

---

# ***Sexism & Sex Discrimination***



# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

*SEXIST ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE (SATWS)*

---

<b>Source/Primary reference</b>	Benson, P., & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and validation of the Sexist Attitudes Toward Women Scale (SATWS). <i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i> , 5, 276-291.
<b>Construct measured</b>	Tendency toward and support for sexist attitudes
<b>Brief description</b>	<p>This scale includes 40 items. Each item is rated on a 7-point scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” (high score = high sexism).</p> <p>The items concern 6 content areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Attitudes that women are genetically inferior (emotionally, biologically, intellectually) to men</li><li>2. Belief for the premise that men are entitled to greater power, prestige, and social advantage</li><li>3. Hostility toward women who engage in traditionally masculine roles and behaviors or who fail to fulfill traditional female roles</li><li>4. Lack of support and empathy for the women’s liberation movement and the issues involved in such a movement</li><li>5. Use of derogatory labels and restrictive stereotypes in describing women</li><li>6. Evaluation of women on the basis of attractiveness information and willingness to treat women as sexual objects</li></ol> <p>24 items are sexist remarks and 16 are non-sexist ones (requiring inverse scoring).</p>
<b>Sample items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ I think that men are instinctually more competitive than women.</li><li>■ I see nothing wrong with men who are primarily interested in a women’s body.</li></ul>
<b>Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)</b>	Adult women and men
<b>Translations &amp; cultural adaptations available</b>	None known
<b>How developed</b>	The authors define sexist attitudes toward women as “attitudes that function to place females in a position of relative inferiority to males

---

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXIST ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE (SATWS)

by limiting women’s social, political, economic, and psychological development” (p. 278). Items were written by the authors to reflect multiple hypothesized dimensions of sexism toward women, then refined through pilot testing.

On the basis of feminist literature and discussion with feminists, the authors identified 7 components of sexism toward women. Then, together with 3 colleagues they wrote 20-21 items to assess each of these 7 components. The resulting 141 items were administered to a development sample:

<i>Development Sample</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 886
<i>Description</i>		482 college students; 402 non-college adults
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 487
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 399
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>		Not Reported

As a result, 91 items were retained from the original poll of 141 items. Two of the original 7 components were merged together, thus obtaining the 6 components included in the scale. From the pool of 91 items, the authors chose 10 items for each component, obtaining a 60-item scale. Using the data from the original development sample of 886 people, the authors performed scale intercorrelations. As a result, the 60 items were collapsed into the final single 40-item scale. Using again the data from the development sample relative to the 40 retained items, Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  was calculated to assess SATWS internal consistency. The coefficient obtained was very high: .91.

## Psychometric properties

### STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Study 1</i>		<i>Study 2</i>
<i>Sample Size &amp; Description</i>		Students	<i>n</i> = 80	<i>n</i> = 58
		Non-students	<i>n</i> = 72	Non-student adults
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	28-74		-
	<i>Mean</i>	-		42.7
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Students</i>			
	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 40		-
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 40		-
	<i>Non-students</i>			
	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 38		<i>n</i> = 30
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 34		<i>n</i> = 28
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>		Not reported		Not reported

## VALIDITY

### *Content Validity*

The authors point out that the scale content validity is enhanced by the fact that it covers a wider range of content areas than other scales that measure sex-role stereotypes or attitudes toward women.

The SATWS was not contaminated by social desirability as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

### *Construct Validity*

Overall, SATWS appears to have a very good construct validity:

- It was correlated as expected with attitudinal and behavioral self-report measures in other domains (e.g., literature preferences, driving frequency relative to spouse/partner/lover, making personality attributions as a function of physical appearance).
- It was not correlated with constructs where not expected: social responsibility, creativity, and social desirability (divergent validity).

### *Concurrent Validity*

The SATWS was correlated with other scales that seek to measure similar constructs:

- The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS; Spence & Helmreich, 1972)
- Sex-role stereotypes as measured by a short form of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974)
- Support for the women's liberation movement (Women's Liberation Movement Scale - WLM; Tavis, 1973)

<i>Scale</i>	<i>SATWS</i>
<i>ATWS</i>	.36**
<i>PAQ</i>	-.65**
<i>WLM</i>	.68**

\*\*p<.01

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXIST ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE (SATWS)

---

## RELIABILITY

### *Internal Consistency*

The SATWS had high internal consistency and reliability for both college students and nonstudent adults:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Student Sample</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Non-student Sample</i> $\alpha =$
<b>SATWS</b>	.90	.93

---

### Comments

- SATWS appears to be a better measure for sexism than scales that assess only one or two of the components of sexism.
- Internal consistency, content validity, and construct validity of SATWS were very good; no data were available for test-retest reliability.
- The ethnic/racial make-up of the sample was not reported. It would be useful to assess its validity and reliability for multiple ethnic/racial groups.

---

### Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Schram, P. (1998). Stereotypes about vocational programming for female inmates. *Prison Journal*, 78(8) 244.

---

### Contact Information

Peter L. Benson  
Search Institute  
Thresher Sq West  
700 S. Third St.  
Minneapolis, MN 55415, USA  
Tel: 612-376-8955  
e-mail: [peterb@search-institute.org](mailto:peterb@search-institute.org)

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

*THE AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY (ASI)*

---

**Source/Primary reference** Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491-512.

---

**Construct measured** Hostile and benevolent sexism toward women

---

**Brief description** The ASI consists of 22 items divided into two subscales:

1. Hostile sexism subscale covers three categories:

- Dominative paternalism
- Competitive gender differentiation
- Heterosexual hostility

2. Benevolent sexism subscale covers three categories:

- Protective paternalism
- Complementary gender differentiation
- Heterosexual intimacy

Each subscale consists of 11 items and is rated on a 6-point rating scale from 0 = disagree strongly to 5 = agree strongly.

---

**Sample items**

Hostile Sexism (HS):

- The world would be a better place if women supported men more and criticized them less.
- A wife should not be significantly more successful in her career than her husband.
- There are many women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

Benevolent Sexism (BS):

- Every woman should have a man to whom she can turn for help in times of trouble.
  - Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
  - People are not truly happy in life unless they are romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
- 

**Appropriate for whom  
(i.e. which population/s)** Adults

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY (ASI)

## Translations & cultural adaptations available

There are multiple versions: Turkish, German, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Korean, Japanese

## How developed

The researchers developed 140 statements to represent the conceptual categories derived from their theoretical analysis. Items were included to assess subjective positive feelings men have toward women. Nine items were adapted from Katz and Hass's (1988) Pro-black Scale, converting the target group to women (e.g., Women do not have the same employment opportunities that men do). Several items expressed recognition of continuing discrimination against women (e.g., Popular culture is very sexist). Six obviously correct/incorrect statements were included to assess validity and response biases (e.g., Few secretarial jobs are held by women).

Based on the results of an initial study, items with extreme means, based on cutoffs of 1 or less and 4 or more, were excluded. Items excluded included the 6 validity items and 22 other items. The remaining 22 items were chosen on the basis of:

- a. the items' tendency to load consistently highly on the HS and BS factors that emerged in the separate factor analyses for men and women.
- b. maintaining diversity in the various aspects of sexism apparently tapped by the items.
- c. consistent performance by the items in subsequent studies (Studies 1 to 4 described below).

## Psychometric properties

### STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>	<i>Study 3</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 833	<i>n</i> = 171	<i>n</i> = 937
<i>Description</i>		Students from 3 universities; 2 in MA & 1 in Midwest	Students from 1 university in MA	Students from 1 university in MA
<i>Age</i>	<i>Mean</i>	19.5-20.7	Similar to Study 1†	Similar to Studies 1 & 2
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 94	<i>n</i> = 541
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 353	<i>n</i> = 77	<i>n</i> = 396
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>White</i>	76-86%‡	Similar to Study 1†	81%‡
	<i>Asian</i>			6%

† Authors state that although age and ethnicity were not recorded, the sample appears to be similar to the sample in Study 1.

‡ No additional race/ethnicity detail is reported.

<b>Age</b>	<b>Range</b>	18-77		Similar to Study 2†
	<b>Median</b>	34		
	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Study 4</b>	<b>Study 5</b>	<b>Study 6</b>
	<b>Sample Size</b>	<i>n</i> = 144	<i>n</i> = 112	<i>n</i> = 85
	<b>Description</b>	Non-student adults recruited in MA	Non-student adults recruited in MA and Midwest	Students from 1 university in MA
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Female</b>	<i>n</i> = 72	<i>n</i> = 76	<i>n</i> = 41
	<b>Male</b>	<i>n</i> = 72	<i>n</i> = 36	<i>n</i> = 44
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>White</b>	83%‡		Similar to Study 2†

†Authors state that sample 6 is similar in characteristics to the sample in Study 2.

‡No additional race/ethnicity detail is reported.

## VALIDITY

### *Content Validity*

Study 2: In order to control for socially desirable responses, participants completed both the ASI and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1988). ASI was not related to the Self-Deception scale but showed a significant correlation with the BIDR Impression Management scale.

### *Construct Validity*

To assess construct validity of the two scales, participants in Studies 4-6 were given a semantic differential scale used by Eagly et al. (1991) to measure attitudes toward specific social groups. The authors predicted that HS would be correlated with negative attitudes toward women and BS would be correlated with positive attitudes toward women. As expected, the overall ASI score did not predict general attitudes toward women. Also as predicted, for men in the nonstudent samples (Studies 4 and 5) the two subscales had the opposite relationships to attitude toward women. In these two studies, the more men expressed positive attitudes toward women, the more benevolent and the less hostile sexism they expressed. Corresponding correlations were not found in the student sample (Study 6), and the results for women were less consistent.



# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

THE AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY (ASI)

Expected differences between women and men were found in all six studies (all  $F$ 's  $> 4.82$ ,  $p < .05$ ), with men scoring higher than women on both subscales.

## Concurrent Validity

In the second study, participants completed four scales that measure sexism and hostility toward women:

- Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS; Spence & Helmreich, 1972)
- Old-Fashioned Sexism Scale (Swim et al., 1995)
- The Modern Sexism Scale (Swim et al., 1995)
- Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA; Burt, 1980)

The ASI showed moderate correlations with most of the other measures of sexism:

<i>ASI Scale</i>	<i>AWS</i>	<i>Old-fashioned sexism</i>	<i>Modern sexism</i>	<i>RMA</i>
<i>ASI</i>	.63**	.42**	.57**	.54**
<i>HS</i>	.68**	.48**	.65**	.61**
<i>BS</i>	.40**	.24**	.33**	.32**

## Controlling for Impression Management

<i>ASI</i>	.61**	.38**	.62**	.54**
<i>HS</i>	.67**	.44**	.70**	.61**
<i>BS</i>	.38**	.19**	.36**	.31**
<i>HS controlling for BS</i>	.60**	.43**	.60**	.55**
<i>BS controlling for HS</i>	.04	-.03	-.06	-.02

\*\* $p < .01$

## Cross-Cultural Validity

Glick et al. (2000) administered the ASI in 19 nations. The complex factor structure of the ASI (HS and BS with 3 subfactors) was replicated in confirmatory factor analyses (the preferred model was the best fit in 16 of the 19 nations). In 12 nations in which spontaneous stereotypes of women were measured, HS predicted negative and BS predicted positive valences in stereotypic traits. Despite the relationship of BS to subjectively positive images of women, national averages on BS (as well as on HS) scores were negatively related to national indicators of gender equality.

**RELIABILITY**

***Internal Consistency***

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Study 1</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 2</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 3</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 4</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 5</i> $\alpha =$	<i>Study 6</i> $\alpha =$
<b>ASI</b>	.92	.88	.83	.83	.87	.90
<b>HS</b>	.92	.87	.80	.87	.91	.89
<b>BS</b>	.85	.75	.77	.78	.73	.83

The Benevolent Sexism subscale consistently presents lower alpha coefficients, which can be explained by the limited number of items, considering its multidimensional nature.

**Comments**

- In cross-national comparisons, BS and HS negatively predict national indicators of gender equality (which included health-related measures such as gender differences in longevity).
- Has been shown to be reliable and valid for cross-cultural use.
- The U.S. study samples were predominantly white. It would be useful to have more information about the scale's validity and reliability for multiple ethnic/racial groups within the U.S.

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Glick, P., et al. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 763-775.

Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 1323-1334.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.

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

Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N. & Ferreira, M. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 292-297.

**Contact Information**

No cost, but permission to use the AMI is required for commercial uses. Contact Peter Glick.  
e-mail: [glickp@lawrence.edu](mailto:glickp@lawrence.edu)

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

**THE AMBIVALENCE TOWARD MEN INVENTORY (AMI)**

**Source/Primary reference**

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23(3), 519-536.

**Construct measured**

Women's hostile and benevolent prejudices toward men

**Brief description**

The AMI consists of 20 items divided into two subscales:

1. Hostility toward men (HM)
2. Benevolence toward men (BM)

Each subscale addresses three subfactors of male structural power:

1. paternalism/maternalism
2. gender differentiation
3. sexuality

The responses on a 6-point rating scale range from 0 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

**Sample items**

Hostility toward Men

- Men will always fight for greater control in society.
- Most men are really like children.
- When in positions of power, men sexually harass women.

Benevolence toward Men

- Even if both work, women should take care of men at home.
- Men are more willing to risk self to protect others.
- Every woman needs a male partner who will cherish her.

**Appropriate for whom  
(i.e. which population/s)**

Adults|

**Translations & cultural  
adaptations available**

Has been used successfully in cross-cultural work (Glick et al., 2003)

**How developed**

This instrument aims to measure women's hostile and benevolent prejudices and stereotypes about men. Theoretical analysis led the authors to distinguish between two dimensions of the phenomenon: 1) **Hostility toward men** (which taps Resentment of paternalism, Compensatory

gender differences, and Heterosexual hostility) and 2) **Benevolence toward men** (which taps Materialism, Complementary gender differences, and Heterosexual intimacy).

The authors conducted three studies to develop AMI. In the first, respondents answered 133 questions rated on a five-point Likert-type scale. Many of these items were inspired by discussions of a small group of women who recorded their attitudes toward men in the absence of the researchers. Study 1 was used to select 32 items that most cleanly loaded on the separate factors, and would be used in the following studies. Further analysis reduced the items of the scale to 20.

**Psychometric properties**

**STUDY SAMPLES:** Three studies established AMI’s psychometric properties.

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>	<i>Study 3</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 480	<i>n</i> = 208	<i>n</i> = 266
<i>Description</i>		Students from 3 universities; 2 in MA & 1 in Midwest	Students from 1 university in MA	Nonstudent adults from the Midwest
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	>90% 17 – 24	Similar to Study 1†	16 – 86
	<i>Median Women</i>	‡	‡	44
	<i>Median Men</i>	‡	‡	48
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 333	<i>n</i> = 134	<i>n</i> = 164
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 147	<i>n</i> = 74	<i>n</i> = 102
<i>Race/ Ethnicity</i>	<i>White</i>	86.5%	Similar to Study 1†	95%
	<i>Asian</i>	4%		3%
	<i>Hispanic</i>	1.4%		<1%
	<i>Native American</i>	1%		‡
	<i>African American</i>	1.2%		1.4%
	<i>Unspecified</i>	5.9%		‡

† Authors state that the sample is similar to the sample in Study 1.

‡ Not reported

**VALIDITY**

**Construct Validity**

The complex structure of the AMI (HM and BM subscales each with 3 subfactors) was replicated in 11/12 nations with sufficient sample size for confirmatory factor analysis (Glick et al., 2003). HM (negatively)

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

*THE AMBIVALENCE TOWARD MEN INVENTORY (AMI)*

---

and BM (positively) predicted the valence of stereotypes toward men in the 6 nations in which this has been tested (Glick & Fiske, 1999; Glick et al., 2003).

## RELIABILITY

### *Internal Consistency*

Internal consistency was established in Studies 1 through 3.

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Cronbach's <math>\alpha</math> Range</i>
<i>HM</i>	.81 - .86
<i>BM</i>	.79 - .83
<i>Overall</i>	.83 - .87

The AMI scales are highly reliable. Average alpha coefficients in a 16-nation study were .76 for HM and .77 for BM (Glick et al., 2003).

---

## Comments

- Average HM and BM scores are negatively related to national indicators of gender equality in cross-national comparisons, which include measures, such as longevity, that are related to health (Glick et al., 2003). These data suggest that HM, despite being associated with negative stereotypes of men, justifies gender inequality (by characterizing men as arrogant, yet powerful).
- Good evidence of cross-cultural reliability and validity.

---

## Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The ambivalence toward men inventory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23(3), 519-536.

Glick, P., Lameiras, M., & Castro, Y. R. (2002). Education and Catholic religiosity as predictors of hostile and benevolent sexism toward women and men. *Sex Roles*, 47, 433-441.

Glick, P. et al. (2003). Hostile as well as Benevolent Attitudes Toward Men Predict Gender Hierarchy: A 16-Nation Study. Lawrence University, Appleton, WI. Manuscript submitted for publication.

---

## Contact Information

No cost, but permission to use the AMI is required for commercial uses. Contact Peter Glick.  
e-mail: [glickp@lawrence.edu](mailto:glickp@lawrence.edu)

---

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

*TITLE OF MEASURE*

*SCHEDULE OF SEXIST EVENTS (SSE)*

<b>Source/Primary reference</b>	Klonoff, E. A., & Landrine, H. (1995). The schedule of sexist events. <i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i> , 19(4), 430-472.
<b>Construct measured</b>	Lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives
<b>Brief description</b>	The SSE is a self-report inventory containing 20 items that are each rated in three different ways: once for the frequency in the last year, another time for the frequency in the respondent's lifetime, and a third time for appraising the stressfulness of each event. Response options range from 1 = the event never happened to me, to 6 = the event happens all of the time for the first two subscales, and 1 = not at all stressful to 6 = very stressful, for the third subscale.
<b>Sample items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisor because you are a woman?</li> <li>▪ How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away and other actions) to deal with some sexist thing that was done to you?</li> </ul>
<b>Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)</b>	Adult women
<b>Translations &amp; cultural adaptations available</b>	None known
<b>How developed</b>	The authors developed 23 items for the scale based on input from women in a variety of contexts. Women were approached on a college campus, in nine small office buildings, and while waiting in a local airport and were asked to complete an anonymous survey. During the data analysis, three items did not load on any factor, so they were omitted from the scale, yielding a final scale with 20 items.

**Psychometric properties**

*STUDY SAMPLE*

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		n = 631
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	18-73
	<i>M (SD)</i>	32.14 (11.74)
	<i>Median</i>	29
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	100%

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

SCHEDULE OF SEXIST EVENTS (SSE)

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Black</b>	<i>n</i> = 38
	<b>Latina</b>	<i>n</i> = 117
	<b>Asian American</b>	<i>n</i> = 25
	<b>White</b>	<i>n</i> = 403
	<b>Other</b>	<i>n</i> = 46
<b>Participants</b>		<b>Demographics</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>College or Graduate Degree</b>	<i>n</i> = 119
	<b>Some College</b>	<i>n</i> = 340
	<b>High School or Less</b>	<i>n</i> = 129
<b>Income</b>	<b>Range</b>	\$0 - \$400,000
	<b><i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)</b>	\$34,058 (\$34,370)
<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>Single</b>	<i>n</i> = 292
	<b>Married</b>	<i>n</i> = 238
	<b>Widowed/Separated/</b>	<i>n</i> = 101
	<b>Divorced</b>	

## VALIDITY

### **Construct Validity**

The data were entered in a principal components analysis with an orthogonal rotation and factors retained based on an eigenvalue equal to or greater than 1.00. Four factors emerged from the analysis, accounting for 58.8% of the variance:

- Sexist degradation and its consequences (I)
- Sexism in distant relationships (II)
- Sexism in close relationships (III)
- Sexist discrimination in the workplace (IV)

### **Concurrent Validity**

SSE was compared to two measures of frequency of stressful events: the Psychiatric Epidemiology Research Interview-Life Events Scale (PERI-LES; Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, & Dohrenwend, 1978) and the Hassles Frequency Scale (Hassles-F; Kanner, Coyne, Schaeffer, & Lazarus, 1981).

	<b>SSE-Recent</b>	<b>PERI-LES</b>	<b>Hassles-F</b>
<b>Scale</b>	<b><i>r</i> =</b>	<b><i>r</i> =</b>	<b><i>r</i> =</b>
<b>SSE-Lifetime</b>	.75	.27	.24
<b>SSE-Recent</b>		.27	.24
<b>PERI-LES</b>			.32

*Note:* All correlations are significant at  $p < .00005$

<i>SSE Factors</i>					
<i>Scale</i>	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>	<b>IV</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<i>Scale</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
<b><i>Lifetime</i></b>					
Hassles-F	.21	.19	.22	.22	.24
PERI-LES	.26	.23	.21	.17	.27
<b><i>Recent</i></b>					
Hassles-F	.19	.20	.17	.23	.29
PERI-LES	.28	.15	.19	.18	.27

**RELIABILITY**

***Internal Consistency***

Internal consistency reliability was calculated for all the subscales of the SSE Lifetime and Recent

<i>SSE-Lifetime</i>	<i>Cronbach's α =</i>
<i>Sexist degradation and its consequences</i>	.89
<i>Sexism in distant relationships</i>	.82
<i>Sexism in close relationships</i>	.67
<i>Sexist discrimination in workplace</i>	.68
<b><i>TOTAL</i></b>	<b>.92</b>

<i>SSE-Recent</i>	<i>Cronbach's α =</i>
<i>Sexist degradation and its consequences</i>	.88
<i>Sexism in distant relationships</i>	.74
<i>Sexist discrimination in workplace</i>	.70
<i>Sexism in close relationships</i>	.61
<b><i>TOTAL</i></b>	<b>.90</b>

***Test-Retest Reliability***

Test-retest reliability was not considered an adequate way to assess the reliability of the scales since a single event occurring on a day would change the scores of both scales. However, a test-retest analysis was conducted with a small sample of 50 college women, over an interval of two weeks.

<i>Scale</i>	<i>r =</i>
<i>SSE-Lifetime</i>	.70**
<i>SSE-Recent</i>	.63**

\*\* $p < .01$



# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

SCHEDULE OF SEXIST EVENTS (SSE)

Split-half reliability was deemed to be the best way to assess the test-retest reliability of both SSE-Lifetime and SSE-Recent scales.

Scale	r =
SSE-Lifetime	.87***
SSE-Recent	.83***

\*\*\* $p < .001$

## Comments

- Evidence that experiences of sexism as measured by the SSE are related to both physical and mental health of women.
- The sample contained only a small number of African American and Asian American women. The factor structure might have been different if the sample were more ethnically and racially diverse.
- The lack of information about the women's appraisal of the stressfulness of sexist events is a limitation of the scale.

## Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

Klonoff, E., Landrine, H., & Campbell, R. (2000). Sexist discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 93-99.

Landrine, H., Klonoff, E., 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, 473-492.

Yoder, J., & McDonald, T. (1998). Measuring sexist discrimination in the workplace: Support for the validity of the Schedule of Sexist Events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 487-491.

## Contact Information

Elizabeth A. Klonoff  
Department of Psychology  
San Diego State University  
5500 Campanile Drive  
San Diego, CA 92182-4611, USA

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

**STIGMA CONSCIOUSNESS QUESTIONNAIRE (SCQ)**

---

<b>Source/Primary reference</b>	Pinel, E. C. (1999) Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 76(1), 114-128.
<b>Construct measured</b>	The extent to which people focus on their stereotyped status
<b>Brief description</b>	The SCQ (originally designed for use with women) can be modified for use with any stereotyped group. It predicts perceptions of discrimination as well as many negative consequences of discrimination (e.g., impaired performance, disidentification, and lowered self-esteem). The SCQ consists of 10 items on a rating scale from 0 = disagree strongly to 6 = agree strongly. 7 items are reverse scored.
<b>Sample items</b>	Examples from SCQ for Women: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Stereotypes about women have not affected me personally.</li><li>▪ When interacting with men, I feel like they interpret all my behaviors in terms of the fact that I am a woman.</li><li>▪ Most men have a lot more sexist thoughts than they actually express.</li></ul>
<b>Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)</b>	Adults, although one could theoretically modify the scale for use with children.
<b>Translations &amp; cultural adaptations available</b>	None currently
<b>How developed</b>	<p>The initial version of the scale was the SCQ for women. The 16 original items were written to span two broad content areas: 1) women's phenomenological experiences when interacting with men, and 2) beliefs about how men view women. At the end of Study 1, 10 items of the original questionnaire were retained.</p> <p>Studies 2, 3, 4, and 5 provide evidence for the scale's psychometric properties. Studies 3 and 4 tested the generalizability of the construct to gays and lesbians and ethnic/racial minority groups. Study 6 illustrated some consequences of stigma consciousness.</p>

---

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

STIGMA CONSCIOUSNESS QUESTIONNAIRE (SCQ)

## Psychometric properties

### STUDY SAMPLES

Participants		Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
Sample Size		n = 753	n = 86 (phase 1) n = 57 (phase 2)	n = 66
Description		Female introductory psychology students	Female introductory psychology students. 44 women who completed phase 1 participated in phase 2.	Gay men and lesbians recruited at the 1997 Gay Pride Festival, San Diego, California
Age	Mean	19.5-20.7	19	not known
Gender	Female	n = 753	n = 94	n = 27
	Male	n = 0	n = 77	n = 23
Race/Ethnicity (when indicated)	White	n = 472	n = 46	
	Black	n = 62	n = 6	
	Asian	n = 83	n = 8	
	Hispanic	n = 101	n = 11	
	Native American	n = 4	n = 4	

Participants		Study 4	Study 5	Study 6
Sample Size		n = 337	n = 393	n = 81
Description		Introductory psychology students	23 gay men and 27 lesbians who participated in Study 3. 142 men, 201 women, 200 Whites and 21 Blacks who participated in Study 4.	Female college students
Age	Mean	Not known	Not known	Similar to Studies 1 & 2
Gender	Female	n = 201	n = 228	n = 541
	Male	n = 136	n = 165	n = 396
Race/Ethnicity (when indicated)	White	n = 198	n = 200	81%
	Black	n = 21	n = 21	6%
	Asian	n = 63		
	Hispanic	n = 53		
	Native American			

**VALIDITY**

***Construct Validity***

Study 1: A principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted for the initial 16 SCQ items. Only one factor with an eigenvalue of 2.92 emerged, accounting for 83% of the common variance and 11% of the total variance. 10 SCQ items that loaded .33 or higher on the single factor were retained.

Another principal-axis factor analysis was conducted for the retained 10-item scale. Again, one factor emerged accounting for 96.5% of the common variance and 24% of the total variance. All 10 items loaded .32 or higher on the single factor, with 0.48 average loading value.

The 10-item SCQ scale was administered to a new sample of 302 female introductory psychology students. Again, principal-axis factor analysis was conducted, and, similarly, one factor was revealed that accounted for 91% of the common variance and 23% of the total variance.

Study 2: To provide further evidence for construct validity, correlations between stigma consciousness, as measured in both Phase 1 and Phase 2, and various measures of discrimination were computed. Women high in stigma consciousness are more likely than women low in stigma consciousness to perceive discrimination at the group, average, and personal levels.

<i>Measure</i>	<i>SCQ</i>	
	<i>Phase 1</i>	<i>Phase 2</i>
<i>Group Discrimination</i>	.36 <sup>*a</sup>	.48 <sup>**b</sup>
<i>Average Discrimination</i>	.33 <sup>*a</sup>	.50 <sup>**c</sup>
<i>Personal Discrimination</i>	.37 <sup>*a</sup>	.48 <sup>**b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*n* = 44; <sup>b</sup>*n* = 57; <sup>c</sup>*n* = 56

\**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01

Study 3: SCQ was adapted for gay men and lesbians. A factor analysis resulted in one factor accounting for 74% of common variance.

Study 4: One of the goals of Study 4 was to examine whether the stigma consciousness construct is distinct from those of group identity and group consciousness. Factor analysis was conducted on SCQ for

Women, Sensitivity to Sexism scale (Henderson-King & Steward, 1997), and Revelation and Embeddedness subscales of Rickard's (1987) Feminist Identity scale. This analysis yielded four factors with eigenvalues of greater than 2. Consistent with the claim that stigma consciousness represents a unique factor, items 1-7 of the SCQ for Women loaded .3 or higher on one single factor and only one of these seven items loaded on any of the other factors. Two SCQ items loaded on the factor associated with items from the Revelation subscale, and the one remaining factor loaded on the factor associated with items from the Sensitivity to Sexism.

### *Concurrent Validity*

Study 2: Various other scales were administered to examine whether the SCQ for Women correlates with measures that reveal how women who are high in stigma consciousness (i) express concern over how others view them and (ii) are attentive to signs of sexism. Self-Consciousness Scale (SCS-scale; Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975) and Modern Sexism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995) were administered. SCS-scale consists of three subscales: a Private Self-Consciousness subscale, a Public Self-Consciousness subscale, and a Social Anxiety subscale.

Correlations between the SCQ for Women with other measures described above

<i>Measure</i>	<i>SCQ</i> <i>r =</i>
<i>Modern Sexism Scale</i>	-.28 **
<i>Private Self-Consciousness</i>	.13
<i>Public Self-Consciousness</i>	.36 *

$n = 86$ ; \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Study 3: To examine the validity of the SCQ for gay men and lesbians, it was administered along with Fenigstein et al.'s (1975) Self-Consciousness Scale (SCS) and four measures of perceived discrimination.

Correlations of the SCQ and other measures

<i>Measure</i>	<i>SCQ for Gays and Lesbians</i> <i>r =</i>
<i>Private Self-Consciousness</i>	.33 **
<i>Public Self-Consciousness</i>	.33 **
<i>Group discrimination</i>	
<i>Lesbians</i>	.34 **
<i>Gay men</i>	.33 **
<i>Gay men and lesbians</i>	.50 **
<i>Personal discrimination</i>	.57 **

Lesbian, gay men, and self-discrimination measures,  $n = 62$ . For group gay men and lesbian discrimination measure,  $n = 61$ .

\*\*  $p < .01$

Study 4: Men and women of five different races completed two SCQs, one pertaining to their race and one pertaining to their sex. Analyses similar to those in previous studies were conducted.

<i>Measure</i>	<i>SCQ for Sex</i>	
	<i>Men</i> <i>n = 136</i> <i>r =</i>	<i>Women</i> <i>n = 198</i> <i>r =</i>
<i>Private Self-Consciousness</i>	.23 **	.31 **
<i>Public Self-Consciousness</i>	.09	.30 **
<i>Discrimination</i>		
<i>Group</i>	.19**	.28**
<i>Average</i>	.22*	.29**
<i>Personal</i>	.29**	.36**

<i>Measure</i>	<i>SCQ for Race</i>			
	<i>Whites</i> <i>n = 197</i> <i>r =</i>	<i>Blacks</i> <i>N = 21</i> <i>r =</i>	<i>Asians</i> <i>n = 63</i> <i>r =</i>	<i>Hispanics</i> <i>n = 53</i> <i>r =</i>
<i>Private Self-Consciousness</i>	.24**	.06	.28*	.12
<i>Public Self-Consciousness</i>	.16*	.02	.23*	.25***
<i>Discrimination</i>				
<i>Group</i>	.31**	.54*	.35**	.51**
<i>Average</i>	.32**	.49*	.26*	.63*
<i>Personal</i>	.42**	.77**	.40**	.64**

**RELIABILITY**

***Internal Consistency***

Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficients of the SCQ for different studies

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Study 1 (phase 1) <math>\alpha =</math></i>	<i>Study 1 (phase 2) <math>\alpha =</math></i>	<i>Study 3 <math>\alpha =</math></i>	<i>Study 5 <math>\alpha =</math></i>	<i>Study 6 <math>\alpha =</math></i>
<b>SCQ</b>	.74	.72	.81	.87	.90

***Test-Retest Reliability***

Study 2: The correlation between stigma consciousness as measured during Phase 1 and stigma consciousness as measured during Phase 2 (average of 5 weeks after Phase 1) was computed:  $r(42) = .76, p < .001$ .

**Comments**

- Stigma consciousness is a potentially useful concept for understanding how people respond to others in the workplace.
- The studies suggest that the SCQ is a useful, valid, and reliable measure.
- The research suggests that stigma consciousness is a domain-specific construct. Knowing people's stigma consciousness levels with respect to one of their group memberships (e.g., gender) does not necessarily inform us about their stigma consciousness levels with respect to their other group memberships (e.g., race).

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Pinel, E. C., & Paulin, N. (2005). Stigma consciousness in the workplace. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 27(4):345-352.

Pinel, E. C., Warner, L. R., & Chua, P. (2005). Getting there is only half the battle: Stigma consciousness and maintaining diversity in higher education. *Journal of Social Issues* 61(3):481-506.

Pinel, E. C. (2004). You're just saying that because I'm a woman: Stigma consciousness and attributions to discrimination. *Self and Social Identity*, 3, 39-51.

Brown, R. P., & Pinel, E. C. (2003). Stigma on my mind: Individual differences in the experience of stereotype threat. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 626-633.

Pinel, E. C. (2002). Stigma consciousness in intergroup contexts: The power of conviction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 178-185.

**Contact Information**

Elizabeth C. Pinel  
Associate Professor of Psychology  
Department of Psychology  
Pennsylvania State University  
543 Moore Building,  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802-3106, USA  
Tel: 814-863-1149  
Fax: 814-863-7002  
e-mail: [ecp6@psu.edu](mailto:ecp6@psu.edu)  
<http://psych.la.psu.edu/faculty/pinel.html>

---



# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

WORKING ENVIRONMENT FOR WOMEN IN ACADEMIC SETTINGS

---

**Source/Primary reference**

Riger, S., Stokes, J., Raja, S., & Sullivan, M. (1997). Measuring perceptions of the work environment for female faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(1), 63-78.

---

**Construct measured**

Perceptions of attitudes toward women faculty in university settings

---

**Brief description**

The 35-item scale includes 3 subscales:

1. Differential treatment
2. Balancing work and personal obligations
3. Sexist attitudes and comments

There are two types of questions. Most were in the agree-disagree format ranging from 1 = do not agree to 5 = strongly agree. For the other questions, respondents are asked to report using a 5-point scale where 1 = not at all likely and 5 = very likely.

A short version with 15 items has been developed. The authors do not recommend using subscale scores with the short version.

---

**Sample items**

- Female faculty are less likely than their male counterparts to have influence in departmental policies and administration.
- Faculty make jokes or comments that are demeaning or degrading to women.
- Male faculty are comfortable having lunch alone with a female faculty member.
- Most faculty are supportive of female colleagues who want to reduce their workload for personal reasons.
- In this department sex discrimination is a big problem.
- Male faculty are not as comfortable serving as a mentor to a female faculty member as they are to a male faculty member.

---

**Appropriate for whom  
(i.e. which population/s)**

Adults working in academia

The authors have also developed a parallel climate scale for use in corporate environments (see entry for Stokes, Riger, & Sullivan, 1997)

---

**Translations & cultural  
adaptations available**

None known

**How developed**

Open-ended interviews were conducted with 20 female faculty of different disciplines and from many colleges and universities in the Chicago area to assess their perceptions of the climate for female faculty within their academic departments. Based on the responses, literature review, and previous work of the authors, 200 items were generated to assess 6 domains (dual standards and treatment, sexist attitudes and comments, informal socializing, balancing work and personal obligations, remediation policies and practices, and mentoring). This questionnaire was piloted with 10 faculty, which resulted in a version of the scale that comprised 89 items, 81 in an agree-disagree format, and 8 quotations which respondents rated in terms of how likely they would be to hear such comments in their department. About half of the items were worded positively, and the other half were worded negatively. Further analyses described below yielded a scale with 35 items.

**Psychometric properties**

STUDY SAMPLE

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 626
<i>Description</i>		Faculty members of 69 colleges and universities in the U.S. and Canada
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	27-91
	<i>Mean for Women</i>	45.8
	<i>Mean for Men</i>	49.1
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	64%
	<i>Male</i>	36%
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>White</i>	97%
<i>Employed Full-Time</i>		98%
<i>Rank</i>	About equal numbers of assistant, associate, and full professors	

VALIDITY

**Construct Validity**

Principal components analyses of the 35 items yielded three components that together accounted for 54.3% of the total variance. The first component, Differential Treatment ( $\alpha = .95$ ), included 20 items from several of the a priori dimensions and seemed to be a general measure of the climate for women faculty. The second and third components were Balancing Work and Personal Obligations ( $\alpha = .86$ ) and Sexist Attitudes and Comments ( $\alpha = .85$ ). These results were not parallel to the Working Environment for Women in Corporate Settings developed by the same authors, where results confirmed a 5-factor solution (Stokes,

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

WORKING ENVIRONMENT FOR WOMEN IN ACADEMIC SETTINGS

Riger, & Sullivan, 1995). The authors speculated that this may be related to differences in distinct status categories, formality of hierarchy, and the fluidity of communication in corporate versus academic work environments.

## RELIABILITY

### *Internal Consistency*

<i>Scale Form</i>	$\alpha =$
<i>Long Form</i>	.97
<i>Short Form</i>	.94

Correlation between short and long forms: .97

Very similar alphas were replicated with a validation sample (1/3 of the sample was analyzed separately to serve as a validation sample).

<i>Subscale</i>	$\alpha =$
<i>Differential Treatment</i>	.96
<i>Balancing Work and Personal Obligations</i>	.83
<i>Sexist Attitudes and Comments</i>	.96

## Comments

- The instrument is concise, easy to understand, and easy to administer.
- The scale was developed with a predominantly white sample. It would be useful to assess its validity and reliability for multiple ethnic/racial groups.

## Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

## Contact Information

Stephanie Riger  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
1007 W. Harrison Street  
Chicago, IL 60607, USA

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

*WORKING ENVIRONMENT FOR WOMEN IN CORPORATE SETTINGS*

---

**Source/Primary reference** Stokes, J., Riger, S., & Sullivan, M. (1995). Measuring perceptions of the working environment for women in corporate settings. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19(4), 533-549.

---

**Construct measured** Perceptions of attitudes toward women in the work environment

---

**Brief description** The 36-item scale includes five subscales plus 4 global discrimination items:

1. Dual standards and opportunities (10 items)
2. Sexist attitudes and comments (7 items)
3. Informal socializing (7 items)
4. Balancing work and personal obligations (9 items)
5. Remediation policies and practices (3 items)

There are two types of questions. Most were in the agree-disagree format ranging from 1 = do not agree to 5 = strongly agree. For the other questions, respondents are asked to report in a 5-point scale (1 = not at all likely, 5 = very likely) about the possibility that the quotations presented would be heard in their workplace.

A short version with 15 items has been developed. The authors do not recommend using subscale scores with the short version.

---

**Sample items**

- Compared to men, women in this office are appointed to less important committees and task forces.
- Jokes that are demeaning or degrading to women are told occasionally in this office.
- Company-sponsored social events generally appeal to both female and male employees.
- In general, supervisors in this company are understanding when personal or family obligations occasionally take an employee away from work.
- People who raise issues about the treatment of women in this company are supported by other employees.

---

**Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)** Working adults

The authors have also developed a parallel climate scale for use in academic environments (see entry for Riger, Stokes, Raja, & Sullivan)

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

*TITLE OF MEASURE*

*WORKING ENVIRONMENT FOR WOMEN IN CORPORATE SETTINGS*

**Translations & cultural adaptations available**

None known

**How developed**

Based on focus groups and feedback from men and women working in corporate environments, the authors developed both positively and negatively worded items for each of 6 hypothesized subscales:

1. Opportunities and mentoring
2. Inappropriate salience of gender
3. Sexist attitudes and comments
4. Informal socializing
5. Balancing work and personal obligations
6. Remediation policies and practices

A version of the questionnaire with 133 randomly ordered items (about half positively worded and half negatively worded) was completed by 398 people in 45 different companies. Analyses of these results yielded a final scale with 36 items.

**Psychometric properties**

**STUDY SAMPLE**

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		n = 398
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	22-63
	<i>Mean for Women</i>	36.9
	<i>Mean for Men</i>	38.9
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	n = 263
	<i>Male</i>	n = 134
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>White</i>	92.4%
<i>Education</i>	<i>Graduate or Professional Degree</i>	51%
	<i>Bachelor's Degree</i>	91%
<i>Income</i>	<i>\$100,000 or more</i>	40%
	<i>\$40,000 or more</i>	90%
<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Never Married</i>	25%
	<i>Currently Married</i>	65%
<i>Children</i>	<i>No children under age 18 years</i>	61%

**VALIDITY**

***Construct Validity***

One third of the surveys were randomly selected to be analyzed separately to serve as a validation sample. A series of principal component analyses yielded five subscales that were confirmed with the validation sample.

**RELIABILITY**

***Internal Consistency***

<i>Scale</i>	$\alpha =$
<i>Overall Scale</i>	.96
<i>Dual Standards and Opportunities</i>	.92
<i>Sexist Attitudes and Comments</i>	.82
<i>Informal Socializing</i>	.82
<i>Balancing Work and Personal Obligations</i>	.90
<i>Remediation Policies and Practices</i>	.78
<i>Short form</i>	.93

Correlation between short and long forms: .97

Values of  $\alpha$  for the validation sample were almost identical to those reported above.

**Comments**

Designed specifically to assess workplace climate.

- The instrument is concise, easy to understand, and easy to administer.
- The scale was developed with a predominantly white sample. It would be useful to assess its validity and reliability for multiple ethnic/racial groups.
- The availability of a short version makes it workable to include within a longer workplace survey.
- Has been adapted to assess race-related climate (Bond, Punnett, Pyle, Cazeca, & Cooperman, in press; Yoder & Aniakudo, 1996).
- Further psychometric research is needed, particularly due to the convenience sampling and lack of comparison with other measures of the work climate.

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Bond, M. A., Punnett, L., Pyle, J. L., Cazeca, D., & Cooperman, M. (2004). Gendered work conditions, health, and work outcomes. *The Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(1), 28-45.

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

*TITLE OF MEASURE*

*WORKING ENVIRONMENT FOR WOMEN IN CORPORATE SETTINGS*

---

Yoder, J. D., & Aniakudo, P. (1996). When pranks become harassment: The case of African American women firefighters. *Sex Roles*, 35(5/6), 253-270.

---

## Contact Information

Joseph Stokes  
Department of Psychology (m/c 284)  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
1007 West Harrison Street  
Chicago, IL 60607, USA

---

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

## TITLE OF MEASURE

## OLD-FASHIONED AND MODERN SEXISM SCALE

**Source/Primary reference** Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199-214.

**Construct measured**

Old-Fashioned Sexism (OFS) - endorsement of traditional gender roles, differential treatment of women and men, and stereotypes of women's lesser competence.

Modern Sexism (MS) - denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward women's demands, lack of support for policies to help women. This scale measures covert or subtle sexism, which is built into cultural or societal norms.

**Brief description**

The measure is a 13-item inventory with 2 subscales:

1. Old-Fashioned Sexism (5 items)
2. Modern Sexism (8 items)

Each item is rated on a 5-point scale, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

**Sample items**

Old-Fashioned Sexism:

- Women are generally not as smart as men.
- I would be equally comfortable having a woman as a boss as a man.

Modern Sexism:

- On average, people in our society treat husbands and wives equally. (denial of continued discrimination)
- It is easy to understand the anger of women's groups in America. (antagonism toward women's demands)
- Over the past few years, the government and news media have been showing more concern about the treatment of women than is warranted by women's actual experiences. (resentment regarding special favors for women).

**Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)** Adults

**Translations & cultural adaptations available** None known



# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

OLD-FASHIONED AND MODERN SEXISM SCALE

## How developed

Theoretical background is that, similarly to racism, sexism can be seen as existing in two distinguishable forms: old-fashioned and modern. Based on the literature and past research, the authors wrote a set of statements to measure old-fashioned sexism. For modern sexism, they also wrote a set of statements based on three basic tenets that underlie the concept of “modern sexism”: denial of continued discrimination, antagonism toward women’s demands, and lack of support for policies to help women.

## Psychometric properties

### STUDY SAMPLE

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Demographics</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 683
<i>Description</i>		Undergraduate students from an introductory psychology class
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>n</i> = 418
	<i>Male</i>	<i>n</i> = 265
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>		Nearly all respondents were European-American

### VALIDITY

#### *Construct Validity*

The authors assessed the instrument’s construct validity by performing a confirmatory factor analysis, investigating differences between female and male respondents’ scores, testing the correlation between the scale and individualistic vs. egalitarian values, and then calculating the correlation between the scale scores and perceptions of job segregation. Factor analyses supported the notion that OFS and MS are two distinct factors.

Campbell et al. (1997) compared the MS scale with the Neosexism scale. The scales correlated highly with each other, but most of the variance in one scale could not be explained by the variance in the other: thus the two instruments are not similar.

Swim and Cohen (1997) compared MS and OFS with the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS, Spence & Helmreich, 1972), obtaining additional construct and discriminant validity for the MS scale. Confirmatory factor analyses show that AWS and OFS loaded on one factor that represents *overt* sexist beliefs. This factor is distinct from the factor that represents the MS scale. The MS scale seems to measure *covert, subtle* sexism. The OFS and AWS were more similar to each other than to the MS scale and their correlation was higher (.90 for both males and females) than the correlation between OFS and MS (.25 for males and .41 for females). MS was found to be a better predictor of sexual harassment than AWS (discriminant validity). AWS and MS correlate with affective reactions to different categories of men and women (general, traditional, feminists, and chauvinists) (convergent validity).

However, MS and AWS are demonstrated to measure different, though related, constructs.

Men's scores on OFS and MS were higher than women's. A correlation matrix among OFS and MS scales, as well as Old-Fashioned Racism (OFR) and Modern Racism (MR) scales (McConahay, 1986) and both a shortened version of Mirels and Garrett's (1971) Protestant Work Ethic scale (PWE; Katz & Hass, 1988) and the Humanitarian-Egalitarian scale (HE; Katz & Hass, 1988), was derived separately for women and men. For women, the pattern of differences of the correlations between OFS, MS, OFR, and MR and PWE and HE were similar. That is, OFS, MS, OFR, and MR were each more strongly correlated with the HE scale than the PWE scale. For men, a similar pattern emerged with OFS and OFR, but not with MS or MR. This pattern of correlations provides partial support for the conclusion that modern prejudice is more strongly related to nonegalitarian beliefs than to highly individualistic beliefs (Sears, 1988). Higher scores on the MS scale correlated with overestimating women's presence in the workforce.

**RELIABILITY**

***Internal Consistency***

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Cronbach's <math>\alpha</math> Range</i>
<i>OFS</i>	.65 - .66
<i>MS</i>	.75 - .84

**Comments**

- The scale was developed with a predominantly white sample. It would be useful to assess its validity and reliability for multiple ethnic/racial groups.

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Campbell, B., Schellenberg, E. G., & Senn, C. Y. (1997). Evaluating measures of contemporary sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 89-102.

McHugh, M. C., & Frieze, I. H. (1997). The measurement of gender-role attitudes. A review and commentary. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 1-16.

Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism Scales. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 103-118.

**Contact Information**

Janet K. Swim  
 515 Moore Building  
 Department of Psychology  
 Pennsylvania State University  
 University Park, PA 16802, USA  
 e-mail: JKS4@PSUVM.PSU.EDU

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

*TITLE OF MEASURE*

*EVERYDAY SEXISM*

---

<b>Source/Primary reference</b>	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. <i>Journal of Social Issues</i> , 57(1), 31-53.
<b>Construct measured</b>	Incidence, nature, and impact of everyday sexism
<b>Brief description</b>	<p>Daily diary approach to recording both personal experiences with and observations of sexist events.</p> <p>For each incident observed, participants were asked to note the time the incident occurred, rate the impact it had on them on a scale ranging from -2 (very negative) to 0 (no impact) to +2 (very positive), and rate the extent to which the incident was sexist from -2 (definitely not sexist) to 0 (uncertain) to +2 (definitely sexist).</p>
<b>Sample items</b>	<p>Participants are told that their role is to record incidents where women are treated differently because of their gender. They are told to note incidents that are directed toward them, someone else, or women in general. In order to obtain a manageable number of incidents to record, participants are told to exclude observations from the media, such as television programming and advertisements.</p> <p>If they observe a gender-related incident, they are to complete the form as soon as possible after the incident has occurred. If more than one incident occurred on one day they are to complete a form for each incident. If they do not observe any gender-related incidents on any particular day, they are to note this on one of the forms at the end of each day.</p>
<b>Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)</b>	Adolescents and adults
<b>Translations &amp; cultural adaptations available</b>	Swim has also used a similar diary approach for recording experiences of racism and differential treatment based on sexual orientation.
<b>How developed</b>	The authors designed the diary approach as an alternative to retrospective strategies.

---

Psychometric properties

STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants Sample Size</i>		<i>Study 1 N = 40</i>	<i>Study 2 n = 37</i>	<i>Study 3 n = 73</i>
<i>Description</i>		Students enrolled in an introductory psychology of gender course	Students enrolled in two introductory psychology courses and one advanced marketing course	Students enrolled in a psychology of gender course and their male friends
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	19 - 26	18 - 44	†
	<i>Median</i>	22	22	†
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Female</i>	n = 40	n = 20	n = 47
	<i>Male</i>		n = 17	n = 26
<i>Race/ Ethnicity</i>		†	†	†

†Not reported

VALIDITY

The authors argue that:

Much of the existing research on people’s experiences with sexism is in the form of retrospective accounts in which participants are asked to characterize what they typically experience, sometimes for more than a year’s worth of experiences. Such approaches often neglect more mundane “everyday” types of experiences and thus may provide an incomplete picture of the extent and variety of daily experiences with sexism. Retrospective surveys and interviews may not accurately reflect the extent and nature of experiences people have with prejudice for the following reasons. First, uncertainty about labeling subtle and ambiguous incidents as prejudicial may decrease the likelihood that such incidents are encoded and recalled as prejudicial. Second, isolated incidents may be minimized over time or seen as insignificant and therefore forgotten. Third, the similarity and commonness of incidents that constitute everyday prejudice may make it difficult to assess the frequency with which they occur through expansive retrospection. Finally, retrospective reports are subject to distortion as moods dissipate and contexts change. In contrast, daily diary studies minimize many of these problems, providing a more accurate and complete report of incidents and responses to them without the distorting processing that may result in errors.

Comments

- The authors found that sexist incidents as measured through diaries affected women’s psychological well-being by decreasing their self-esteem.

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

*TITLE OF MEASURE*

*EVERYDAY SEXISM*

---

- The diary approach had the advantage of yielding qualitative data that can be quantified while at the same time being potentially richer in detail than survey data.
- 

## **Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

---

### **Contact Information**

Janet K. Swim  
515 Moore Building  
Department of Psychology  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802, USA  
e-mail: JKS4@PSUVM.PSU.EDU

---

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

## *TITLE OF MEASURE*      *GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD AFFIRMATIVE ACTION (AA) AND MEN'S COLLECTIVE INTEREST*

**Source/Primary reference**      Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(8), 842-891.

**Construct measured**      Attitudes toward affirmative action

**Brief description**      The 11-item scale uses two approaches to measuring attitudes toward affirmative action:

1) General Attitudes (AA)

The general scale includes 3 items to assess the respondents' attitudes toward affirmative action. Ratings are made on a 7-point scale where 1 = total disagreement and 7 = total agreement. Composite scores are calculated by taking a mean.

2) Impact on Men's Collective Interest (CI)

Following a brief description of the goals of affirmative action for women, participants are asked to evaluate the effects of these programs on the situation of men by means of 6 items: 3 statements and 3 associated evaluative questions.

**Sample items**      1) General Attitudes toward Affirmative Action

- If there are no affirmative action programs helping women in employment, they will continue to be unfairly treated.
- After years of discrimination, it is only fair to set up special programs to make sure that women are given fair and equitable treatment.
- All in all, do you favor the implementation of affirmative action programs for women in industries?

2) Impact on Men's Collective Interest

- These programs disadvantage men compared to women in terms of their chances of getting a job.
- These programs disadvantage men, compared with women, in terms of their chances for obtaining a promotion.

Each statement is followed by a question asking participants whether they are satisfied with the implied situation.

**Appropriate for whom  
(i.e. which population/s)**      Adults

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

*TITLE OF MEASURE*      *GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD AFFIRMATIVE ACTION (AA) AND MEN'S COLLECTIVE INTEREST (CI)*

**Translations & cultural adaptations available**

English and French versions available

Women and racial/ethnic minority versions available

**How developed**

Items were developed by the study authors.

**Psychometric properties**

**STUDY SAMPLES**

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 130	<i>n</i> = 149
<i>Description</i>		Students	Workers
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	18-43	29-60
	<i>Mean</i>	21.6	41.5
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Male</i>	100%	100%
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>		Not reported	Not reported

**VALIDITY**

*Concurrent Validity*

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Men's Collective Interest Scale</i>		<i>Neosexism Scale</i>	
	<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>	<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>
	<i>R</i> =	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =
<i>AA</i>	-.48***	-.33***	-.58***	-.36***
<i>CI</i>			.50***	.18*

\**p* < .05; \*\*\**p* < .001

**RELIABILITY**

*Internal Consistency*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>
<i>Version</i>	women	women & minority
<i>Language</i>	English & French	French
<i>General Attitudes (AA)</i>	$\alpha$ = .81	$\alpha$ = .86
<i>Men's Collective Interest</i>	$\alpha$ = .81	$\alpha$ = .67

**Comments**

- Samples for both validation studies were all male, and the ethnic/racial make-up of the sample was not reported. It would be useful to assess its validity and reliability for women and for multiple ethnic/racial groups.

# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

*TITLE OF MEASURE*      *GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD AFFIRMATIVE ACTION (AA) AND MEN'S COLLECTIVE INTEREST (CI)*

---

- Since the scale was developed in Canada, some items may not translate to the situation in other countries (particularly given the wide range of approaches to affirmative action).
- 

## **Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

### **Contact Information**

Francine Tougas  
School of Psychology  
University of Ottawa  
Ottawa, Ontario KIN 6N5, Canada  
e-mail: ftougas@uottawa.ca

---



# Sexism & Sex Discrimination

TITLE OF MEASURE

NEOSEXISM SCALE

**Source/Primary reference** Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus a change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(8), 842-891.

**Construct measured** Neosexism defined as the “manifestation of a conflict between egalitarian values and residual negative feelings toward women.”

**Brief description** This instrument consists of 11 items based on the tenets of modern racism (McConahay, 1986). The rating scale ranges from 1 to 7 where 1 = total disagreement and 7 = total agreement.

- Sample items**
- Women will make more progress by being patient and not pushing too hard for change.
  - Discrimination against women in the labor force is no longer a problem.
  - In order to not appear sexist, many men are inclined to overcompensate women.

**Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)** Adults

**Translations & cultural adaptations available** English and French versions available

**How developed** The authors developed a number of items specifically for this scale and adapted items from covert racism scales, due to their relevance to the situation of women. An exploratory factor analysis did not show a definite structure so all the items were pooled.

**Psychometric properties** STUDY SAMPLES

<i>Participants</i>		<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>
<i>Sample Size</i>		<i>n</i> = 130	<i>n</i> = 149
<i>Description</i>		Students	Workers
<i>Age</i>	<i>Range</i>	18-43	29-60
	<i>Mean</i>	21.6	41.5
<i>Gender</i>	<i>Male</i>	100%	100%
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>		Not reported	Not reported

**VALIDITY**

***Concurrent Validity***

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Affirmative Action</i>	
	<i>Study 1</i> <i>r =</i>	<i>Study 2</i> <i>r =</i>
<i>Neosexism Scale</i>	-.58***	-.36***

\*\*\* $p < .001$

**RELIABILITY**

***Internal Consistency & Test-Retest Reliability***

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Study 1</i>	<i>Study 2</i>
<i>Language</i>	English & French	French
<i>Cronbach's <math>\alpha =</math></i>	.78	.76
<i>Test-retest <math>r =</math></i>	.84**	-

\*\* $p < .01$

**Comments**

- Samples for both validation studies were all male, and the ethnic/ racial make-up of the sample was not reported. It would be useful to assess its validity and reliability for women and for multiple ethnic/ racial groups.
- Neosexism is an interesting construct that assesses support for public policies designed to support women, while most sexism measures look at prejudicial attitudes or discriminatory behavior based on gender.
- When compared with the Modern Sexism Scale, the Neosexism Scale was found to have better internal reliability and exhibited stronger gender differences (Campbell et al., 1997).

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Campbell, B., Schellenberg, E. G., & Senn, C. (1997). Evaluating | measures of contemporary sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(1), 89-102.

Masser, B., & Abrams, D. (1999). Contemporary sexism: The relationships among hostility, benevolence, and neosexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 503-517.

**Contact Information**

Francine Tougas  
 School of Psychology  
 University of Ottawa  
 Ottawa, Ontario KIN 6N5, Canada  
 e-mail: ftougas@uottawa.ca