

**The Most Effective Response to Sexism: A Nudge in the Right Direction?**

J.S.J.A. Spanenburg

In Collaboration With:

N. Bakker

M. Destree

E. Kiely

Z. Richter

C. Zimmeck

Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences University of Groningen

Student number: S3329100

Supervisor: Dr. Namkje Koudenburg

Second Evaluator: Prof. Dr. Martijn van Zomeren

July 5, 2023

A thesis is an aptitude test for students. The approval of the thesis is proof that the student has sufficient research and reporting skills to graduate, but does not guarantee the quality of the research and the results of the research as such, and the thesis is therefore not necessarily suitable to be used as an academic source to refer to. If you would like to know more about the research discussed in this thesis and any publications based on it, to which you could refer, please contact the supervisor mentioned.

### Abstract

Previous literature suggests that the different ways we can respond to sexism have different impacts when it comes to social norms and perception of sexism. This study investigated the effects of different responses to a sexist comment on the degree of disapproval, while also examining the impact of feminism and gender of the responder on this relationship. Our sample (N = 135) consisted of exclusively male participants above the age of 16. They watched a video where a sexist comment is made and then filled in a self-report questionnaire. After this, they watched the same video again, only this time they also got to see the response to the comment. They were randomly assigned to three conditions: direct confrontation, humorous confrontation, or a control condition. The results do not reveal statistically significant differences between the different responses or significant effects of feminism and gender. However, this study contributes to understanding the effects of response types to a sexist comment on disapproval rates and the role of feminism and gender of the responder in this context. Future research should explore these dynamics further with larger samples and diverse measurement approaches.

*Keywords:* Sexism, conversation, social norms, feminism, gender roles

## **The Most Effective Response to Sexism: A Nudge in the Right Direction?**

In recent years, the conversation surrounding all forms of discrimination has been setting the world alight. Social justice is one of the most relevant topics of today, and a big part of it is discussing which things are and are not offensive. With the arrival of fourth wave feminism in the early 2010s came a new standard of what things classify as sex-based discrimination, also known as sexism, and currently, many things that were previously seen as socially acceptable, are now no longer tolerated by most people. However, that does not mean that sexism has completely been banished from this world. On the contrary, it is still a big problem in most societies. As UNICEF (2021) explains in their Gender Action Plan 2022-2025, while we have seen considerable progress, we are also witnessing an increase in extremist ideologies that aim to uphold repressive gender norms and power structures as a response. It has been found that these repressive gender norms are often maintained in conversations (Koudenburg et al., 2020), which means that if we, as a society, find a way to counter that, we might reduce the normality of sexism in those instances. Other research has shown that being subjected to sexism has a negative effect on mental health (Swim et al., 2001; Feigt et al., 2021), so it is imperative that we find a way to combat it. Therefore, the present study will look at whether our response to a sexist statement can influence the degree of disapproval of said statement, and which types of responses are most effective in doing so.

There is a wide range of previous research done on sexism. As mentioned above, one facet of this is the impact on mental health. Studies have shown that there is a link between sexism and psychological distress (Fisher & Holz, 2010) and higher alcohol use in both heterosexual (Petzel & Casad, 2019) and sexual minority women<sup>1</sup> (Scheer et al., 2022). Additionally, Landrine et al. (1995) found that the psychological distress experienced as a

---

<sup>1</sup> In this paper, the terms 'men' and 'women' are used. We are aware there are many other gender identities, but since there is little to no research done on sexism and people who are not part of the gender binary, we cannot make inferences about that population based on previous research and therefore we do not mention them.

result of sexism goes beyond what is expected from stressful major and minor life events, and Klönoff et al. (2000) concluded that observed gender differences in depression, anxious and somatic symptoms might be attributable to sexism. As a logical next step, more research was done to investigate how we can mitigate these negative mental health effects. Szymanski et al. (2009) found that internalised misogyny moderates the relationship between sexism and psychological distress, meaning that the more internalised misogyny someone has, the more distress they will experience as a result. Internalised misogyny is a form of internalised oppression, which is when the members of the oppressed group aid in their own oppression by directing the oppressive tactics at play towards themselves and others, even when the oppressor group is not present. In line with this, multiple studies have shown that having feminist attitudes and beliefs lessens the impact of sexism on psychological well-being (Fisher et al., 2000; Klönoff et al., 1997; Moradi & Subich, 2002). Sabik & Tylka (2006) even found evidence that in women with low feminist consciousness, experiencing sexism is a positive predictor for disordered eating, whereas in women with high feminist consciousness, this is not the case. Based on all these findings, we can consider feminist education a main goal when trying to mitigate the negative mental health effects associated with sexism. One could argue that if different responses to a sexist comment can elicit varying degrees of disapproval, it can be seen as a way to create feminist consciousness. Most of us have probably changed our opinions based on the way someone else responds to a comment before, so this is definitely a factor to consider. However, since these are all internal processes, they do not change anything when it comes to other people's sexist attitudes. Therefore, if we want to actually combat sexism on a societal level, we need to look into other-focused interventions that can achieve that goal, in addition to providing feminist education.

With this in mind, it is important to look at how we respond to sexism. For a long time, psychological research was focused on the perpetrator of prejudice, while the target was

considered a passive victim, until Lalonde & Cameron (1994) demonstrated that targets play a bigger role in these interactions than originally believed. Research has shown that besides the interpersonal aspect, targets also apply different types of cognitive and behavioural coping strategies to deal with being on the receiving end of prejudice (Crocker & Major, 1989; Feagin, 1991; Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Hyers & Swim, 1998; Lalonde & Cameron, 1994; Wright et al., 1990). Examples of these behavioural coping strategies include sarcasm, humour and nonverbal responses that do not indicate disapproval. However, multiple studies (e.g. Hyers, 2007; Swim & Hyers, 1999) show that confronting sexism and directly challenging the perpetrator is key when we want to reduce sexism, since it is externally focused (as opposed to internal coping strategies). Confronting prejudice has also been found to reduce stereotype use in both perpetrators (Czopp et al., 2006) and observers (Rasinski & Czopp, 2010). Additionally, some positive effects for the confronter include higher self-esteem, increased sense of competence, empowerment (Gervais et al., 2010; Swim & Thomas, 2005) and satisfaction (Hyers, 2007). This makes confronting prejudice also a form of coping with it (Miller & Kaiser, 2001).

Unfortunately, confronting prejudice can also have negative consequences. One of these is the social cost it has for the confronter (Kaiser & Miller, 2004). Female confronters of sexism are often seen as whiny, oversensitive trouble makers, overreacting, having a cold personality and scared of retaliation (e.g. Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Dodd et al., 2001; Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003). Dodd et al. (2001) also found that female confronters were less liked by men and were at risk of being seen as egoistic and self-interested. Another interesting finding from Czopp & Monteith (2003) is that a perpetrator is more likely to experience amusement as a response to being confronted on sexism, as opposed to the feelings of guilt and apologetic response elicited when confronted on racism. This means that while racism and sexism are both forms of prejudice and oppression, the underlying mechanisms are

different enough that the results of confrontation are almost antithetical, which should be taken into account when looking at potential ways of reducing sexism through confrontation.

Fiske & Stevens (1993) posit multiple reasons for this discrepancy. One of them is the fact that the stereotypes associated with sexism and racism are of a different nature, i.e. people expect women to conform to common stereotypes (like warm and nurturing) whereas they do not expect the same with the stereotypes imposed on Black people (like criminal and lazy). Furthermore, because of the close relational contact between men and women (as parents, spouses or children for example), those gender stereotypes may be perceived as more accurate. Another thing is that people tend to view sexism as a less serious problem than racism, as demonstrated by Rodin et al. (1990). This matches the findings of Czopp & Monteith (2003) mentioned earlier, namely that confrontations on sexism are more likely to elicit amusement. Becker et al. (2014) argued that because of all these differences, we cannot simply apply prejudice reduction tactics used for racism to sexism. For racism, intergroup interventions were found to be the most effective in reducing prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). However, one of the reasons these interventions work so well is because of the unfamiliarity often present between racial/ethnic groups, and intergroup interactions reduce intergroup anxiety. The same cannot be said for men and women, since the contact between groups is more frequent and pretty much unavoidable, so there is little to no intergroup anxiety present to begin with.

Thus, considering that previous research showed that confrontation is an effective tool in reducing sexism and well-known reduction strategies for other types of prejudice do not work because of the nature of sexism, it is beneficial to further explore the effect of confrontation across different contexts and conditions. Koudenburg et al. (2020) found that during conversation, the type of response (e.g. nonresponse or a short silence) to a sexist comment influences the perceived normality of sexism. Earlier research showed that

maintaining conversational flow after a statement conveys acceptance while disrupting that flow implies the statement in question may have been controversial (Koudenburg et al., 2011). The findings by Koudenburg et al. (2013) that brief conversational silences can induce attitude adjustment, also indicate that different types of responses have different effects. As mentioned in previously, humour is also a common coping strategy that targets use to respond to sexism. However, we do not yet know the effects of a humorous confrontational response to a sexist comment. If you consider that confronting sexism can elicit amusement, this could mean that if someone confronts sexism in a humorous way, it is not necessarily clear that they are disagreeing with the comment. As a result, people could be less likely to disapprove of said comment. All this together suggests that the different ways we can respond to sexism could yield different results when it comes to changing sexist attitudes.

If this is true, it would be beneficial on multiple levels. For one, it can be seen as a way of educating the people on what is and is not sexist to say during conversations, i.e. it creates feminist consciousness. As mentioned before, having high feminist consciousness lessens the negative effects of sexism on the targets (e.g. Fisher et al., 2000), which is something we should strive for. Another benefit is that if we find the best way to elicit disapproval of a sexist comment, it is possible to change opinions of people in the conversation where this comment is being said. When hearing the opinions of peers on a given issue, people tend to filter and integrate the social information and adjust their own beliefs accordingly (Gigerenzer & Todd, 1999; Yaniv, 2004). It is self-explanatory that changing mind-sets and attitudes is crucial when it comes to eradicating prejudice in our society. However, as mentioned previously, different types of prejudice have different nuances involved that change the perception of responses, so we cannot apply research from other types of prejudice (like racism) to this. That is why it is important that we investigate sexism specifically.



However, we have to take certain other factors into account as well. Like multiple studies have shown, the gender of the responder affects the way that response is perceived (e.g. Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Dodd et al., 2001). We have to account for possible gender differences; what may be the most effective response for a man might not be the case for a woman. Additionally, since rejecting sexist attitudes is an integral part of being a feminist, the extent to which someone identifies as a feminist also affects the perception of sexist comments. If someone already ascribes to egalitarian views, they will be more likely to share the potential disapproval elicited by certain responses.

For this study, we will look at the extent to which individuals disapprove of a sexist comment, and whether this level of disapproval differs for different responses. We speculate that an individual may adjust their perception of a sexist comment after someone else responds a certain way. We will use a humorous confrontation, a direct confrontation and a topic change (control) as the different types of responses. Based on all the previous research, we hypothesise a significant difference between the responses, with H1 being direct confrontation elicits more disapproval than a non-response. We also hypothesise that a humorous confrontation will be more effective than the control, but not more than a direct confrontation (H2). Our next hypothesis (H3) is that the gender of the person responding moderates the relationship between the different responses and the level of disapproval, with men being more effective than women. Lastly, we hypothesise that holding egalitarian views also moderates this relationship, with higher feminism resulting in higher disapproval (H4).

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The participants in this study were all men above the age of sixteen. A total of 179 participants were recruited through online forums like SONA (a research participation

platform) and snowballing via social media, platforms and our personal network. There was an attrition rate of 29%, with 52 participants not finishing the study completely. However, since we do not look at every measure, for this study the overall sample size is 136, with only the measure feminism having a sample size of 127. All participants provided informed consent prior to participation in the study. The average age of our sample was 25 (SD = 9.8), and the main nationalities were Dutch (n = 90) and German (n = 31), with Other (n = 15). We compensated the participants recruited through SONA with 0.5 SONA credits for their time upon completion of the survey. Additionally, non-SONA participants could sign up for a raffle where they could win a €15 bol.com voucher.

## **Procedure**

Participants were assured that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would be kept confidential. The participants were asked to complete the study online on a device of their choice, in their own personal setting (not in a laboratory). The study was in English and it was recommended to use headphones for optimal sound quality. In the study, they were asked to watch a video of a group of four young adults, two men and two women, having a conversation about their holidays. Then, one of the two men makes a sexist remark after one of the women mentioned having had a female pilot: “A woman? Most women can’t even drive a car, why is she allowed to fly a plane?”. They were instructed to imagine they were the person making that comment. The video lasted for 22 seconds, after which participants were asked to answer questions about the norms and disapproval surrounding the comment and whether they believed the man expressed his true beliefs. The participants were randomly assigned to one of six experimental conditions depending on whether they watched the same video with the following different responses: (1) a man confronted the sexist comment with humour<sup>2</sup>, (2) a man confronted the sexist comment

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3SFpOrhFWSE>

directly<sup>3</sup>, (3) a man did not confront the sexist comment but changed the topic<sup>4</sup>, (4) a woman confronted the sexist comment with humour<sup>5</sup>, (5) a woman confronted the sexist comment directly<sup>6</sup>, or (6) a woman did not confront the sexist comment but changed the topic<sup>7</sup>. This was followed by a series of questions about the participants' level of disapproval, norms, feminism, personality traits, recognition of sexism, and plausible deniability. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the RUG. Participants provided informed consent prior to participation in the study and were debriefed upon completion.

## Measures

This is a quasi-experimental study with a between subject design, as the participants were only tested once. The dependent variable measured in the study is disapproval. We also measured the extent to which someone identifies as a feminist, which is an independent variable in our study. The participant's extent of disapproval was assessed with the question "To what extent do you personally approve/disapprove with [the sexist remark]?". This question uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disapprove" to "strongly approve". Participants were asked this question twice, before and after manipulation. For the variable feminism we used a similar 7-point Likert scale with the question "To what extent do you identify as a feminist?" (1 = "not at all" to 7 = "very much"). Other variables measured were perceived norms, future behaviour, warmth and competence, awareness of sexism, the cohesion of the group, plausible deniability and status and respect, but these are not relevant for this study.

Another scale checked if our manipulation worked. For each condition, we asked participants whether the response was perceived the way we intended. This was done with

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iLZbmC-iJnM>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2X4X2EnkHv0>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uohxdl-k91g>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XjumQM2ZUnI>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MqiqWKgJ04o>

questions like ‘Lucy confronted/objected to the remark made by Paul’, using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. If we were successful, the averages for each question should differ significantly between conditions, with e.g. the average of the aforementioned question being highest in the female confrontation condition.

### **Analysis Plan**

The program we will use to analyse our data is IBM SPSS Statistics 28. The independent variables used in this study are type of response, gender of the responder and feminism. Type of response and gender of the responder are categorical variables, with three (control = 0, confrontation = 1, humour = 2) and two categories (woman = 0, man = 1) respectively, while feminism is quantitative. The quantitative dependent variable disapproval is divided in two, one being a pre-score and the other being a post-score. As we hypothesise that feminism and disapproval are highly correlated, both disapproval scores were reversed so that the scales for the measures each ranged from low to high.

First, to see whether the means for each condition differ significantly, we will run an ANCOVA analysis. This way, we can easily compare the means, and if we use the pre-score as a covariate, we will be able to see the effects of each condition clearly. To examine the potential moderating effect of the moderator variables on the relationship between the type of response and the level of disapproval, we will do a moderation analysis using the PROCESS macro extension for SPSS (Hayes, 2012).

The moderation analysis includes the disapproval pre-score as a covariate to control for its potential influence on the post-score, which means in the end we only assess how condition affects the change in disapproval. We will have one model (Model 1) test the moderation effect without including the pre-score, and another model (Model 2) to assess the moderation effect while controlling for the pre-score. Each model will be tested twice, one

time with feminism, and the other with gender of the responder as the moderators. Since PROCESS macro allows for covariates to be included, we will use this for all our relevant analyses. Additionally, the variable type of response (a.k.a. condition) will be dummy coded, which PROCESS macro also allows for.

## **Results**

To recapitulate, our main hypotheses were H1: Direct confrontation elicits more disapproval than the control, H2: Humorous confrontation is more effective than the control, but less effective than direct confrontation, H3: The gender of the responder moderates the relationship between the type of response and disapproval levels, with men being more effective than women, and lastly, H4: The extent to which someone identifies as a feminist also moderates the relationship between the type of response and disapproval, with higher feminism meaning higher disapproval.

### **Preliminary Analysis**

Prior to conducting the main analyses, preliminary analyses were performed to check for any violations of assumptions. The normality assumption was not met, but this is not necessary, considering each condition has more than 20 participants. One participant went from one extreme (strongly disapprove) for the disapproval prescore, to another (strongly approve) for the postscore, while being in the control condition. Since this is theoretically unlikely and this one finding severely skewed the results of the homogeneity of regression slopes assumption, it was decided to remove this case. Without it the regression slopes run roughly parallel, meaning we meet that assumption. The linearity assumption also seems to be met.

Descriptive statistics and correlations were examined for all variables included in the analysis. Table 1 displays the means and standard deviations. The correlations (as seen in table 2) revealed significant positive associations between the disapproval pre- and postscores, and between feminism and both disapproval scores. The disapproval scores were highly correlated, whereas feminism and the disapproval scores were moderately correlated.

**Table 1.** *Descriptive Statistics*

	N	M (SD)	Min	Max
Age	135	26.09 (10.55)	17	72
Disapproval Pre-score	135	6.11 (1.13)	2	7
Disapproval Post-score	135	6.00 (1.28)	2	7
Feminism	126	4.05 (1.78)	1	7
<b>Disapproval</b>				
Per condition				
Control	45	6.13 (1.14)	3	7
Confrontation	44	5.77 (1.51)	2	7
Humour	46	6.09 (1.15)	3	7

**Table 2.** *Correlations*

		Disapproval Prescore	Disapproval Postscore	Gender	Feminism
Disapproval Pre-score	Pearson Correlation	1	,792**	,075	,343**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<,001	,390	<,001
Disapproval Post-score	N	135	135	135	126
	Pearson Correlation	**	1	,117	,289**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			,178	,001
	N		135	135	126
Gender	Pearson Correlation			1	-,062
	Sig. (2-tailed)				,493
Feminism	N			135	126
	Pearson Correlation	**	**		1
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N				126

\*\**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

## ANCOVA

Results of the ANCOVA analysis indicated that neither direct confrontation ( $\beta = 0.241, p = .149$ ) nor humorous confrontation ( $\beta = 0.219, p = .183$ ) had statistically significant effects on disapproval levels when controlling for the covariate. Partial eta squared values for both conditions were small ( $\eta^2 < .02$ ), suggesting very limited variance in disapproval levels explained by the conditions. This means that we failed to find evidence that supports H1 and H2.

### Model 1: Unadjusted Moderation Model

The results of the first analysis, with feminism as the moderator, indicated that the overall model was significant ( $R^2 = .137, F(5, 120) = 3.819, p = .003$ ). However, since none of the interaction effects are significant, we failed to find evidence that supports H3 for now. The same analysis was run with gender as a moderator. This resulted in a non-significant model ( $R^2 = .40, F(5, 129) = 1.072, p = .379$ ), which means that gender does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between the type of response and disapproval.

**Table 3.** Results Unadjusted Moderation Models

	coeff	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
<b>Feminism</b>						
Control	6.141	.192	31.921	.000	5.760	6.522
Confrontation	-.361	.271	-1.335	.185	-.897	.175
Humour	-.072	.269	.268	.790	-.604	.460
Feminism*Control	.220	.122	1.807	.073	-.021	.460
Feminism*Confrontation	.156	.159	.978	.330	-.159	.470
Feminism*Humour	.175	.157	1.114	.267	-.486	.136
<b>Gender</b>						
Control	6.000	.272	22.094	.000	5.463	6.537
Confrontation	-.227	.384	.039	.555	-.987	.533
Humour	-.200	.372	-.677	.592	-.936	.538
Gender*Control	.261	.380	.688	.494	-.491	1.012
Gender*Confrontation	-.261	.540	-.483	.630	-1.330	.808
Gender*Humour	.368	.535	.687	.493	-.691	1.427

### Model 2: Moderation Model with Covariates

After controlling for the disapproval pre-score, the overall model remained significant ( $R^2 = .665$ ,  $F(6, 119) = 39.428$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The inclusion of the pre-score did not reveal a significant effect, meaning we can conclude that feminism does not affect disapproval rates, so we failed to find evidence that supports H3. After running the same analysis with gender, we do find a significant effect of the model ( $R^2 = .638$ ,  $F(6, 128) = 37.650$ ,  $p < .001$ ), however this is caused by the fact that the relationship between the pre-score and the post-score is significant ( $p < .001$ ). In Table 4, we see that none of the other effects are significant, so we can conclude that gender does not moderate the relationship between the type of response and disapproval, which does not support our last hypothesis H4.

### *Covariate Effects*

Additionally, the results revealed significant main effects of the pre-score ( $\beta = .886$ ,  $t = 13.70$ ,  $p < .001$ ), on the post-score in the analysis with feminism, indicating that the pre-score independently influenced the post-score. This is also the case for the analysis with gender ( $\beta = .892$ ,  $t = 14.553$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Both results are to be expected, since there is a direct relation between the two scores.

**Table 4.** Results Moderation Model with Covariates

	coeff	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
<b>Feminism</b>						
Control	.789	.409	1.932	.056	-.020	1.599
Confrontation	-.294	.169	-1.737	.085	-.629	.041
Humour	-.259	.169	-1.536	.127	-.593	.075
Feminism*Control	-.021	.078	-.263	.793	-.175	.134
Feminism*Confrontation	.137	.010	1.379	.171	-.060	.334
Feminism*Humour	-.041	.099	-.412	.689	-.236	.155
Disapproval Pre-score	.886	.065	13.703	.000	.758	1.014
<b>Gender</b>						
Control	.690	.401	1.719	.088	-.104	1.484
Confrontation	-.349	.237	-1.473	.143	-.817	.120
Humour	-.276	.230	-1.204	.231	-.730	.178
Gender*Control	.027	.235	.123	.910	-.438	.491
Gender*Confrontation	.217	.335	.648	.518	-.445	.479
Gender*Humour	.128	.330	.388	.699	-.525	.782
Disapproval Pre-score	.892	.061	14.553	.000	.771	1.013



## Discussion

The present study aimed to examine the influence of different response types to a sexist comment on disapproval rates, while considering the moderating role of both feminism and gender of the responder. Although the results did not yield statistically significant effects, several important points emerged from the analysis, and it is essential to interpret the findings in light of our study's limitations.

We hypothesised that the different conditions would elicit different disapproval rates, but we failed to find evidence that supports that. These findings suggest that the chosen response types may not significantly influence individuals' levels of disapproval in response to a sexist comment in the current study. With that in mind, it is not surprising that we did not find any evidence that supports our other hypotheses. If the relationship between condition and disapproval does not exist, of course we will not find any other significant effects. However, it is worth noting that effect sizes for these main effects were not negligible, and future research with larger sample sizes might uncover more nuanced effects.

These results are fairly surprising, since there is sufficient theoretical basis to suggest that we would find some significant effects. Due to the nature of this study however, with the main goal being education and not actual publication, it is to be expected that it is not perfect. Just because we did not find any significant effects this time, does not mean that the relationship does not actually exist in the population. There is still a lot to improve here, but we can use what we learned to improve this research in the hope that next time, we will find a relationship between response types and disapproval.

## Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged. Firstly, the sample size in this study was relatively small, which may have restricted the statistical power to detect significant effects. A larger sample size would enhance the study's ability to identify more nuanced effects and increase the generalizability of the findings.

Secondly, the use of self-report measures may have introduced common method bias and potential social desirability biases. In this case, the likelihood of a social desirability bias is very high, considering in our current political climate, sexism is seen as undesirable, and being sexist is usually seen as wrong. This is supported by our data, since the average rates of disapproval are relatively high. Future studies could benefit from incorporating additional objective or behavioural measures to complement the self-report data, providing a more comprehensive understanding of participants' responses.

Furthermore, the study focused on a specific context and utilized a convenience sample, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other populations or settings. Replication with diverse samples and in different contexts is necessary if we want to make meaningful inferences about the population. Our sample's average age is relatively low, so maybe the fact that we did not find any relationships is because of potential age differences in the societal normality of sexism (i.e. old people thinking sexism is more normal than younger people).

Lastly, the study relied on cross-sectional data, limiting our ability to establish causal relationships. Future research could employ longitudinal designs to investigate the temporal dynamics and directionality of the observed associations. During the design phase of this study, it was considered to use a post-measure at a later date, to see if the potential effects of the conditions remained over time. We opted to not do that, since it complicated things too much, however for future research it could be an interesting aspect to research.

In conclusion, despite not obtaining statistically significant results, this study contributes to the existing literature on sexism and how to respond to it. The non-significant findings emphasise the importance of considering limitations, such as the sample size, methodological aspects, and generalizability. Future research with larger samples and refined methodologies can build upon these findings and provide further insights into the complex dynamics of response types and disapproval rates of sexism.

## References

- Becker, J. C., Zawadzki, M. J., & Shields, S. A. (2014). Confronting and reducing sexism: A call for research on intervention. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 603–614.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12081>
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96*, 608–630.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532–544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923>
- Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., & Mark, A. Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 784–803. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.784>
- Dodd, E. H., Giuliano, T. A., Boutell, J. M., & Moran, B. E. (2001). Respected or rejected: Perceptions of women who confront sexist remarks. *Sex Roles, 45*, 567–577.  
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014866915741>
- Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Antiblack discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 101–116.
- Fischer, A. R., & Holz, K. B. (2010). Testing a model of women's personal sense of justice, control, well-being, and distress in the context of sexist discrimination. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*(3), 297–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01576.x>

Fischer, A. R., Tokar, D. M., Mergl, M. M., Good, G. E., Hill, M. S., & Blum, S. A. (2000).

Assessing women's feminist identity development: Studies of convergent, discriminant, and structural validity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 15–29.

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

discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo Czopp, Monteith / *CONFRONTING PREJUDICE 543 (Eds.)*, *Gender issues in contemporary society*. Claremont

*Symposium on Applied Social Psychology* (pp. 173-196). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The

psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment.

*Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 117–138.

Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting sexism: The role of

relationship orientation and gender. *Sex Roles*, 63, 463–474.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-98387>.

Gigerenzer G., Todd P. (1999). Simple heuristics that make us smart. Oxford University

Press.

Hayes, A. F. (2012). PROCESS: A versatile computational tool for observed variable

mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling [White paper]. Retrieved

from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/process2012.pdf>

Hyers, L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to

anti-Black racism, anti-semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles*, 56, 1–12.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9142-8>.

- Hyers, L. L., & Swim, J. K. (1998). A comparison of the experiences of dominant and minority group members during an intergroup encounter. *Group processes and intergroup relations*.
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 254–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010>
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2003). Derogating the victim: The interpersonal consequences of blaming events on discrimination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302030063001>
- Kaiser, C. R., & Miller, C. T. (2004). A stress and coping perspective on confronting sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 168–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2004.00133.x>.
- Klonis, S., Endo, J., Crosby, F., & Worrell, J. (1997). Feminism as life raft. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 333–345.
- Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Campbell, R. (2000). Sexist discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 93–99
- Koudenburg, N., Kannegieter, A., Postmes, T., & Kashima, Y. (2020). The subtle spreading of sexist norms. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(8), 1467–1485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220961838>
- Koudenburg, N., Postmes, T., & Gordijn, E. H. (2011). Disrupting the flow: How brief silences in group conversations affect social needs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 512–515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.12.006>

Koudenburg, N., Postmes, T., & Gordijn, E. H. (2013). Resounding silences: Subtle norm regulation in group interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 76, 224–241.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272513496794>

Lalonde, R. N., & Cameron, J. E. (1994). Behavioral responses to discrimination: A focus on action. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.). *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 7, pp. 257–288). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Landrine, H., Klonoff, E. A., Gibbs, J., Manning, V., & Lund, M. (1995). Physical and psychiatric correlates of gender discrimination: an application of the schedule of sexist events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19(4), 473–492.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1995.tb00087.x>

Miller, C. T., & Kaiser, C. R. (2001). A theoretical perspective on coping with stigma.

*Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 73–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00202>

Moradi, B., & Subich, L. M. (2002). Perceived sexist events and feminist identity development attitudes: Links to women's psychological distress. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 30, 44–65.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory.

*Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 751–783.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>

Petzel, Z. W., & Casad, B. J. (2019). Sexism predicts alcohol use and motivations among college women with stronger alcohol identity. *Social Cognition*, 37(3), 341–354.

<https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2019.37.3.341>

- Rasinski, H. M., & Czopp, A. M. (2010). The effect of target status on witnesses' reactions to confrontations of bias. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 8–16.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530903539754>
- Rodin, M. J., Price, J. M., Bryson, J. B., & Sanchez, F. J. (1990). Asymmetry in prejudice attribution. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 26, 481-504.
- Sabik, N. J., & Tylka, T. L. (2006). Do feminist identity styles moderate the relation between perceived sexist events and disordered eating? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00264.x>
- Scheer, J. R., Batchelder, A. W., Wang, K., & Pachankis, J. E. (2022). Mental health, alcohol use, and substance use correlates of sexism in a sample of gender-diverse sexual minority women. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 9(2), 222–235. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000477>
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 31–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00200>
- Swim, J. K., & Hyers, L. L. (1999). Excuse me—what did you just say?: Women's public and private responses to sexist remarks. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35, 68–88. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1998.1370>
- Swim, J. K., & Thomas, M. A. (2005). Responding to everyday discrimination: A synthesis of research on goal-directed, self-regulatory coping behaviors. In S. Levin, & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality* (pp. 105–128). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.



Szymanski, D. M., Gupta, A., Carr, E. R., & Stewart, D. (2009). Internalized misogyny as a moderator of the link between sexist events and women's psychological distress. *Sex Roles, 61*(1-2), 101–109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9611-y>

UNICEF. (2021) Gender Action Plan 2022-2025.

Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 994–1003.

Yaniv, I. (2004). Receiving other people's advice: Influence and benefit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 93*, 1–13.