has adequate internal consistency, with Alpha ranging from .82 to .90 for each of the subscales and a composite Alpha of .86.

**Demographics.** The demographic information was collected in the same order in every packet. The demographic information included: age, income, and education (see Appendix D for the items).
Procedure

Upon arrival to the study room, participants were handed a clipboard, used for privacy, with a consent form and survey. The participants were asked to read the consent form, sign it, and give it back to the researcher. The consent form briefly outlined the study for the participants. The researcher also verbally explained what was written on the consent form. After reviewing the consent form, the participants completed the 45-minute survey that was placed on the clipboard. After completing the survey packet, participants were asked to read a debriefing form that further explained the purpose of the study and research goals before leaving. Each session had anywhere from 1 to 8 participants with an average of about 4 participants per session. All sessions were conducted by a trained female facilitator.

Sessions for community residents followed a similar procedure. These participants reported to the lab where they took the survey on the computers using Survey Monster. The consent forms, surveys, and debriefing forms were all the same as the pen-and-paper versions. The community participants were asked to complete a receipt after reading the debriefing form. They were then given $20 in exchange for their time.

Results

Data for the present study were analyzed using SPSS version 16.0. First, data were screened for missing values. Two participants were removed because they had most or all of their data missing. For the rest of the missing values, SPSS was set to use pairwise deletion because it includes all available data and is best to use when the sample size is small. The rest of the regression assumptions were checked including outliers, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. No outliers were removed
because all of the extreme outliers fell within the range of the Likert scale, which may provide useful information about the population. To test for normality, I created a composite score for each scale (Stigma Consciousness, Ambivalent Sexism, and Psychological Well-being). Because the significance for the Shapiro-Wilk test was greater than .05, I was able to conclude that the three scales were normally distributed. To test for linearity, I created a scatterplot for each scale and made sure all points were equally distributed above and below a line through the center. Testing for homoscedasticity was done by plotting the standardized residual of the dependent variable, psychological well-being. A flat line was plotted through the points, indicating homoscedasticity in the DV. Means and standard deviations as well as correlations among the variables of interest are shown in Table 1. As predicted, hostile sexism and benevolent sexism were correlated, r(227)=0.359, p<0.01. Both variables, hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, were strongly correlated with ambivalent sexism, r(227)=0.822, p<0.01 and r(227)=0.826, p<0.01, respectively.

Because the sample represented community members and students, an independent t-test, or two-sample t-test, was used to determine whether there was a difference between the two groups. Students and community members differed on age, t(233)=-2.232, p=0.034 and income, t(195)=3.151, p=0.003. Based on these results, age and income were used as covariates for the present analyses. Table 2 shows the results of the independent t-tests.

**Correlations**

As have others (e.g., Branscombe et al, 1999), a preliminary test of the primary hypotheses were conducted via an examination of the correlations among the primary
variables by sample (i.e., all participants, students, community members). Table 1 displays the correlations for all participants.

**All participants.** In contrast with the hypothesis, ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being were marginally positively correlated, $r(227)=0.119$, $p=0.071$. Ambivalent sexism was not significantly correlated with stigma consciousness, $r(227)=-0.093$, $p=0.159$. Hostile sexism and psychological well-being were significantly positively correlated, $r(227)=0.155$, $p=0.019$. Hostile sexism was significantly negatively correlated with stigma consciousness, $r(227)=-0.197$, $p=0.003$. Benevolent sexism and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated, $r(227)=0.041$, $p=0.536$. Benevolent sexism was not significantly correlated with stigma consciousness, $r(227)=0.043$, $p=0.517$. Stigma consciousness and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated $r(233)=0.041$, $p=0.533$. Based on these correlations, it would seem that mediation would not be present in the analysis of all participants.

**Student participants.** In contrast with the hypothesis, ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being were marginally positively correlated, $r(198)=0.119$, $p=0.094$. Ambivalent sexism was not significantly correlated with stigma consciousness, $r(198)=-0.064$, $p=0.366$. Hostile sexism and psychological well-being were significantly positively correlated, $r(198)=0.160$, $p=0.024$. Hostile sexism was significantly negatively correlated with stigma consciousness, $r(198)=-0.175$, $p=0.013$. Benevolent sexism and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated, $r(198)=0.039$, $p=0.586$. Benevolent sexism was not significantly correlated with stigma consciousness, $r(198)=0.060$, $p=0.395$. Stigma consciousness and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated $r(204)=0.053$, $p=0.450$. All correlations for the student
participants are in Table 3. Based on these correlations, it was predicted that mediation would not be present in the analysis of the student participants.

**Community participants.** In contrast with the hypothesis, ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated, \( r(27)=0.267, p=0.162 \). Ambivalent sexism was not significantly correlated with stigma consciousness, \( r(27)=-0.271, p=0.155 \). Hostile sexism and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated, \( r(27)=0.296, p=0.119 \). Hostile sexism was marginally negatively correlated with stigma consciousness, \( r(27)=-0.336, p=0.075 \). Benevolent sexism and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated, \( r(27)=0.115, p=0.554 \). Benevolent sexism was not significantly correlated with stigma consciousness, \( r(27)=-0.071, p=0.714 \). Stigma consciousness and psychological well-being were not significantly correlated \( r(27)=-0.150, p=0.438 \). All correlations for the community participants are in Table 4. Based on these correlations, it was predicted that mediation would not be present in the analysis of the community participants.

**Regression Analyses**

To determine whether mediation was present, regression analyses were used as preliminary tests. Baron and Kenny (1986) outline steps to determining mediation testing the relationship between each predictor variable and criterion variable using regression. The first step in the Baron and Kenny model is demonstrating that the independent variable (sexism) and the dependent variable (psychological well-being) are correlated. The next step is to demonstrate the independent variable (sexism) is related to the mediator variable (stigma consciousness). The third step is to show that the mediator variable affects the dependent variable. Finally, the relationship between the independent
variable and the dependent variable needs to be analyzed controlling for the mediator variable. If all of these criteria are met, then a mediation relationship exists. The analyses were done testing the simple relationships among ambivalent sexism, hostile sexism, or benevolent sexism and psychological well-being with stigma consciousness as a possible third variable. The analyses were also conducted in the same manner adding age, income, employment, and race as covariates. Each analysis was run examining all participants combined, just the student sample, and just the community sample.

All participants. Without accounting for the covariates, the relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being was marginally significant, $\beta=0.119$, $t(227)=1.812$, $p=0.071$. The relationship between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness was not significant, $\beta=-0.093$, $t(227)=-1.412$, $p=0.159$. Because this relationship is not significant, I did not continue to analyze this model for possible mediation. The relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was significant, $\beta=0.155$, $t(227)=2.360$, $p=0.019$. Hostile sexism was significantly associated with stigma consciousness, $\beta=-0.197$, $t(227)=-3.024$, $p=0.003$. The relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta=0.041$, $t(233)=0.625$, $p=0.533$. Based on the Baron and Kenny method of testing for mediation, it was not necessary to continue because the direct path between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being was not significant. The relationship between benevolent sexism and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta=0.041$, $t(227)=0.619$, $p=0.536$. The relationship between benevolent sexism and stigma consciousness was not significant, $\beta=0.043$, $t(227)=0.649$, $p=0.517$. Therefore, it was not necessary to continue with the analysis of mediation for this relationship.
When accounting for the covariates age and income the relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.114$, $t(185)=1.501$, $p=0.625$. The relationship between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness was not significant, $\beta = -0.066$, $t(185)=-0.884$, $p=0.103$. Because neither of these relationships was significant, it was not necessary to continue looking for mediation in this model. The relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was not significant when accounting for the covariates, $\beta = 0.153$, $t(185)=2.02$, $p=0.381$. Hostile sexism was significantly related to stigma consciousness, $\beta = -0.185$, $t(185)=-2.503$, $p=0.012$. The relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.054$, $t(188)=0.734$, $p=0.887$. Because these relationships were not significant, there was no need to continue with further mediation analyses. The relationship between benevolent sexism and psychological well-being was not significant when including the covariates, $\beta = 0.033$, $t(185)=0.438$, $p=0.922$. Benevolent sexism was marginally associated with stigma consciousness, $\beta = 0.074$, $t(185)=1.002$, $p=0.095$. Because no other relationships between the variables were significant, it was not necessary to continue with the mediation analyses while controlling for the covariates.

**Student participants.** Without accounting for the covariates, the relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being was marginally significant, $\beta = 0.119$, $t(198)=1.684$, $p=0.094$. The relationship between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness was not significant, $\beta = -0.064$, $t(198)=-0.905$, $p=0.366$. Because this relationship is not significant, I did not continue to analyze this model for possible mediation. The relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was significant, $\beta = 0.160$, $t(198)=2.279$, $p=0.024$. Hostile sexism was significantly related to
stigma consciousness, $\beta = -0.175$, $t(198) = -2.504$, $p = 0.013$. The relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.053$, $t(204) = 0.757$, $p = 0.450$. Therefore, it was not necessary to continue with mediation analyses. The relationship between benevolent sexism and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.039$, $t(198) = 0.545$, $p = 0.586$. The relationship between benevolent sexism and stigma consciousness was not significant, $\beta = 0.060$, $t(198) = 0.852$, $p = 0.395$. Therefore, it was not necessary to continue with the analysis of mediation for this relationship.

When taking the covariates age and income into account, the relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being for the student sample was not significant, $\beta = 0.118$, $t(156) = 1.439$, $p = 0.655$. Ambivalent sexism was not significantly related to stigma consciousness, $\beta = -0.055$, $t(146) = -0.672$, $p = 0.579$. Because neither of the paths is significant, it was not necessary to continue looking for mediation. Hostile sexism, when accounting for the covariates in the student sample, was not significantly associated with psychological well-being, $\beta = 0.159$, $t(156) = 1.99$, $p = 0.396$, or stigma consciousness, $\beta = -0.175$, $t(146) = -2.207$, $p = 0.146$. Benevolent sexism was not significantly related to psychological well-being, $\beta = 0.033$, $t(156) = 0.393$, $p = 0.927$, or stigma consciousness, $\beta = 0.081$, $t(146) = 0.990$, $p = 0.503$, when accounting for covariates in the student sample. It is unnecessary to examine stigma consciousness as a potential third variable for the relationship between benevolent sexism and psychological well-being.

**Community participants.** The relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.267$, $t(27) = 1.439$, $p = 0.162$. The
relationship between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness was not significant, $\beta = -0.271$, $t(27) = -1.462$, $p = 0.155$. Because this relationship is not significant, I did not continue to analyze this model for possible mediation. The relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.296$, $t(27) = 1.612$, $p = 0.119$. Hostile sexism was marginally associated with stigma consciousness, $\beta = -0.336$, $t(27) = -1.853$, $p = 0.075$. The relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.150$, $t(27) = 0.788$, $p = 0.438$. Because of the not significant findings, it was not necessary to continue with the mediation analyses. The relationship between benevolent sexism and psychological well-being was not significant, $\beta = 0.115$, $t(27) = 0.599$, $p = 0.554$ nor was the relationship between benevolent sexism and stigma consciousness, $\beta = -0.071$, $t(27) = -0.371$, $p = 0.714$. Because this relationship is not significant, I did not continue to analyze this model for possible mediation.

When taking the covariates age and income into account, the relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being for the community sample was not significant, $\beta = 0.259$, $t(21) = 1.149$, $p = 0.716$, nor was the relationship between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness $\beta = -0.128$, $t(21) = -0.630$, $p = 0.195$. Because neither of the paths was significant, it was not necessary to continue looking for mediation. Hostile sexism, when accounting for the covariates in the community sample, was not significantly related to psychological well-being, $\beta = 0.379$, $t(21) = 1.685$, $p = 0.498$, or stigma consciousness, $\beta = -0.238$, $t(21) = -1.156$, $p = 0.139$. Benevolent sexism was not significantly associated with psychological well-being, $\beta = 0.014$, $t(21) = 0.060$, $p = 0.910$, or stigma consciousness, $\beta = 0.058$, $t(21) = 0.277$, $p = 0.218$, when accounting for covariates
in the community sample. It is unnecessary to examine stigma consciousness as a potential third variable for the relationship between benevolent sexism and psychological well-being.

**Discussion**

It was hypothesized that stigma consciousness would serve as a mediator of the relationship between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being such that those who hold more sexist views toward women would have significantly lower psychological well-being. Specifically, it was predicted that holding more sexist views toward women would be associated with less stigma consciousness. It was predicted that less stigma consciousness would be associated with greater psychological well-being. When controlling for the mediator, stigma consciousness, it was predicted that the relationship between sexism and psychological well-being would no longer be significant. The results of the present study do not support the hypothesized mediation. The relationship between ambivalent sexism and stigma consciousness as well as the relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being were not significant. Therefore, ambivalent sexism was broken down and examined using its two components, hostile sexism and benevolent sexism.

Like ambivalent sexism, there were no significant mediation results between benevolent sexism and psychological well-being with stigma consciousness as a mediator. The reason for the lack of evidence for this type of relationship could be because many do not recognize benevolent sexism as a true type of sexism. Our data indicate that women were more likely to agree with benevolent sexism more than both hostile and benevolent sexism (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations). Many do
not consider holding women on a pedestal as a type of stereotype, prejudice, or discrimination against women. Because ambivalent sexism incorporates benevolent sexism, it may not come off as a threat to women.

Analysis of hostile sexism did not indicate evidence for mediation. For all participants, the relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was not significantly mediated by adding the third variable, stigma consciousness. The relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was significant and positive. The relationship between hostile sexism and stigma consciousness was a negative significant relationship. Because there was not a significant relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being, we could not determine that stigma consciousness was a mediator. For the community participants, the relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was not significant with or without inclusion of the third variable. The relationship between hostile sexism and stigma consciousness was marginally significant and negative. Those that have more sexist attitudes toward women have less stigma consciousness but it is unclear whether this stigma consciousness impacts psychological well-being because analyses yielded results that were not significant. For the student sample the relationship between hostile sexism and psychological well-being was initially significant and positive. The relationship between hostile sexism and stigma consciousness was negative.

The findings of this research may come as a surprise to some. After all, the results suggest that women who have hostility toward their own group may actually be better off psychologically than those who are less sexist and more aware of the stigma they face. However, past research shows that results of correlational survey data examining
attitudes toward rape found that women endorsed hostile sexism more readily than men and believe that men should be more dominant than women (Davies, Gilston, & Rogers, 2012).

Past research suggests that these results may stem from protection afforded by worldviews, such as belief in a just world. Jost and Hunyady (2005) consider these worldviews to be system-justifying ideologies. System-justifying ideologies help to maintain the status quo by avoiding conflict. Those that endorse system-justifying ideologies tend to have better well-being outcomes. Research by Sakalh-Uğurlu, Yalçin, and Glick (2007) suggests that hostile sexism and belief in a just world are positively correlated. This means that hostile sexists believe that outcomes in life are fair and due to one’s individual actions. For example, if a woman is raped, those that endorse sexist views will believe that a woman was raped because she deserved it. Therefore, if women who are hostile sexists lead lives that they believe warrant positive outcomes, they will still have high functioning psychological well-being because they deserve it. This worldview serves as a protective factor for women.

This research adds to the work by other psychologists that have found that the relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being relies on a third variable between the two, especially among college aged adults. Past research indicates that this direct relationship was not visible because of the exclusion of third variables such as group identification (i.e., like, value, pride, positive), legitimizing ideologies (i.e., worldview), and group status (e.g., Schmitt et al., 2002; Major et al., 2002, 2007). In their examination of the relationship between perceived discrimination and self-esteem among gay men, Doyle and Molix (2012) found that behavioral identification served to
suppress the relationship between the two variables. By including the third variable as a suppressor, the relationship between perceived discrimination and self-esteem was strengthened. It is important to note, however, that self-esteem is a correlate of psychological well-being, and not necessarily a measure of well-being. Therefore, it may be important to further investigate third variables in the relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being.

**Limitations**

No psychological research is perfect, and the present work is no exception. First, the sample size was not as large as it could have been. Smaller sample size leads to less power, which can be a cause for possible error. The inclusion of covariates and added variables takes away from the power even more. Additionally, the research comparing the two groups, students and community, may have been stronger if the samples for each had been larger and more equal. For example, comparing 206 students to 29 community residents is not ideal.

Another limitation of this research is that it was not an experiment; no variables were manipulated. This research was based on self-report, survey data. As is the case with most self-report measures, this research was unable to measure internal attitudes. Measuring implicit attitudes that women hold toward their own group could be a solution to this limitation. Even though we found that women do self-report sexist attitudes, implicit measures may help make clear underlying thoughts, feelings, and emotions that women hold toward their own group.

An additional limitation involves the operationalization of the variables. For the purposes of this research, psychological well-being was operationalized using the Ryff’s
Psychological Well-being Scale, a eudemonic measure of well-being. However, well-being can be measured using hedonic or subjective well-being measures, such as the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ), the Personal Growth Initiative Scale (PGIS), and the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Schulman, 2007). These measures could have differing findings among well-being. Perhaps there would be a negative relationship between sexism and positive affect. Examining these different measures of well-being with our variables could be interesting for future research. Likewise, sexism could have been operationalized differently. Instead of examining ambivalent sexism and its components hostile and benevolent sexism, measures of sexism such as the Modern Sexism Scale (MSS) or Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale (OFSS) could have been used (Morrison, Morrison, Pope, & Zumbo 1999). The operationalization of variables impacts the results of the research and the interpretation of these results.

Aside from methodological limitations, there were potential theoretical limitations in this research. Because past research indicates that the relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being is due to a potential third variable (e.g., Schmitt et al., 2002; Major et al, 2002), perhaps stigma consciousness was not the ideal variable to serve as a mediator between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being. For example, work by Liss, Erchull, and Ramsey (2010) found a link between endorsing hostile sexism and increased self-esteem with enjoying the experience of sexualization and objectification among women. Because of this association, perhaps a measure such as the Enjoyment of Sexualization Scale (ESS) would have been a more appropriate possible mediator.
Future Research

There are many paths that future research can take to expand on the current research. First and foremost, including an experimental manipulation can lead researchers to make causal conclusions regarding the relationship among sexist views toward women, stigma consciousness, and psychological well-being. The current research cannot explain directionality of the variables, but experimental research would demonstrate the directionality of the relationship of the variables.

Future research can include additional measures to help explain the relationship among the variables. For example, does the level of a woman’s female identity influence the relationship among sexism, stigma consciousness and psychological well-being? If a woman’s female identity is not particularly salient to her then the present findings would make more sense. Perhaps women have other identities that serve as a buffer and improve their psychological well-being. Another interesting measure to include could be a scale measuring women’s belief in a just world. There could be many variables added as measures; these variables would be additional and not necessary for the relationship to exist. There are a vast amount of other variables that could serve as potential buffers that allow women to cope with their stigmatized status. Including more open-ended questions that allow the participants to explain their reasoning could also be helpful to better understand these possible underlying buffers.

Longitudinal future research could yield interesting findings. Perhaps the impact of hostile sexism does not impact women until many years down the road. Because most of the participants represented women under the age of 21, it would be interesting to explore whether there are negative impacts of hostile sexism on psychological well-being
later in life. Longitudinal research would also be helpful for directionality and true tests of mediation, not just indirect effects. Longitudinal research may lead to practical application. Starting gender and sexuality studies earlier can be a way to change our findings. If women (and men) are exposed to this field earlier, they will be more aware of the inequality and less able to remain indifferent. Women will become aware of their minority status and hopefully hold less sexist views. If these egalitarian views became the norm then holding non-sexist views would hopefully lead to better psychological well-being. Another benefit of longitudinal analyses is that they allow the ability to bypass possible limitations associated with cross-sectional data. Longitudinal data allows researchers to make more causal, directional conclusions.

**Implications**

Does the current research suggest that the old saying “ignorance is bliss” actually holds true? Perhaps being unaware of the stigma that they face protects women from the harmful effects of self-stereotyping one’s group. This could be the case if our results suggested that hostile sexism and psychological well-being were positively related only with the inclusion of stigma consciousness. Instead, our results suggest that even without the third variable, stigma consciousness, mediating the relationship those women with more sexist views actually have more positive psychological well-being. Research by Crocker and Major (1989) suggests that overt discrimination, like hostile sexism, can actually serve as a type of protection for women. If women are under the impression that they should be treated a certain way because of their group membership, they do not have to attribute it to their individual character. Therefore a woman who believes that in
general “women are too easily offended” does not attribute that quality to herself so no harm is done to her psychological well-being.

Women comprise an interesting stigmatized group to study. Unlike most stigmatized groups, women make up more than half of the population and may not recognize their minority status. Because women tend to be indistinctive in their environment, their identity as female may not be as salient (Crocker & Major, 1989). Perhaps the findings for this study would be different if the sample of women examined found themselves in a male-dominated environment.

So much of past research focuses on third variables in the relationship between stigma consciousness and psychological well-being (e.g., Major et al., 2007). However, the current research provides evidence for antecedent variables for this relationship, such as hostile sexism. Understanding that this relationship exists can add to the literature and bring more dimension to a topic that has been extensively studied.

The present work opened by discussing current women’s rights issues in the United States. Even though the research suggests that hostile sexism is associated with better psychological well-being, it is not appropriate to conclude that these issues should not be of great importance. In fact, psychological well-being does not measure emotional responses, like anger and hostility (Major & Eliezer, 2010); therefore, even though sexist women report positive well-being, they may still experience some type of negative response. The true challenge that we may find in the coming years is the pervasive nature of benevolent sexism in society. Because hostile sexism is less socially acceptable, benevolent sexism may start to have pernicious effects on women’s well-being. Even President Barack Obama in his State of the Union address in February 2013 refers to
women as “our wives, mothers, and daughters” when describing the elimination of workplace discrimination and domestic violence (Obama, B., 2013). While it may seem as though Obama is respecting women in his remarks, in fact, he is exhibiting benevolent sexism. Women do not deserve equality because they are people, but because they represent a type of possession: our wives, our mothers, our daughters (Thériault, 2013). It will be interesting to see how women’s well-being will be affected as sexism shifts even more from hostile to benevolent; perhaps the impact will depend significantly on women’s stigma consciousness.
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Footnotes

1. Being able to distinguish between the two types of sexism and understand the concept of ambivalent sexism can be helpful for learning more about psychological well-being. Napier et al. found an inverse relationship between hostile, but not benevolent, sexism and life satisfaction in Western societies such that those that supported hostile sexism had lower satisfaction in their lives than those that had more of an ambivalent view about sexism. Ambivalent sexism allows for higher life satisfaction, an aspect of psychological well-being, than hostile sexism because of the impact of the benevolent sexism (Napier et al., 2010).
Figure A1. Stigma Consciousness as Mediator between Ambivalent Sexism and Psychological Well-Being. The straight line between ambivalent sexism and psychological well-being represents a significant relationship between the two variables, whereas the dashed line represents the relationship becoming not significant upon the introduction of the mediator variable, stigma consciousness.
Table 1.

*Correlation matrix, means, and standard deviations.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stigma Consciousness</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.181*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Psychological Well-being</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ambivalent Sexism</td>
<td>-0.139*</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.119†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Benevolent Sexism</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>.822**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hostile Sexism</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.197**</td>
<td>0.155*</td>
<td>.826**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Range of scores displayed is possible range, not observed range.

†p<.10, *p<0.05, **p<0.01
Table 2.

Independent t-test for community and students samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-2.232*</td>
<td>28.74</td>
<td>19.2255</td>
<td>2.98647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>18.8981</td>
<td>1.94417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>21.5517</td>
<td>6.36164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3.151**</td>
<td>34.681</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>1.14646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.8929</td>
<td>1.44784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2.7931</td>
<td>1.78044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma Consciousness</td>
<td>-0.534</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4.476</td>
<td>0.85234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4.4648</td>
<td>0.83776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>4.5552</td>
<td>0.96199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-being</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>5.618</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5.6265</td>
<td>4.0204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>5.5613</td>
<td>1.3506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent Sexism</td>
<td>4.175***</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>3.1054</td>
<td>0.71401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.1779</td>
<td>0.70173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2.6058</td>
<td>0.59634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexism</td>
<td>5.024***</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2.9526</td>
<td>0.87275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.0575</td>
<td>0.82781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2.2292</td>
<td>0.8434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexism</td>
<td>1.884†</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>3.2576</td>
<td>0.85974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>3.2981</td>
<td>0.88649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2.9781</td>
<td>0.58395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: †p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
Table 3.

*Correlation matrix, means, and standard deviations for student participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>.172*</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stigma Consciousness</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Psychological Well-being</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ambivalent Sexism</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.155*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.119†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Benevolent Sexism</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.142*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>.832**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hostile Sexism</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>- .175*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>.804**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Range of scores displayed is possible range, not observed range.

†p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01
**Table 4.**

*Correlation matrix, means, and standard deviations for community participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7931</td>
<td>1.78044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.621**</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4483</td>
<td>0.94816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma Consciousness</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.423*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-being</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent Sexism</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.331†</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexism</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>.757**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexism</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.433*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.336†</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>.887**</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Range of scores displayed is possible range, not observed range.

†p<.10, *p<0.05, **p<0.01
Appendix A

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman. (BS)

2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for “equality.” (HS)

* 3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men. (BS)

4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist. (HS)

5. Women are too easily offended. (HS)

* 6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex. (BS)

* 7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men. (HS)

8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess. (BS)

9. Women should be cherished and protected by men. (BS)

10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them. (HS)

11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men. (HS)

12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores. (BS)

* 13. Men are complete without women. (BS)

14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work. (HS)

15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash. (HS)
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against. (HS)

17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man. (BS)

* 18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances. (HS)

19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility. (BS)

20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives. (BS)

* 21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men. (HS)

22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste. (BS)

Note: * denotes item reverse-scored.
Appendix B

Stigma Consciousness Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Stereotypes about women have not affected me personally.

2. I never worry that my behaviors will be viewed as stereotypically female.

3. When interacting with men, I feel like they interpret all my behaviors in terms of the fact that I am woman.

4. Most men do not judge women on the basis of their gender.

5. My being female does not influence how men act towards me.

6. I almost never think about the fact that I am a female when I interact with men.

7. My being female does not influence how people act with me.

8. Most men have a lot more sexist thoughts than they actually express.

9. I often think that men are unfairly accused of being sexist.

10. Most men have a problem with viewing women as equals.

*Note: * denotes item reverse-scored.
Appendix C

Psychological Well-being Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the value of what others think is important.
2. I am quite good at mastering the many responsibilities of my daily life.
* 3. I have given up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life.
* 4. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
* 5. I sometimes feel as if I’ve done all there is to do in life.
* 6. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.
7. I have confidence in my own opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.
* 8. The demands of everyday life often get me down.
9. For me, life has become a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
10. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.
11. Some people wander aimlessly though life, but I am not one of them.
12. I like most aspects of my personality.
* 13. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.
14. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.
15. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and your world.
* 16. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.
* 17. I live life one day at a time and don’t really think about the future.
18. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.

Note: * denotes item reverse-scored.
Appendix D

Demographic Information

1. Age: ______________

2. What is the approximate total yearly income for all of the members who contribute to your household income?

   $0-$24,999  $25,000-$49,999  $50,000-$74,999  $75,000-$99,000

   $150,000+

3. Please circle the highest level of education you completed.

   No degree  H.S. Diploma  Associates  Bachelors
   Masters    Ph.D.      M.D.      J.D.

   Other, please specify ________________