

8-23-2016

Does benevolence benefit? Understanding the role of benevolent sexism sub-factors in predicting sexual aggression among men

Alyssa Nicole Shilinsky

Rowan University, shilinska9@students.rowan.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shilinsky, Alyssa Nicole, "Does benevolence benefit? Understanding the role of benevolent sexism sub-factors in predicting sexual aggression among men" (2016). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2045.

<http://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2045>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

**DOES BENEVOLENCE BENEFIT? UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF
BENEVOLENT SEXISM SUB-FACTORS IN PREDICTING SEXUAL
AGGRESSION AMONG MEN**

by

Alyssa Shilinsky

A Thesis

Submitted to the
Department of Psychology
College of Science and Mathematics
In partial fulfillment of the requirement
For the degree of
Master of Arts in Clinical Mental Health Counseling
at
Rowan University
June 15, 2016

Thesis Chair: DJ Angelone, Ph.D.

© 2016 Alyssa Shilinsky

Abstract

Alyssa Shilinsky

DOES BENEVOLENCE BENEFIT? UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF BENEVOLENT SEXISM SUB-FACTORS IN PREDICTION SEXUAL AGGRESSION AMONG MEN

2015-2016

DJ Angelone, Ph.D.

Master of Arts in Clinical Mental Health Counseling

Sexual aggression remains a pervasive problem in our society, with approximately one in five women reporting an unwanted sexual experience (Koss et al., 2007). A key construct associated with sexual aggression may be the endorsement of sexist beliefs, which have been conceptualized along two domains: Hostile and benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Hostile sexist beliefs can predict engagement in sexual aggression (Malamuth et al., 1995); however, there is a paucity of research examining the influence of benevolent sexism on sexual aggression perpetration. The goal of this study is to explore the relationship between the three sub-factors of benevolent sexism (protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy) on sexual aggression using an established laboratory paradigm (Mitchell, Angelone, Hirschman & Lilly, 2002). A total of 188 college men participated in the video showing behavioral analogue of sexual aggression. A hierarchical linear regression revealed that men lower in complementary gender differentiation were more likely to engage in sexual aggression. Future directions and limitations are discussed

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
The Current Study.....	5
Chapter 2: Methodology	7
Participants.....	7
Measures	8
Video Paradigm (Hall & Hirschman, 1993).	8
Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996)	8
Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss et al., 2007)	9
Paulhus Deception Scale (PDS; Paulhus, 1998).....	9
Demographic Questions.....	9
Procedure	10
Chapter 3: Results	13
Manipulation Check.....	13
Video Showing: Descriptive Data.....	13
Video Showing: Predictive Analysis	15
Chapter 4: Discussion	19
References.....	26

List of Tables

Table	Page
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Independent and Dependent Variables (N=188).....	14
Table 2. Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses Predicting Video Showing (N = 188).....	18

Chapter 1

Introduction

Sexual aggression is a broad term that encompasses both rape and sexual assault. Rape is defined as forced sexual intercourse, including vaginal, anal, and oral penetration. Sexual assault is defined as any unwanted sexual contact that may or may not be forced and can involve verbal and physical threats (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1995).

Throughout the literature, a wide variety of terms have been used to refer to rape and sexual assault, however, for the purpose of the current study, we will use the term “sexual aggression.” Contrary to popular belief, the reasons that underlie sexual aggression tend to be more about control and power over women rather than sexual arousal (Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002). Both men and women in college, between the ages of 18 and 25, are at a particularly high risk of either engaging in or being a victim of sexual aggression. For example, in a survey of college men, 22% reported engaging in some type of sexual aggression (Calhoun, Bernat, Clum, & Frame, 1997). In addition, when 7,850 US Navy men were surveyed, approximately 11% of them reported engaging in behaviors that met the legal definition for rape (Merrill, Thomsen, Gold, & Miller, 2001). Currently, there are approximately 300,000 people who report experiencing a form of sexual aggression to the government each year (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2015).

College women appear to be at an especially heightened risk for victimization, with one in five women encountering an unwanted sexual experience (Koss et al., 2007). Despite the high prevalence of sexual aggression, it is one of the most underreported crimes in the United States, suggesting that these rates could be even higher (Koss et al., 2007). Given

both past and current statistics, it is clear that sexual aggression remains a pervasive problem throughout the United States.

A key construct that has been associated with sexual aggression is the endorsement of sexist beliefs, also known as sexism. The original definition of sexism is an antipathy toward women based on their sex (Allport, 1954); however, this definition was thought to be too simplistic to encompass all of its current aspects (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Thus, Glick and Fiske (1996) developed a more modern perspective on sexism, in which people fall on a continuum with their sexist beliefs. These researchers believed that there are two types of sexism; Hostile and benevolent. *Hostile sexism* is the endorsement of blatant, negative stereotypes about women. This type of sexism maintains gender inequality by shunning and degrading women when they fail to subscribe to their gender roles. *Benevolent sexism* is the endorsement of protective, yet patronizing beliefs toward women (Becker & Swim, 2012), and this construct maintains gender inequality by offering women affection and protection only when they behave according to their subscribed gender roles (Becker & Swim, 2012). Glick and Fiske (1996) assert that people can have different levels of both hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. Those who are higher on their hostile sexist beliefs and lower on their benevolent sexist beliefs are known as hostile sexists. Those who are higher on their benevolent sexist beliefs and lower on their hostile sexist beliefs are known as benevolent sexists. Those who have a relatively even mix of benevolent and hostile sexist beliefs are known as ambivalent sexists. Those who are low in both their benevolent and hostile sexist beliefs are known as egalitarian (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexism is the most recent addition to this

more modern view that we have on sexism, and thus, there is less known about this particular construct in relation to other variables.

Given that hostile sexism is an older, more established type of sexism, there is a wide range of literature that supports its relationship to sexual aggression, however, little research has explored benevolent sexism's relationship with sexual aggression. Men's hostile sexist beliefs are predictive of sexual aggression in men, as has been shown across a variety of studies (Abbey, Jacques-Tiura, & LeBreton, 2011; Abbey et al., 2006; Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995; Wheeler, George, & Dahl, 1992). While there is little research examining sexual aggression and benevolent sexism together, some researchers have examined sexual aggression in relation to intimate partner violence (IPV), a construct closely related to sexual aggression (Renzetti, Lynch, & DeWall, 2015). IPV is defined as psychological or physical harm that repeatedly occurs from a partner or spouse (Renzetti, et al., 2015). The findings in regard to benevolent sexism and IPV have been mixed, however, making it difficult to draw global conclusions (Renzetti, et al., 2015). For instance, men who are higher in their benevolent sexist beliefs have been shown to be less likely to engage in IPV (Allen, Swan, & Raghavan, 2009). On the other hand, another set of researchers suggest that there is no relationship between benevolent sexism and IPV (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001). While researchers know that hostile sexist beliefs predict men's engagement in sexual aggression, there is a lack of research with benevolent sexism and sexual aggression, and the research completed thus far has come to variegated results.

Glick and Fiske (1996) conceptualized benevolent sexism as having three distinct sub-factors: *Protective Paternalism*, *Complimentary Gender Differentiation*, and

Heterosexual Intimacy (1996). Protective Paternalism (PP) is the belief that women are considered subordinates who must be protected, and this in turn limits women's rights to freedom and personal responsibilities. Complementary Gender Differentiation (CGD) is the belief that men are justified in being more powerful than women because their gender has given them the necessary traits to be rulers, whereas women inherently do not have these traits. Both PP and CGD emphasize women being weaker, less capable, and less worthy of power than men. Heterosexual Intimacy (HI), on the other hand, is the belief that men, despite being superior to women, are dependent upon women and desire them for sex and intimacy. It believed that this dependency gives women power over men, which can sometimes contribute to men's hostility toward women (Glick & Fiske, 1996). HI emphasizes that men need and want women because they desire an intimate relationship with them in which they can love and be loved in return. Despite these three constructs having been established over 20 years ago, few researchers have sought to thoroughly examine these three sub-factors and their relationship to sexual aggression.

One reason for the paucity of knowledge on how the three sub-factors of benevolent sexism relate to sexual aggression may be the difficulty that researchers have in accurately measuring sexual aggression. Historically, researchers have used self-report as a way to measure an individual's engagement in sexually aggressive behaviors (Hall & Hirschman, 1993). However, because engagement in sexual aggression is socially undesirable, it has been suggested that people are likely to under-report their engagement in these behaviors. Furthermore, given that self-report occurs after the event, men are being asked to provide an accurate depiction of the event based on memory, which is known to be faulty. Thus, there had been a need for an improved methodology to

measure sexual aggression, paving the way for the introduction of behavioral paradigms as a way to more accurately measure this behavior. Over time, researchers have created a variety of different paradigms that serve as analogues for sexual aggression; however, in a recent review of these paradigms, the video-showing paradigm created by Hall & Hirschman (1993) was found to be the most accurate (Davis et al., 2014). This video paradigm involves showing a series of video clips to a man, some of which include violent or sexually explicit content. The man is then asked to select one clip to show to a female peer. If the man shows a sexual clip to the woman, it is analogous to an act of sexual aggression (Hall & Hirschman, 1993). In other words, selecting a sexual clip is conceptualized as a sexually impositional act and is considered sexually aggressive. Research supports the validity of this paradigm, such that this behavior in the lab is associated with sexually aggressive behaviors in the real world (Hall & Hirschman, 1993; Mitchell et al., 2002). To date, however, there is a lack of research that establishes the relationship between hostile sexism and sexual aggression using this paradigm, nor has anyone used this paradigm to explore the benevolent sexism sub-factors in relation to sexual aggression.

The Current Study

Given that sexual aggression against women is still a pervasive problem in our society, it is important to learn about all of the existing factors that contribute to this behavior. The main goal of this study is to examine how the three sub-factors that make up benevolent sexism are related to men's likelihood to engage in sexual aggression via the behavioral paradigm. In addition, a second goal of this study is to further confirm the role hostile sexism has with sexual aggression in a behavioral setting. There are four

hypotheses that coordinate with the four different types of sexist beliefs (hostile sexism, PP, CGD, HI). We expect that men who adopt greater hostile sexist beliefs will be more likely to engage in sexual aggression (Hypothesis 1), given that hostile sexist beliefs have been found to predict men's engagement in sexual aggression in the past (Malamuth et al., 1995). Because Protective Paternalism and Complementary Gender Differentiation emphasize women being subordinate and deserving less power because they have less suitable traits than men (Glick & Fiske, 1996), we expect that men who have adopted these sexist beliefs may also be more likely to engage in sexually aggressive behaviors against women (Hypotheses 2 and 3), given that sexual aggression is about power and control. Heterosexual Intimacy, on the other hand, emphasizes the desire for an emotional connection with women (Glick and Fiske, 1996); thus, we expect that this sub-factor of benevolent sexism will serve as a protective factor and will predict a decrease in sexual aggression among men (Hypothesis 4), given that these men desire intimacy as opposed to power over women.

Chapter 2

Methodology

Participants

Two hundred and twelve male college students who were enrolled in an Essentials of Psychology course at Rowan University signed up to participate in this study for course credit. The study was titled “Themes in the Media,” and participants signed up through SONA, an online listing of psychology research studies going on throughout the department. Participants were required to be 18 years of age or older. A total of 24 participants were omitted from the final analyses of the data. Four of these participants were omitted for being over the age of 25. We had omitted these participants given that they were not within the age range of typical college-aged men. Twenty of these participants were omitted because their responses indicated that they had knowledge of the experimental hypotheses. Of the remaining 188 participants, the mean age of was 19.3 ($SD = 1.3$) years and ranged from 18 to 25 years. With respect to ethnicity, 54.3% identified themselves as European American, 12.8% identified themselves as African American, 10.0% identified themselves as Asian American, 2.4% identified themselves as Latino, and 2.8% identified themselves as Other. With respect to sexual orientation, this sample was predominantly heterosexual (92%). With respect to relationship status, 61.2% identified themselves as single, 13.3% identified themselves as dating, 22.9% identified themselves as being involved in a serious relationship, but not living with a significant other, 2.1% identified themselves as living with a significant other, and 0.5% identified themselves as Other.

Measures

Video paradigm (Hall & Hirschman, 1993). All three of the film clips that were shown to participants in this study were taken from the 2010 version of the film, *I Spit on Your Grave*. Clips from the original version of this movie have been previously used in a paradigm as a way of measuring sexual aggression (Hall & Hirschman, 1993). These particular film clips were rated by participants in a previous pilot study to be neutral, sexual, or sexual-violent. The selected neutral clip is of the main character in *I Spit on Your Grave* discovering a deserted building. The sexually non-violent clip is of the main character spilling wine in her lap and then standing at the kitchen sink in her bra and underwear trying to wash the wine out of her clothing. The sexually violent clip is of the main character being brutally raped by a group of men. Each of these clips are about a minute and a half in length. Prior to the current study, a pilot study was conducted to rate participants' reactions to the film clips across a variety of different emotions. All three film clips were equal in their ratings of tension, however, the sexual film clip was considered to be significantly more sexual than the other two clips, and the sexual-violent clip was considered to be significantly more sexually aggressive than the other two clips.

Ambivalent sexism inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996). The ASI consists of 22 items and asks participants to rate their agreement with the statements on a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*). This measure is comprised of two sub scales that measure the two different types of sexism. The HS subscale consists of 11 items. The BS subscale also contains 11 items and is comprised of the 3 smaller sub-factors, PP, CGD, and HI (Glick & Fiske, 1996). These three sub-factors will serve as the main focus of this study.

Sexual experiences survey (SES; Koss et al., 2007). The SES is a self-report measure of sexual aggression. This measure is scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *N/A*, 4 = *3+ times*). The behaviors that are questioned in this measure are listed on a continuum from consensual sex to forced intercourse. An example item of this survey reads, “Have you ever been so aroused you couldn’t stop?” (Koss et al., 2007). The SES is a widely used self-report measure of sexual behavior listed on a continuum from consensual sex to forced intercourse. The SES has demonstrated good consistency with other variables related to sexual aggression, such as physical aggression, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and traditional sex role beliefs (Lackie & de Man, 1997).

Paulhus deception scale (PDS; Paulhus, 1998). The PDS consists of 40 items and is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not true*, 5 = *very true*). The PDS is a measure used to identify biases, both conscious and unconscious, in self-report. This measure was included to control for social desirability and consists of two subscales, Impression Management (IM) and Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE). Each subscale consists of 20 items. One example item from the IM scale reads “I sometimes tell lies if I have to.” One example item from the SDE scale reads “I don’t care to know what other people really think of me.” Higher scores on the PDS reflect greater social desirability responding (Paulhus, 1998).

Demographic questions. Additional questions were asked to gather more information about the participants. We asked participants five questions regarding their sex, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and relationship status. We also asked them if they had ever seen the film before, if they thought that the film was outdated, and whether or not they would prefer to watch the rest of the film, as we believed that this information

may have affected the participants' reaction to the film clips that they watched.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through the SONA system at a midsize university. The advertisement for participants stated they would be participating in an hour-long study titled "Themes in the Media," in which they would be asked to watch video clips and evaluate various "themes" that are found in the media. In return, the students would be given course credit for their participation. Participants were run individually with a single experimenter and a confederate, which is typical protocol for the Video Showing Paradigm (Hall & Hirschman, 1993). When the participant arrived, he walked into a room with two chairs, with the female confederate already seated. The experimenter asked if both people were there for the "Themes in the Media" study, and after confirmation from them and ID checking, each was given an informed consent. The experimenter explained that both participants would be working together throughout the study, and that one person would be randomly assigned to the role of the "audience member", while the other person would be assigned to the role of the "distributor." It was explained in the informed consent that the distributor would be watching three randomly selected video clips, then would rate the clips for their thematic content and select one to show to the audience member. Participants were also informed during the informed consent that some of the videos might include violent or sexually explicit material.

The study was blinded to the participants and they were unaware that the movie clips have been predetermined for them. After signing the informed consent, the experimenter retrieved a cup with the roles inside. Both pieces of paper in the cup were labeled "Distributor" so that the male would always be assigned this role while the

female would always be assigned the role of the audience member. Once the male picked the role of the distributor, the experimenter led him to another room where he was able to place his belongings into a locker. The experimenter then led the participant into the video showing room, where the first of the three videos was placed into the DVD player by the experimenter. The videos were color-coded and the order was randomized for each participant. The experimenter handed the participant the remote, call button, pencil, manila envelope, and clipboard with the video survey on it. The experimenter explained to the participant that each video clip is only a minute and a half long and that once he is alone, he can hit play, watch the clip all the way through, fill out the post-clip survey, place it in the manila envelope, and then hit the call button for the experimenter to come back and put in the next clip. This process was repeated until all three clips had been viewed by the participant.

Immediately after the experimenter inserted the first clip and exited the room, the confederate was retrieved from original room and taken to the room with the lockers. When the experimenter and the confederate walked past the room where the participant was watching the film clip, the experimenter said, "You can put your belongings in the locker in here," and the confederate replied with "In here?" The experimenter and confederate spoke loudly enough to ensure that the participant in the room heard them. This occurred to maintain the guise that the confederate is a participant in the study.

Upon completing the last questionnaire for the final video clip, the experimenter took the manila envelope and explained to the participant that he now needs to pick one of the three videos to show to the audience member who has been sitting across the hall. The participant put the selected video in the DVD player when the experimenter stepped

out of the room to retrieve the female confederate. The participant was instructed not to hit the play button. The experimenter allowed 30 seconds before re-entering the room with the female confederate. When the female confederate sat down, the experimenter and the male participant exited the room and went back to the room in which they initially started. At this point, the participant was instructed to complete the online survey on the computer, which consisted of all the questionnaires listed in the “Measures” section aside from the video clip survey. The participant was instructed to hit the call button when he was finished. When the participant hit the call button indicating that he was finished, the experimenter returned with the debriefing form, reviewed it with the participant, asked if he had any questions, and then dismissed the participant, assuring him that he would be assigned his credit on SONA within the next 24 hours.

Chapter 3

Results

Manipulation Check

As noted previously, written responses from 20 participants on the manipulation check indicated that they had some understanding of the hypothesis of this experiment. Thus, the data for these participants was omitted from the analyses. The remaining participants' responses to the manipulation check were consistent with the cover story for this study.

Video Showing: Descriptive Data

Overall, 75.0% of men selected the neutral video clip to show the woman, 21.3% of men selected the non-violent sexual clip to show the woman, and 3.7% of men selected the sexual-violent scene to show the woman. Of the participants that showed the sexual and rape clips, 16.5% of them reported a history of engaging in a sexually aggressive behavior, as identified on the SES (Koss et al., 2007). With respect to relationships between the variables, both hostile sexism and complementary gender differentiation were correlated with the type of video chosen ($r(185) = 0.19, p < .01$; $r(185) = -0.17, p < .05$). No significant correlations were revealed among the other variables (See Table 1). SDE was found to be significantly correlated with the other variables in this study; however, IM was not found to be significant, therefore predictive analyses included SDE as a control and we dropped IM from further analyses. Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients of all relevant measures included in analyses.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Independent and Dependent Variables
(N=188)

Variable	M(SD)	α	VC	HS	PP	CGD	HI	IM	SDE
VC	1.29(0.53)	–	–						
HS	2.67(0.89)	0.81	0.19**	–					
PP	3.83(0.87)	0.76	0.03	0.17*	–				
CGD	3.15(0.91)	0.77	-0.17*	0.03	0.32**	–			
HI	3.17(1.08)	0.82	0.09	0.32**	0.49**	0.16*	–		
IM	3.26(2.88)	0.70	0.09	0.08	0.08	-0.06	0.12	–	
SDE	6.19(3.05)	0.68	0.03	-0.21**	-0.01	-0.06	-	0.20**	–
							0.03		

Note. VC = video chosen, HS = Hostile Sexism subscale; PP = Protective Paternalism subscale; CGD = Complimentary Gender Differentiation subscale; HI = Heterosexual Intimacy subscale; IM = Impression Management subscale; SDE = Self-deceptive Enhancement subscale.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Video Showing: Predictive Analysis

We performed a hierarchical linear regression analysis using SPSS software to examine the relationship between the video clip that participants selected and the independent variables. We selected this analysis due to continuous nature of the dependent variable (neutral v. sexual v. sexual violent). More specifically, we were interested in seeing if the three benevolent sexism sub-factors could be predictive over and above hostile sexism. Given that SDE was related to multiple variables, we controlled for it on the first step of the hierarchical linear regression. In step 2, we included hostile sexism in order to replicate previous findings; and in step 3, we included PP, CGD, and HI to see if these variables had an effect on sexual aggression over and above the other variables.

Participants' video clip was coded on a continuum from least sexually aggressive to most sexually aggressive. A coding of 1 indicates that the participant selected the least sexually aggressive video clip (woman walking into a deserted shed). A coding of 2 indicates that the participant selected the moderately sexually impositional video clip (a woman in her bra and underwear). A coding of 3 indicates that a participant selected the most sexually impositional video clip (rape scene). We entered independent variables into the regression hierarchically as follows: first, participants' scores on SDE, second, participants' self-reported hostile sexist beliefs, and third, participants' self-reported beliefs on complementary gender differentiation, heterosexual intimacy, and protective paternalism. SDE was entered first in the order of these variables because we wanted this variable to be controlled for, as we believed that it would skew the data. Hostile sexism was entered second in the order of these variables because we were seeking to replicate

previous research that indicates that this variable has a strong effect on sexually aggressive behaviors (Malamuth, 1986; Malamuth et al., 1995; Mitchell et al., 2002). The three benevolent sexism sub scales were entered third in the order of these variables because we were attempting to predict a relationship between these variables and sexual aggression over and above the relationship between hostile sexism and sexual aggression.

We predicted that hostile sexism would be a significant predictor of video showing, in that the higher men are in their hostile sexist beliefs, the more sexually aggressive their video clip selection will be (Hypothesis 1). As can be seen in Table 2, hostile sexist beliefs were predictive of sexually aggressive behaviors in men ($Beta = .20$, $t(186) = 2.76$, $p < .05$), thus providing support for our hypothesis. In other words, men who display hostile sexist beliefs may be more likely to engage in sexually impositional behaviors.

With respect to benevolent sexism, we predicted that Protective Paternalism would be a significant predictor of video showing, in that men who are higher in PP are more likely to show a sexually aggressive video (Hypothesis 2). As can be seen in Table 2, contrary to our hypothesis, PP did not significantly predict video showing behaviors in men ($Beta = .04$, $t(186) = 0.46$, $p = .65$). We predicted that Complimentary Gender Differentiation would also be a significant predictor of video showing, in that men who are higher in their gender differentiation beliefs may be more likely to show a sexually aggressive video (Hypothesis 3). CGD did predict video showing in men, however, contrary to our hypothesis, CGD had a negative relationship with video showing. As can be seen in Table 2, men who had lower levels of CGD were more likely to show a sexually aggressive video clip ($Beta = -.19$, $t(186) = -2.53$, $p < .05$). In other words, men

who were lower in their CGD beliefs were more likely to engage in a sexually impositional behavior. We predicted that Heterosexual Intimacy would be a significant predictor of video showing, in that men who are lower in HI are more likely to show a sexually aggressive video (Hypothesis 4). As can be seen in Table 2, contrary to our hypothesis, HI did not significantly predict video showing behaviors in men ($Beta = .05$, $t(186) = 0.53$, $p = .60$).

Table 2
Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses Predicting Video Showing (N = 188)

Predictor	β	t	F Change (df)	R^2
Step 1			0.15 (1, 185)	0.00
SDE	0.03	0.39		
Step 2			3.88 (2,184)	0.04*
HS	0.20	2.76*		
Step 3			2.91 (5, 181)	0.07*
PP	0.04	0.46		
CGD	-0.19	-2.53*		
HI	0.05	0.53		

Note. HS = Hostile Sexism subscale; PP = Protective Paternalism subscale; CGD = Complimentary Gender Differentiation subscale; HI = Heterosexual Intimacy subscale.
 * $p < .05$.

Chapter 4

Discussion

As hypothesized, the more hostile sexist beliefs that our participants held, the more likely they were to show a sexually aggressive video clip. While previous studies have supported the relationship between hostile sexism and sexual aggression, this study is the first to replicate these findings using a behavioral paradigm. The video-showing paradigm that was used in the study was recently reviewed among other paradigms for measuring sexual aggression, and it was found that this particular paradigm is the most accurate for measuring sexual aggression (Davis et al., 2014), thus this study is the first to replicate the findings for hostile sexism using the most accurate measurement of sexual aggression. CGD had the opposite relationship of what we had initially predicted in that men who were higher in these beliefs were less likely to engage in sexually aggressive behaviors. As explained earlier, CGD asserts that traditional gender roles are complementary. It promotes the idea that women compliment men because they make up for the traits that men lack (e.g., sensitive, nurturing) (Glick & Fiske, 1996). CGD as a whole does not promote as much dominance over women or hostility toward women as PP does. This sub-factor of benevolent sexism makes women seem like appreciated and admirable counterparts to men. Therefore, CGD may actually be serving as a protective factor in our study. In a recent study on acquaintance rape, researchers found that men who were higher in their CGD beliefs were more likely to attribute blame for the rape to the perpetrator as opposed to the victim (Angelone, Mitchell, & Smith, 2016). Thus, in the current study, men who were high in CGD may have been looking to protect women

from any potential harm that the violent or sexual video clip could have caused due to their beliefs about the sensitive nature of women.

Contrary to our hypotheses, PP and HI, however, did not have a relationship with sexual aggression. One possibility for the lack of relationship between PP and HI could stem from the correlations, particularly between self-deceptive enhancement and the video clip chosen. In previous studies, researchers have found a strong correlation between SDE and sexual aggression or variables related to sexual aggression (Angelone, Mitchell & Smith, 2016; Hall & Hirschman, 1993; Mitchell, Angelone, Hirschman, Lilly & Hall, 2002). Given this, it is surprising that no relationship exists between these two variables in the current study. The lack of correlation that was found between these two variables may explain a lack of predictability in the regression analyses. Given that there was no relationship between PP and HI and sexual aggression, it makes sense that PP and HI will not predict engagement in sexually impositional behaviors. Moreover, hostile sexist beliefs for men at Rowan University were about one standard deviation below the average. In other words, Rowan University students are reporting lower levels of hostile sexist beliefs, which creates even more difficulty in trying to examine these variables.

As mentioned earlier, we controlled for hostile sexism in the hierarchical linear regression as a way to look at the predictability of the three benevolent sexism sub-factors. While we did have a specific purpose for doing this, the fact that we controlled for hostile sexism may be the reason why we did not find much support for some of our hypotheses. This is not to say, however, that these sub scales do not influence sexual aggression, but rather, this implies that hostile sexism may be the more powerful influence. Furthermore, we described four different types of sexism, egalitarian, hostile

sexism, benevolent sexism, and ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). In the current study, we looked at how the benevolent sexism sub-factors and hostile sexism predict sexual aggression as completely separate constructs. It may be, however, the ambivalent sexist ideals that are predicting sexual aggression. Future researchers should look at the likelihood of ambivalent sexist men, or in other words, men who are high in both hostile and benevolent sexism, of engaging in sexual aggression.

Another explanation for the lack of relationship between PP and HI may be that these sub-factors are not related to sexual aggression against women who are complete strangers. As noted earlier, there are mixed findings on the relationship between benevolent sexism overall and variables related to sexual aggression (Renzetti, Wall, & DeLynch, 2015). With respect to IPV, in some cases benevolent sexism had no relationship with IPV (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001), whereas other cases show that benevolent sexism is serving as a protective factor against IPV (Allen, Swan, & Raghavan, 2009). It may be possible that the benevolent sexism sub-factors are, in fact, having more of an effect on sexual aggression when there is a relationship between two people. To date, researchers have not examined PP, CGD, or HI in their relation to sexual aggression between people in romantic relationships. Thus, one future direction may be to examine these constructs among dyads in romantic relationships.

It is also important to note that in this study, the experimenter and the participant were always strangers to one another. The lack of relationship between the experimenter and the confederate may have affected the participants' decision when selecting a video clip. It may be possible that if the male participants were friends with the experimenter, they would have felt more comfortable, as though they are "in their element." If they are

feeling more comfortable, they may be more likely to engage in sexual aggression, perhaps as a way to try to impress their friend, the male experimenter. On the other hand, men may have been less likely to engage in sexual aggression if they were friends with the experimenter because they may have wanted to strive to maintain their levels of social desirability. Researchers have used the joke telling paradigm, another analogue for sexual aggression, to assess how being around peers can affect a man's likelihood to engage in sexual aggression (Schwartz & DeKerseredy, 1997). These researchers found that men are more likely to be sexually aggressive when they are in the presence of other sexually aggressive men (Schwartz & DeKerseredy, 1997). Thus, another future direction should include examining experimenter-participant dyads. Another option should also include placing men in groups throughout the experiment as a way to see if the results that Schwartz and DeKerseredy (1997) found would hold true in the video-showing paradigm.

With regard to video showing, some have argued that simply choosing a sexual or violent video clip to show to a woman is not nearly the same as actually raping or sexually assaulting a woman; and that because of this, we cannot say that we are measuring sexual aggression (Hall & Hirschman, 1993). Behavioral paradigms of sexual aggression have been created as a way to improve upon the limitations of previous measures of sexual aggression, such as self-report. Various behavioral paradigms have been crafted over the years, however, in a recent review, it was agreed upon that the video showing paradigm used in this study is currently the most accurate method for studying sexual aggression in the laboratory setting (Davis et al., 2014).

Moreover, some may also argue that showing a video clip of a woman in her bra and underwear is not sexually aggressive, especially in comparison to showing a video

clip of a rape scene, therefore it should not be considered to be an act of sexual aggression. On the contrary, however, the video-showing analogue for sexual aggression is actually a conservative measure of this construct. It is not easy for men to show sexual and/or violent video clips in the laboratory setting because other people (i.e., the experimenter) are watching them. Research supports the notion that men are, in fact, more likely to engage in sexual aggression when they know they will not be caught (Malamuth, 1981). Moreover, as mentioned earlier, a survey of college men revealed that approximately 22% of men report engaging in sexual aggression. In the current study, 25% of men engaged in sexual aggression by selecting a sexual or sexual-violent video clip. Thus, these findings in our study closely match the real-world statistics on college male perpetration. This provides support that the video-showing analogue is, in fact, an accurate measure of sexual aggression.

Prior to this study, we had conducted a pilot study in which we assessed participants' ratings of these clips. Thus, while the video clip of a woman in her bra and underwear may not seem like an act of sexual aggression, in comparison to the neutral scene, participants from the pilot study had rated the clip of a woman in her bra and underwear as being more sexually aggressive. Furthermore, analyses revealed that there were no significant differences between the group of men who chose the clip of the woman in her bra and underwear and the group of men who chose the clip of the rape scene across the dependent variables. Therefore, both videos are considered to be sexually aggressive when compared to the neutral scene and both groups of men who chose the sexually aggressive videos were not significantly different from one another.

It is important to note that although we did find relationships between certain variables, our study is not without its limitations. Given that this is the first study to attempt to replicate findings with hostile sexism and sexual aggression using a behavioral paradigm and it is the first study to break down the sub-factors of sexual aggression in their relation to sexual aggression, this study can be considered exploratory. This study is the first of many more steps that need to be taken to get to the truth about how these variables take part in acts of sexual aggression. For example, one factor that was not accounted for in this study is the environment. Our actions tend to be a product of the interaction between our personalities and the environment, and in this study, we only examined personality traits. We did not account for how the environment that these men were in may have affected their actions. Furthermore, we cannot confidently say that the video clips that we selected are on a continuum with equivalent intervals. That is to say, the increase in sexually impositional behaviors between the neutral clip and the sexual non-violent clip might not be the same as the increase in sexually impositional behaviors between the sexual non-violent clip and the violent-sexual clip. There may be other video clips that represent other stages of sexually impositional behavior that must be added into this paradigm. With some changes, future researchers might be able to find more evidence to support the relationships between these variables.

Despite the fact that our results mostly differed from what we had originally predicted, we have gained a deeper understanding of sexism and sexual aggression. Our study was the first to confirm the relationship between hostile sexism and sexual aggression using the video showing paradigm. Our study then expanded knowledge on the benevolent sexism sub-factors by confirming that Complementary Gender

Differentiation serves as a protective factor against sexual aggression. In the future, it would be ideal to use this paradigm with men and women in romantic relationships as well as explore the effect of male peer support in engaging in sexual aggression.

Nevertheless, the current study has served as one of many steps that must be taken toward gaining further insight on how men's sexist beliefs are contributing to their likelihood to engage in sexual aggression. As mentioned previously, understanding these behaviors are key in helping to ultimately put an end to them.

References

- Abbey, A., Jacques-Tiura, A., & LeBreton, J. (2011). Risk factors for sexual aggression in young men: An expansion of the confluence model. *Aggressive Behavior, 37*, 450-464.
- Abbey, A., Parkhill, M. R., BeShears, R., Clinton-Sherrod, M.A. & Zawaki, T. (2006). Cross-sectional predictors of sexual assault perpetration in a community sample of single african american and caucasian men. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*, 54-67.
- Allen, C. T., Swan, S. C., & Raghavan, C. (2009). Gender symmetry, sexism, and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 1816-1834.
- Angelone, D.J., Mitchell, D. & Smith, D. (2016). The influence of gender ideology, victim resistance, and spiking a drink on on acquaintance rape attributions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-25*.
- Bargh, J. A., Raymond, P., Pryor, J. B., & Strack, F. (1995). Attractiveness of the underling: An automatic power-sex association and its consequences for sexual harassment and aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 768-781.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1995). *Criminal victimization in the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Calhoun KC, Bernat JA, Clum GA, Frame CL. 1997. Sexual coercion and attraction to sexual aggression in a community sample of young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence 12*, 392-406.
- Chapleau, K. & Oswald, D. (2010). Power, sex, and rape myth acceptance: Testing two models of rape proclivity. *Journal of Sex Research, 47*, 66-78.
- Davis, K., Parrott, D., George, W., Tharp, A., Hall, G. & Stappenback, C. (2014). Studying sexual aggression: A review of the evolution and validity of laboratory paradigms. *Psychology of Violence, 4*, 462-476.
- Forbes, G. B., & Adams-Curtis, L. E. (2001). Experiences with sexual coercion in college males and females: Role of family conflict, sexist attitudes, acceptance of rape myths, self-esteem, and the Big-Five personality factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 865-889.
- Glick, P. & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512.

- Hall, G. C. N. & Hirschman, B. (1993). Use of a new laboratory methodology to conceptualize sexual aggression. In G. C. N. Hall, B. Hirschman, J. R. Graham, & M. S. Zaragoza (Eds.). *Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment, and treatment*, 115-132. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Hillenbrand-Gunn, T. L., Hepner, M. J., Mauch, P. A. & Park, H. (2010). Men as allies: The efficacy of a high school rape prevention intervention. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 88, 43-51.
- Koss, M.P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 357-370.
- Lackie, L., & de Man, A. F. (1997). Correlates of sexual aggression among male university students. *Sex Roles*, 37, 451-457.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37, 138-157.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 953-962.
- Malamuth, N., Linz, D., Heavey, C., Barnes, G. & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 353-369.
- Merrill, L. L., Thomsen, C. J., Gold, S. R. & Milner, J. S. (2001). Childhood abuse and premilitary sexual assault in male navy recruits. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology* 69, 252-261.
- Mitchell, D., Angelone, D. J., Hirschman, R., Lilly, R.S, & Hall, . (2002). Peer modeling and college men's sexually impositional behavior in the laboratory. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 39, 326-333.
- Murnin, S. K., Wright, C. & Kaluzny, G. (2002) If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles*, 46, 359-375.
- Murphy, M. (2006). The fire will not consume us: Exploring the link between homophobia and sexism in US feminism. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 15, 209-221.
- Palm Reed, K. M., Hines, D.A., Armstrong, J. L. & Cameron, A. Y. (2014) Experimental evaluation of a bystander prevention program for sexual assault and dating violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 5, 95-102.

- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). *Paulhus Deception Scales: Users' manual*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health System.
- Parkhill, M. & Abbey, A. (2008). Does alcohol contribute to the confluence model of sexual assault perpetration? *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 27*, 529-554.
- Rapaport, K. & Burkhart, B. R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93*, 216-221.
- Renzetti, C. M., Lynch, K. R. & DeWall, N.C. (2015). Ambivalent sexism, alcohol use, and intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1-28*.
- Schwartz, M. D. and De Keseredy W. S. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support*, Sage Publications, Inc.
- Stahl, T., Eek, D. & Kazemi, A. (2010). Rape victim blaming as system justification: The role of gender activation of complementary stereotypes. *Social Justice Research, 23*, 239-258.
- Swim, J. & Becker, J. (2012). Reducing endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist beliefs: Differential effects of addressing harm versus pervasiveness of benevolent sexism. *Social Psychology, 43*, 127-137.
- Wyre, H. (2009). The fourth wave of feminism: Psychoanalytic perspective introductory remarks. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality, 10*, 185-189.
- Wheeler, J. G., George, W. H. & Dahl, B. J. (2002). Sexually aggressive college males: Empathy as a moderate in the "confluence model" of sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences, 33*, 759-775.
- Yamawaki, N., Darby, R. & Queiroz, A. (2007). The moderating role of ambivalent sexism: The influence of power status on perceptions of rape victim and rapist. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 147*, 41-56.