PREJUDICE AGAINST WOMEN AND MEN – CORRELATES, PREDICTORS AND CONSEQUENCES FOR ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Eugenia Mandal[1], Tomasz Kurzeja[2]

Summary. The aim of the article is to review analyzes indicating that nowadays, despite moral changes, in many societies there are various forms of social prejudice against women and men. Traditional sexism and contemporary sexism, ambivalent sexism, hostile sexism and benevolent sexism were indicated. The mutual dependencies and components of these phenomena are shown. The phenomenon of cognitive justification of sexism and the effects of retaliation are described. Major research studies linking gender bias to demographic and psychological variables are discussed. It shows the consequences of sexism in close relationships between men and women.
Key words: prejudice, woman, man, sexism, romantic relationships

Introduction

Nowadays, people declare less and less support for unequal treatment of women and men, double standards or the belief that women or men cannot or should not perform specific tasks. At the same time, there are many indications that in modern societies the problem of prejudice against women and men has not disappeared and its various forms can be observed. In a recent review, Orly Bareket and Susan Fiske (2023) note that interest in the problem of sexism has increased over the past two decades. The topic is widely discussed in many contexts, not only in psychology but also in education, economics, management and law. The role that sexism may play in strengthening gender inequality in various areas of life is emphasized.

[1] Instytut Psychologii, Uniwersytet Śląski (Institute of Psychology, University of Silesia), ORCID: 0000-0003-1125-1756.

[2] Wydział Nauk Społecznych, Uniwersytet Śląski (Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Silesia), ORCID: 0000-0002-0457-623X.

Mailing address: Eugenia Mandal,
eugenia.mandal@us.edu.pl

Old-fashioned sexism and modern sexism

In the mid-1990s, Janet Swim, Kathryn Aikin, Wayne Hall, and Barbara Hunter (1995) identified old-fashioned and modern prejudices, describing old-fashioned sexism (OFS) and modern sexism (MS); other names – covert, subtle sexism. Researchers have emphasized that traditional and modern sexism are separate but interrelated constructs in people's minds (cf. Swim, Cohen, 1997; Ekehammar, Akrami, Araya, 2000). They described them as – theoretical factors of old-fashioned sexism (OFS): 1. supporting the traditional separation of women's and men's roles, 2. different treatment of women and men, 3. accepting stereotypes about women's lower competencies, and factors of modern sexism (MS): 1. denial the existence of gender discrimination, 2. antagonism against the demands made by women, 3. lack of support for projects designed to help women; Swim et al. (1995) and Swim, Cohen (1997).

Research has shown that modern sexism correlates more strongly with support for anti-egalitarian values than individualistic values. It also correlates positively with scales measuring old-fashioned and modern racism, conservatism and social dominance orientation (Ekehammar, Akrami, Araya, 2000). The predictors of modern sexism are such personality factors as Openness to experience ($\beta = -.30$) and Agreeableness ($\beta = -.25$) as well as the subscales: Tendency to sympathize ($\beta = -.35$) and Values ($\beta = -.28$)(Ekehammar, Akrami, 2007). Moreover, people with high mod-ern sexism, compared to people with low modern sexism, overestimate the percentage of women in typically male occupations (Swim et al., 1995).

Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism

It was pointed out that in contact between women and men, there may be different emotions – love, the need for closeness, as well as competition and the fight for power. This state of affairs may result in ambivalent attitudes towards women and men. Hostile sexism towards women (HS) reflects negative feelings (Glick, Fiske, 1996), while benevolent sexism (BS) reflects positive feelings towards women, especially those who fulfill stereotypical female roles and behaviors (e.g. prosocial or regarding intimacy).

Benevolent sexism is not assessed positively because it is based on male domination and traditional gender stereotypes (cf. Glick, Fiske, 1996, 2011; Gaunt, 2013; Studzińska, Wojciszke, 2014). Both hostile and benevolent sexism towards women serves to justify men's structural power – to justify the existing system (see system justification theory, Jost, Banaji, 1994; Jost, Kay, 2005; Mandal, Kofta, 2009). The sources of ambivalent sexism can be found in biological and social conditions, e.g. sexual dimorphism, a higher tendency to dominate in men, and division of roles based on gender (cf. Pratto et al., 1993). Women have dyadic power (cf. Guttentag, Secord, 1983; Mandal, 2004; 2008) by creating close relationships, fulfilling the needs of closeness, sexual needs and care for offspring. Many societies have beliefs that require them to

protect women, praise their role as mothers and wives, and idealize them as objects of romantic love.

Three areas of hostile and benevolent sexism towards women have been distinguished (Glick, Fiske, 1996, 2001): 1) paternalism, which may be dominative (HS; hostile sexism) or protective (BS; benevolent sexism), 2) gender differentiation – focused on competitive (HS) or complementary (BS), 3) heterosexual – hostility (HS) or intimacy (BS). These three beliefs characterize benevolent sexism. Women can be perceived as people who should be protected, supported, adored and whose love is necessary for men to achieve fulfillment. Women are judged as trying to gain control over men; whether through manipulation of sexual availability or feminist ideology (Glick, Fiske, 1996, 2001)

Paternalism suggests that women's "weakness" compels men to protect them and provide material resources. Only men have the appropriate qualities to manage important social institutions, only women have the qualities needed to fulfill the role of mother and wife. The need for closeness, but also the fear of female manipulation, of dependence on women, is the strongest source of ambivalence (cf. Berscheid, Peplau, 1983; Unger, Crawford, 1992; Glick, Fiske, 1996; Fisher, et al. 2021). Ambivalence concerns not only prejudice against women but also against men (Glick, Fiske, 1999). On the one hand, men can be perceived as taking power away from women, but also behaving "like children". And only women can take good care of them, and they need their resources and love.

Three areas were also distinguished for ambivalent sexism towards men (*AMI; Ambivalence toward Men Inventory*): 1) resentment of paternalism (HM; hostile sexism towards men) or maternalism (BM; benevolent sexism), 2) compensatory (HM) or complementary (BM) gender differentiation, 3) heterosexual hostility (HM) or attraction (BM); Glick, Fiske, 1999.

Resentment of paternalism (Glick and Fiske, 1999) results from the grievances of members of a socially inferior group (here – women), resentment towards the dominant group (men) because they seized power and high status (cf. social identity theory; Tajfel, 1981). Maternalism (Glick, Fiske, 1999), on the other hand, justifies the fact that women provide care to men, e.g. cooking and cleaning. Compensatory gender differentiation – allows to "safely" criticize men, e.g. describing them as "behaving like children when they are sick". Complementary gender differentiation refers to admiring men for their power, qualities and skills. Most women highly value being in a romantic relationship with men – this is heterosexual attraction.

Peter Glick and Susan Fiske and their colleagues (Glick et al., 2000) conducted research on ambivalent sexism toward women (ASI) in 19 countries. They demonstrated the presence of sexism and that both hostile and benevolent sexism are complementary to each other. In countries where the degree of support for hostile sexism was high, the degree of support for benevolent sexism was also high. The level of hostile sexism allowed for predicting the degree of attributing negative characteristics to women, and benevolent sexism – positive characteristics. In countries where men

were characterized by a high level of sexism, women had a greater tendency to support sexism – both hostile and benevolent, which is consistent with the theory of system justification (cf. Jost, Banaji, 1994; Mandal, Kofta, 2009). Compared to men, women often rejected hostile sexism but were willing to accept benevolent sexism. This trend was particularly visible in countries with high overall levels of sexism, which may be due to women's increased need to experience the "protection" provided by benevolent sexism (cf. Glick et al., 2000).

There was a negative correlation between hostile and benevolent sexism and respect for gender equality – the higher sexism towards women in a given country, the lower the share of women in high positions, the lower the level of education and the standard of living (according to UN indicators: GEM and GDI with HDI controlled). It is worth noting that compared to South Africa, Great Britain and the USA, Polish male and female students were characterized by the highest level of ambivalent sexism towards women (Zawisza, Luyta, Zawadzka, 2015).

A cross-cultural study of ambivalent sexism toward men (AMI) was conducted in 16 countries by Peter Glick, Maria Lameiras, Susan Fiske, and colleagues (2004). The results for hostile and benevolent sexism towards men were positively correlated both with each other and with the level of hostile and benevolent sexism towards women. It is negatively correlated with the level of respect for gender equality (cf. Glick et al., 2000). Women, compared to men, were characterized by a significantly higher level of hostile sexism towards men. Men, compared to women, were characterized by a significantly higher level of benevolent sexism towards men. In countries where men had high levels of hostile sexism towards women (ASI-HS), women endorsed hostile sexism towards men (AMI-HM) more than men.

The analyses of Orly Bareket and Susan Fiske (2023) showed the relationship of ambivalent sexism with tendencies towards other prejudices and the relationship with ideologies that reflect the motivation to maintain the current division of roles, resistance to changes (e.g. authoritarianism, prejudice against sexual minorities). The ambivalence reflected in BS may generalize to perceptions of other social groups.

A meta-analysis by Elena Agadullina and colleagues (2022) examining the relationship between men's ambivalent sexism and aggressive attitudes and violence against women showed that both hostile sexism and benevolent sexism are related to aggression and violence against women, although to different degrees. The relationship between these behaviors is stronger with hostile sexism than with benevolent sexism. The type and context of violence appeared to be moderators of this relationship.

Justifying sexism

The system justification theory (Jost, Banaji, M. 1994; Jost, Banaji, Nosek, 2004; Jost, Kay, 2005) assumes that sexism is associated with maintaining the existing social hierarchy. Bareket and Fiske (2023) state that hostile sexism legitimizes and protects men's power, while benevolent sexism guards traditional gender roles.

Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism towards women and men (ASI and AMI) are positively correlated with perceived legitimacy for the existing social hierarchy within gender; both in women ($r = .21 \div .5$) and in men ($r = .38 \div .65$). However, only hostile sexism predicts the perceived stability of the existing social hierarchy within gender (Glick, Whitehead, 2010).

A persistent belief in deserving special goods and treatment, the so-called entitlement (cf. Fetterolf, Rudman, 2014), is a predictor of benevolent sexism in women ($\beta = .35$), and hostile sexism in men ($\beta = .17 \div .32$), but not in women (Grubbs, Exline, Twenge, 2014).

Ethan Zell, Jason E. Strickhouser, Tyler N. Lane, and Sabrina R. Teeter (2016) found that the more gender differences people perceived, the more they endorsed hostile or benevolent sexism towards women. Additionally, the more strongly people endorse hostile or benevolent sexism, the more they exaggerate the size of gender differences. The observed differences are greater in women than in men. Changes in the perceived magnitude of gender differences predict corresponding changes in levels of sexism.

In Poland, Anna Studzińska and Bogdan Wojciszke (2014) found that only hostile sexism towards women mediates the relationship between beliefs about the biological or cultural nature of gender differences and the degree of legitimization of these differences. Hostile sexism was associated with hostility towards women. It was also found that the greater the belief in the biological determinants of gender differences, the stronger the legitimization of gender inequalities; there was a more visible tendency to ignore the negative situation of women and not engage in social actions aimed at changing the situation of women and men. Similarly, an increase in the belief in the influence of culture on the unequal status of women and men was associated with the delegitimization of this inequality.

People who do not conform to gender stereotypes may face social and economic sanctions from the environment, i.e. the backlash effect, which may contribute to maintaining prejudices (cf. Rudman, 1998; Rudman, Glick, 2002; Glick, Rudman, 2010). This explains the existing negative stereotypes of women who are feminists (Mandal, Banot, 2007; Mandal, Kofta, 2009). Sabotaging a stereotypical person increases the "saboteur's" self-esteem, and stereotypical people who fear rejection choose the strategy of hiding or pretending to conform to social gender expectations (Rudman, Fairchild, 2004).

The hostile aspect of sexism may seem to stand in opposition to the benevolent one – contempt on the one hand and admiration for women on the other. Laurie Rudman and Janell Fetterolf (2014) conducted a series of studies and showed that women overestimate men's level of hostile sexism towards women and underestimate their level of benevolent sexism towards women. In turn, men overestimate women's level of benevolent sexism towards women and underestimate their level of hostile sexism. The authors argue that putting hostile and benevolent sexism in opposition is an illusion because they are positively correlated and both forms reinforce the existing gender hierarchy.

Sexism and individual variables

The gender of the respondents differentiates the results for sexism (Glick, Fiske, 1996, 1999). In the research of Peter Glick, Maria Castro Lameiras and Yolanda Rodriguez Castro (2002), men scored higher than women on the scale of sexism towards women (both hostile and benevolent). At the same time, men had lower scores than women for hostile sexism towards men. The gender of the respondents did not differentiate the level of benevolent sexism towards men.

Religious people are often committed to traditional gender roles (Jenen, Jansen, 1993; Sanchez, Hall, 1999; Wilcox, Jelen, 1991). The Roman Catholic Church distances itself from hostile sexist ideology. In research that included 1,003 people (including 508 women), Peter Glick, Maria Lameiras and Yolanda R. Castro (2002) found that in both sexes, religiosity is not a predictor of higher hostile sexism, but is related to the recognition of gender differences.

A higher level of education is associated with a lower level of general prejudice (Farley et al., 1994) and also with lower sexist attitude (Benson, Vincent, 1980; Sidanius, 1993). It may be the result not so much of a reduction in prejudices, but of greater concealment of them (Schaeffer, 1996) or greater, open disclosure of egalitarian attitudes (Farley et al., 1994). For ambivalent sexism, in both sexes, the level of education negatively correlates with both hostile and benevolent sexism towards both women and men (cf. Glick, Lameiras, Castro, 2002). In Polish research by Małgorzata Mikołajczyk and Janina Pietrzak (2014), the higher the level of education, the lower the hostile sexism towards women in men (ASI-HS) and the lower sexism towards women in women (ASI-BH).

Age, in both women and men, is a predictor of sexism for all subscales of ambivalent sexism towards women and towards men (β from .16 to .30) except hostile sexism towards women (Glick, Lameiras, Castro, 2002). This relationship is not straightforward. Matthew D. Hammond, Petar Milojev, Yanshu Huang, Chris G. Sibley (2017), in a series of six studies on over 10,000 New Zealanders, found that due to the age of the respondents (cohort), the level of ambivalent sexism in the graph took the shape of the letter "U". More precisely – for women and ambivalent sexism (ASI HS and BS) and for men and hostile sexism (HS), their level was relatively high in young people, decreased in middle-aged people and increased again in older people. In turn, men's support for benevolent sexism towards women increased linearly with the age of the respondents. Hostile and benevolent sexism were most strongly correlated among young people, and the strength of this relationship decreased with the age of the respondents. Across a series of studies, it was found that the level of sexism decreased over time. The greatest declines were recorded, as expected, in young subjects.

In New Zealand, between 2009 and 2016, the average level of ambivalent sexism towards women decreased over time: the average level of benevolent sexism towards women (BS) decreased in men by 1.3% and in women by 4.1%, and for hostile sexism (HS), there was a decrease of 3.9% in men and 1.8% in women (Huang et al., 2018).

At the same time, another type of analysis – based on ranks – showed that the level of sexism towards women is stable over time among the surveyed women and men. In Polish research on a population other than students, ambivalent sexism towards women was not related to age (Mikołajczak, Pietrzak, 2014).

Research by Cristina Mosso, Giovanni Briante, Antonio Aiello and Silvi Russo (2013) indicates that ambivalent sexism towards women is positively correlated with **social dominance orientation** (SDO; cf. Sidanius, Pratto, 1999, Bareket, Fiske, 2023) and **political orientation** (from liberal to conservative). Hostile sexism towards women is positively associated, but only in men, with an orientation towards social dominance, and only in women with a tendency to maintain the social status quo. In Poland, Janina Pietrzak and Małgorzata Mikołajczyk (2015) found that social dominance orientation is not a predictor of benevolent sexism, but is a predictor of hostile sexism (β = .16), more strongly in men (β = .38) than in women (β = .12), and this difference is probably due to the higher position.

The level of ambivalent sexism towards women correlates with attitudes towards women of different ages and in different life situations (Chrisler et al., 2014). For example, in women, the higher the level of benevolent sexism towards women, the more positive the attitude toward pre-menstrual women, pregnant women and those with small children. In men, the higher the benevolent sexism, the more favorable the attitude towards women with small children, and the higher the hostile sexism towards women, the worse the opinion about women after menopause and hysterectomy (removal of the uterus).

Paternalistic chivalry refers to attitudes towards women that dictate being polite and respecting women, but placing limits on what behaviors are appropriate for women. Benevolent sexism towards women, but not hostile sexism or gender, is associated with the level of paternalistic chivalry (β = .36) (Viki, Abrams, Hutchison, 2003).

High benevolent sexism is associated with a lower quality of work for women (Dardenne, Dumont, Bollier, 2007). Women who rank high on the scale of benevolent sexism towards women are more willing to give leadership to men who also present characteristics typical of this form of prejudice; i.e. those who should be willing, among others, to protect women (Kulich, de Lemus, Montañés, 2020). In contrast, women low on the scale of hostile sexism toward women care more about leadership when they have to work with men exhibiting high hostile sexism; which can also be explained as a form of resistance against hostile domination. Men are more willing to take over leadership when a woman displays characteristics that suggest her high benevolent sexism or ambivalent attitude rather than those that break gender stereotypes, e.g. high hostile sexism, or low benevolent sexism.

Deborah Giustini and Peter Matanle (2019) illustrate that employers' high expectations, e.g. regarding time spent at work, are problematic not only for women but also for men. Creating a more employee-friendly environment would also contribute to improving and equalizing opportunities for women and men in the job market.

Sexism and romantic relationships

Gender bias is unique in nature because women and men enter into close, romantic relationships and marriages. Hostile sexism in men is associated with aggressive views and behaviors that make it difficult to meet basic needs in an intimate relationship. In turn, benevolent sexism works to offset the costs of hostile behavior by promoting caring behaviors, but these in turn increase men's influence and relationship satisfaction (Hammond, Overall, 2017). Women support benevolent sexism because it promises them security in a relationship, and men because it supports their career goals. Women's high benevolent sexism makes them more vulnerable in a relationship crisis.

The fact of being in a relationship with someone is not a predictor of sexism in women, while in men it explains the lower score on the scale of hostile sexism towards women ($\beta = -.11$) and benevolent sexism towards men ($\beta = -.10$) (Glick, Lameiras, Castro, 2002). Being in a serious romantic relationship is more strongly associated with overall life satisfaction in people with high than low benevolent sexism towards women, and the exact opposite relationship holds for hostile sexism (Waddell, Sibley, Osborne, 2018). The fact of being a parent in women is associated with lower hostile sexism towards men and benevolent sexism towards women and men, while for men it explains lower scores for hostile sexism towards men (HM; $\beta = -.20$) (Glick, Lameiras, Castro, 2002).

As support for sexist beliefs towards women and men increases, men's preference for younger women who have good domestic skills increases, while women's preference for older men who have skills that can translate into higher earnings increases (Eastwick and al., 2006; Lee et al., 2010; Chen, Fiske, Lee, 2009).

The issue of the division of household chores and the belief in the "naturalness" of differences between the sexes was explored by Gabriell Poeschl and her colleagues (2006). Both Portuguese men and women strongly believe that "natural" differences between the sexes exist (average 5.1 on a scale of 1÷7). Both men and women carried out the traditional, stereotypical division of household duties – however, men were more satisfied with the traditional division of duties than women. Married women, compared to unmarried or divorced people, had higher benevolent sexism towards women and were more willing to justify the traditional division of household chores (Poeschl et al., 2006).

High levels of benevolent sexism in women may undermine relationship stability. Research carried out in New Zealand on 363 couples showed that high hostile sexism towards women in male partners predicts lower relationship satisfaction in female partners and problems in many areas, e.g. power in the relationship, dependency, trust, gender roles, abuse, infidelity, substance use (Cross, Overall, 2019). Similar results were obtained in a year-long study conducted by Matthew Hammond and Nickola Overall (2014) – the greater the discrepancy between expectations (ideal) and the current partner, the greater the willingness to end the relationship, but this effect

was stronger among women who supported benevolent sexism towards women. Also, partners of women who endorsed benevolent sexism were more likely to end the relationship.

Women's romantic attachment style is associated with their ambivalent sexism towards men (Hart, Glick, Dinero, 2013). Attachment distress (anxiety) predicts higher both hostile and benevolent sexism toward men. Attachment avoidance in a relationship predicts higher hostility and lower benevolent sexism toward men. The level of romanticism is a mediator for the influence of benevolent sexism, and the level of trust is a mediator for the influence of hostile sexism toward men. These results illustrate the ambivalent nature of sexism – on the one hand, reluctance and hostility towards men, and on the other hand, fear that strengthens the need to be cared for – the benevolent aspect of sexism.

In research conducted on students in the USA and China (Chen, Fiske, Lee, 2009), men and Chinese were the most supportive of hostile sexism, while Chinese women accepted benevolent sexism to a greater extent than American women. The Chinese – both women and men – were looking for partners oriented towards the home environment, that is, men who would provide support and women who would take care of the house. Americans preferred partners who took into account the other party's feelings and respected them, but men also looked for attractive women.

Marta Szastok, Małgorzata Kossowska and Joanna Pyrkosz-Pacyna (2019) determined that people with high levels of benevolent sexism towards women assess mothers who stay with their children for a long time after giving birth (for three years of parental leave) as more emotionally warm, more effective as parents, more attractive socially than mothers who return to work soon after giving birth (using only three months of maternity leave). People who were not characterized by high levels of benevolent sexism towards women assessed both mothers who stayed at home with their children for a short and long time equally well. The researchers conclude that high benevolent sexism predicts a more positive attitude towards women choosing traditional roles, hence contributing to maintaining the status quo.

For both men and women, endorsing sexist beliefs toward women predicts their **attitudes toward violence** against women (wives) (Glick et al., 2002; Bareket, Fiske, 2023). However, when controlling for the contribution of hostile sexism to benevolent sexism and benevolent sexism to hostile sexism, it turned out that only hostile sexism predicts attitudes that legitimize the use of violence in a relationship and predicts it better in men. As a result, benevolent sexism does not protect women against attitudes that legitimize violence, especially when women are perceived as those who undermine their husband's authority and break away from conventional gender roles.

Beth Jaworski and Eileen Zurbriggen (2007) described the correlates of ambivalent sexism towards women and various dimensions of sexuality, focusing on rape myth acceptance (RMA; Burt, 1980), sexual experiences, attraction to sexual aggression, antagonistic beliefs about sexual intercourse, use of contraception, age of sexual initiation. Acceptance of the rape myth and antagonistic sexual beliefs moderately

positively correlate with hostile and benevolent sexism towards women. For men, hostile and benevolent sexism towards women correlates positively with imagined, but not with actual sexual aggression. For women, benevolent sexism towards women correlates positively with victimization, and hostile sexism with victimization, committing a criminal act and imaginary sexual aggression; and all of these correlations are low. For women, hostile and benevolent sexism do not correlate significantly with safe sex or casual sex. For men, both hostile and benevolent sexism correlate significantly positively with casual sex, while benevolent sexism negatively correlates with safe sex.

In men, highly hostile sexism towards women may be associated with false beliefs about a lack of power in the relationship and being exploited by the partner, which may lead to a lack of relationship satisfaction, anxiety and aggression (Hammond, Cross, Overall, 2020). Benevolent sexism may involve idealizing the romantic model of a relationship and partner. For men, a partner who ranks high on the scale of benevolent sexism will invest a lot in the relationship, giving it a sense of stability, while not limiting the man in his efforts to raise his social status. In this way, a woman gains a sense of security in a relationship, but at the cost of her independence.

Weakening sexism

In the social sciences, researchers have undertaken numerous analyses of the effectiveness of reducing prejudices, including those related to gender. One of the paradigms is teaching people to notice sexist behaviors in everyday life (Becker, Swim, 2011) and also to notice the harmfulness of these beliefs (Becker, Swim, 2012). Probably also teaching about the cultural, and not only biological, sources of differences between the sexes can reduce sexism. Furthermore, as Julia Becker, Matthew Zawadzki and Stephanie Shields (2014) note – mechanisms that work well for reducing other forms of prejudice are not always effective in the case of sexism.

Aife Hopkins-Doyle and colleagues (2019), in a series of seven studies, tried to determine how benevolent sexism contributes to reducing women's willingness to change the current status quo on gender issues. Women are more likely to recall life experiences related to benevolent (than hostile) sexism, but they are less likely to protest against them, seeing them as a manifestation of warmth/kindness. Men described with traits indicating their high level of benevolent sexism towards women were, via the warmth factor, rated as being lower on the scale of hostile sexism and as more supportive of gender equality. Men described as emotionally warm towards women (vs. cold) were also rated as having high benevolent sexism, but did not rank as high for known correlates of benevolent sexism, e.g., (not) blaming rape victims, justifying domestic violence, preferring that the man took the initiative during dating or felt psychologically entitled/deserving special treatment. The authors conclude that it is the warm tone of behavior associated with benevolent sexism in men that

somehow "masks" their ideological function (consolidating the status quo), reduces opposition, and "disarms" women's will to strive for change.

Women's motivation to try to change the status quo may be the reflection that the current state is unfavorable for them – women. Can anything motivate men to change the established order that is favorable to them? Spanish researchers Lucía Estevan-Reina, Soledad de Lemus and Jesús L. Megías (2020) point to two motivations – egalitarian and paternalistic. In a series of three studies, they found that men who score high on the scale of benevolent sexism towards women are willing to question sexism for paternalistic reasons, while people who identify high with feminist views are willing to question it for egalitarian reasons. Moreover, this applies not only to individual actions but also to the readiness to engage in collective events, e.g. participation in a strike for equal pay for women and men. The authors also draw attention to the limitations of these motivations, e.g. paternalistic motivation may lead to positive behavior, but at the same time legitimize men's power (cf. Nadler, 2002 and Good et al., 2018).

Stereotypes and prejudices operate automatically. We can make more balanced assessments, but we must be aware of the stereotype threat in a given situation (Moskowitz 2009). Ethan Zell and colleagues (2016), citing the results of their research, suggest the possibility of reducing sexism through interventions that reduce exaggerated beliefs about gender differences. In an experimental study, Jessica L. Cundiff, Matthew Zawadzki, Cinnamon Danube, and Stephanie Shields (2014) showed the effectiveness of teaching about the dangers of subtle sexism in an academic environment. The experimental group identified sexist behaviors encountered in everyday life as harmful better than the control group, and also sought more information about gender inequalities. Both the experimental and control groups received the same information about gender inequality, but the experimental group additionally used the experiential learning method (cf. Kolb, 1984). The experiential learning method involved arranging a board game that the participants played, but its rules favored men. Then, participants were encouraged to engage in a discussion that stimulated reflection, and as a result, people from the experimental group built an abstract theory about the meaning and implications of the experience they had experienced (related to gender-based favoritism in a board game). Jessica Cundiff and co-authors (2014) suggest that using the experiential learning method reduces the effect of reactance and resistance to presented information about gender inequality.

The usefulness of behavioral intervention in reducing ambivalent sexism towards women was experimentally tested by Christopher Kilmartin, Robin Semelsberger, Sarah Dye, Erin Boggs, David Kolar (2015). For this purpose, 43 students completed an instrument measuring the level of sexism (ASI) and attitudes towards rape (cf. Burt, 1980). Then 23 of them (the experimental group) took part in classes during which sexist ideology was criticized in the form of drama and essay writing. The control group had assertiveness workshops at that time. After two weeks, the measurement was repeated. There was a statistically significant but small decrease in sexist beliefs in the experimental group.

Psychologists use interventions based on the contact hypothesis (frequent, positive contact) to induce representatives of discriminated groups to like those who have privileges – which is to accelerate the achievement of social harmony (cf. Allport, 1954; Dovidio, Glick, Rudman, 2005; Pettigrew, Tropp , 2006). John Dixon, Linda Tropp, Kevin Durrheim and Colin Tredoux (2010) showed that such action may also lead to unintended effects – harmony cannot always be identified with good relationships and conflict with bad relationships. More frequent, positive contact correlated with declared greater tolerance (here – racial). For Caucasians respondents, it positively correlated with the perception of racial injustice. However, African-American respondents showed a negative correlation, that is, they underestimated the scale of racial injustice and discrimination. Modern racism and sexism have similar theoretical foundations (cf. McConahay, 1986; Swim et al., 1995), hence it can be speculated that positive contact between the sexes may also lead to less support for actions aimed at eliminating inequalities. Julia Becker and her colleagues (2013) also made similar observations – positive contact between groups is led, among others, to a situation in which women will not take action to support equal rights unless men say directly that the current situation is unfair.

Instead of a conclusion

People incorrectly assess the frequency with which they use stereotypes (Moskowitz, 2009). People who want to see themselves as egalitarian reject stereotypes on a conscious level, but they do not always protect themselves against negative, unconscious emotions related to the stereotype (Gaertnera, Dovidio, 1986). Stereotype affect can lead to biased behavior – for example, biased examples, using valid attitudes as opportunities to highlight differences between groups, e.g., a person who considers himself or herself unbiased only lists examples of sloppy men and ignores examples of women. Activation of stereotypes and prejudices takes place automatically (Devine, 1989), without the participation of consciousness. Activation does not force us to use stereotypes. However, it commonly leads to, often unconscious, bias – and de facto the use of a stereotype (Moskowitz, 2009). Even slightly prejudiced people who consciously avoid stereotyping cannot inhibit the automatic activation of the stereotype – when they are not aware that a given stimulus triggers the activation of a stereotype, the stereotype distorts their judgments at a similar level to that of highly prejudiced people (Devine, 1989). This is, among other things, why the issue of sexism and gender bias is important – without knowledge about them, it is difficult to protect ourselves from the thoughtless use of stereotypes. All the more so because, as Olga Sutherland et al. (2017) note, sexist ideology has changed under the influence of socio-economic changes and contemporary forms of sexism still legitimize men's power, but in new, "creative" ways, often even including in their rhetoric some arguments of the feminist movement.

Translated by Katarzyna Jenek

References

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Agadullina, E., Lovakov, A., Balezina, M., & Gulevich, O.A. (2022). Ambivalent sexism and violence toward women: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 52*(5–6), 819–859. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2855

Bareket, O., & Fiske, S.T. (2023). A systematic review of the ambivalent sexism literature: Hostile sexism protects men's power; benevolent sexism guards traditional gender roles. *Psychological Bulletin, 149*(11–12), 637–698, doi: 10.1037/bul0000400

Becker, J.C., & Swim, J.K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily encounters with sexism as a way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 227–242, doi: 10.1177/0361684310397509

Becker, J.C., & Swim, J.K. (2012). Reducing endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist beliefs: Differential effects of addressing harm versus pervasiveness of benevolent sexism. *Social Psychology, 43*(3), 127–137, doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000091

Becker, J.C., Wright, S.C., Lubensky, M.E., & Zhou, S. (2013). Friend or Ally: Whether Cross-Group Contact Undermines Collective Action Depends on What Advantaged Group Members Say (or Don't Say). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(4), 442–455, doi: 10.1177/0146167213477155

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

Benson, P.L., & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and validation of the sexist attitudes toward women scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5*, 276–291, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1980.tb00962.x

Berscheid, E., & Peplau, L.A. (1983). The emerging science of relationships. In H.H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J.H. Harvey, T.L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L.A. Peplau, & D.R. Peterson (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 1–19). New York: Freeman

Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*, 217–230, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217

Cameron, J.E., & Lalonde, R.N. (2001). Social identification and gender-related ideology in women and men. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(1), 59–77, doi: 10.1348/014466601164696

Chen, Zhixia, Fiske, Susan T., Lee, & Tiane L. (2009). Ambivalent Sexism and Power-Related Gender-role Ideology in Marriage. *Sex Roles, 60*, 765–778, doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9585-9

Chrisler, J.C., Gorman, J.A., Marván, M.L., & Johnston-Robledo, I. (2014). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward women in different stages of reproductive life: A semantic, cross-cultural approach. *Health Care Women International, 35*(6), 634–657, doi: 10.1080/07399332.2012.740113

Cross, E.J., & Overall, N.C. (2019). Women experience more serious relationship problems when male partners endorse hostile sexism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 49*(5), 1022–1041, doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2560

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

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

Devine, P.G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5–18, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5

Dixon, J., Tropp, L.R., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2010). "Let Them Eat Harmony": Prejudice-Reduction Strategies and Attitudes of Historically Disadvantaged Groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*(2) 76–80, doi: 10.1177/0963721410363366

Dovidio, J.F., Glick, P., & Rudman, L.A. (Eds.), (2005). *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, doi: 10.1002/9780470773963.ch1

Eastwick, P.W., Eagly, A.H., Glick, P., Johannesen-Schmidt, M.C., Fiske, S.T., Blum, A.M.B., …, & Volpato, C. (2006). Is traditional gender ideology associated with sex-typed mate preferences? A test in nine nations. *Sex Roles, 54*(9–10), 603–614, doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9027-x

Ekehammar, B., & Akrami, N. (2007). Personality and prejudice: From Big Five personality factors to facets. *Journal of Personality, 75*(5), 899–925, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00460.x

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2000). Development and validation of Swedish classical and modern sexism scales. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 41, 307–314, doi: 10.1111/1467-9450.00203

Estevan-Reina L., de Lemus S., & Megías J.L. (2020). Feminist or Paternalistic: Understanding Men's Motivations to Confront Sexism. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 2988, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02988

Farley, R., Steeh, C., Krysan, M., Jackson, T., & Reeves, K. (1994). Stereotypes and segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit area. *American Journal of Sociology, 100*, 750–780, doi: 10.1086/230580

Fetterolf, J.C., & Rudman, L. (2014). Gender Inequality in the Home: The Role of Relative Income, Support for Traditional Gender Roles, and Perceived Entitlement. *Gender Issues, 31*(3–4), 219–237, doi: 10.1007/s12147-014-9126-x

Fisher, M.I., Burgess, T.C., & Hammond, M.D. (2021). Men who endorse hostile sexism feel vulnerable and exploited when seeking support in close relationships. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 22*(4), 732–744, doi: 10.1037/men0000357

Gaertner, S.L., & Dovidio, J.F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L. (Eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gaunt, R. (2013). Ambivalent sexism and perceptions of men and women who violate gendered family roles. *Community, Work & Family, 16*(4), 401–416, doi: 10.1080/13668803.2013.779231

Giustini, D., & Matanle, P. (2019). Revisiting the First and Second Sexism in Japan. *The Newsletter, International Institute of Asian Studies*, Leiden University, *82*, 14.

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, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1999). The Ambivalence toward Men Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23*(3), 519–536, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x

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, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (2011). Ambivalent Sexism Revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(3), 530–535, doi: 10.1177/0361684311414832

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

Glick, P., Lameiras, M., & Castro, Y.R. (2002). Education and Catholic Religiosity as Predictors of Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Toward Women and Men. *Sex Roles, 47*(9/10), 433–441, doi: 10.1023/A:1021696209949

Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S.T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., …, & Wells, R. (2004). Bad but Bold: Ambivalent Attitudes Toward Men Predict Gender Inequality in 16 Nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*(5), 713–728, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.5.713

Glick, P., & Rudman, L.A. (2010). Sexism. In J.F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V.M. Esses (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (pp. 328–344). London: SAGE Publications Ltd, doi: 10.4135/9781446200919

Good, J.J., Sanchez, D.T., & Moss-Racusin, C.A. (2018). A paternalistic duty to protect? Predicting men's decisions to confront sexism. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 19*(1), 14–24, doi: 10.1037/men0000077

Grubbs, J.B., Exline, J.J., & Twenge, J.M. (2014). Psychological Entitlement and Ambivalent Sexism: Understanding the Role of Entitlement in Predicting Two Forms of Sexism. *Sex Roles, 70*(5–6), 209–220, doi: 10.1007/s11199-014-0360-1

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

Hammond, M.D., Cross, E.J., & Overall, N.C. (2020). Relationship (in)security is central to the sources and outcomes of sexist attitudes. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 14*(3), doi: 10.1111/spc3.12522

Hammond, M.D., Milojev, P., Huang, Y., & Sibley, C.G. (2017). Benevolent sexism and hostile sexism across the ages. *Social Personality and Psychological Science, 9*(7), 863–874, doi: 10.1177/1948550617727588

Hammond, M.D., & Overall, N.C. (2014). Endorsing benevolent sexism magnifies willingness to dissolve relationships when facing partner-ideal discrepancies. *Personal Relationships, 21*(2), 272–287, doi: 10.1111/pere.12031

Hammond, M.D., & Overall, N.C. (2017). Dynamics Within Intimate Relationships and the Causes, Consequences, and Functions of Sexist Attitudes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 26*(2), 120–125, doi: 10.1177/0963721416686213

Hart, J., Glick, P., & Dinero, R.E. (2013). She Loves Him, She Loves Him Not: Attachment Style as a Predictor of Women's Ambivalent Sexism Toward Men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*(4), 507–518, doi: 10.1177/0361684313497471

Hopkins-Doyle, A., Sutton, R.M., Douglas, K.M., & Calogero, R.M. (2019). Flattering to deceive: Why people misunderstand benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 116*(2), 167–192, doi: 10.1037/pspa0000135

Huang, Y., Osborne, D., & Sibley, Ch.G. (2018). The Gradual Move Toward Gender Equality: A 7-Year Latent Growth Model of Ambivalent Sexism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 10*(3), 335–344, doi: 10.1177/1948550617752472

Jaworski, B.K., & Zurbriggen, E.L. (2007). *Ambivalent Sexism and Its Correlates Across Dimensions of Sexuality* [Referat prezentowany podczas: American Psychological Association 2007, Convention Presentation; w oparciu o rozszerzony abstrakt].

Jensen, L.C., & Jensen, J. (1993). Family values, religiosity, and gender. *Psychological Reports, 73*, 429–430, doi: 10.2466/pr0.1993.73.2.429

Jost, J.T., & Banaji, M.R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 1–27, doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x

Jost, J.T., Banaji, M.R., & Nosek, B.A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology, 25*(6), 881–919, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x

Jost, J.T., & Kay, A.C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 498–509, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498

Kilmartin, C., Semelsberger, R., Dye, S. Boggs, & E., Kolar, D. (2015). A Behavior Intervention to Reduce Sexism in College Men. *Gender Issues, 32*(2), 97–110, doi: 10.1007/s12147-014-9130-1

Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kulich, C., de Lemus, S., & Montañés, P. (2020). The Impact of Sexism on Leadership in Female-Male Climbing Dyads. *Social Psychological Bulletin, 15*(1), 1–31, doi: 10.32872/spb.2667

Lee, T.L., Fiske, S.T., Glick, P., & Chen, Z. (2010). Ambivalent Sexism in Close Relationships: (Hostile) Power and (Benevolent) Romance Shape Relationship Ideals. *Sex Roles, 62*(7–8), 583–601, doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9770-x

Mandal, E. (2004*). Podmiotowe i interpersonalne konsekwencje stereotypów związanych z płcią. Wydanie drugie zmienione*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Mandal, E., & Banot, A. (2007). Kobiecość i męskość a stereotypy feministki. In E. Mandal (Ed.), *W kręgu gender* (pp. 58–78). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Mandal, E. (2008). *Miłość, władza i manipulacja w bliskich związkach.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Mandal, E., & Kofta, M. (2009). Wykluczanie społeczne feministek jako przejaw usprawiedliwiania patriarchalnego systemu społecznego. In A. Cisłak, K. Henne, & K. Skarżyńska (Eds.), *Przekonania w życiu jednostek, grup, społeczności* (pp. 153–170). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica.

McConahay, J.B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J.F. Dovidio, & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Mikołajczak, M., & Pietrzak, J. (2014). Ambivalent sexism and religion: Connected through values. *Sex Roles, 70*(9–10), 387–399, doi: 10.1007/s11199-014-0379-3

Moskowitz, G.B. (2009). *Zrozumieć siebie i innych. Psychologia poznania społecznego.* Gdańsk: GWP.

Mosso, C., Briante, G., Aiello, & A. Russo, S. (2013). The Role of Legitimizing Ideologies as Predictors of Ambivalent Sexism in Young People: Evidence from Italy and the USA. *Social Justice Research, 26*(1), 1–17, doi: 10.1007/s11211-012-0172-9

Nadler, A. (2002), Inter–Group Helping Relations as Power Relations: Maintaining or Challenging Social Dominance Between Groups Through Helping. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 487–502, doi: 10.1111/1540-4560.00272

Pettigrew, T.F., & Tropp, L.R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of inter-group contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751–783, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pietrzak, J., & Mikołajczak, M. (2015). Seksizm w Polsce. In A. Stefaniak, M. Bilewicz, & M. Winiewski (Eds.), *Uprzedzenia w Polsce* (pp. 207–236). Warszawa: Liberi Libra.

Poeschl, G., Pinto, I., Múrias, C., Silva, A., & Ribeiro, R. (2006). Representations of Family Practices, Belief in Sex Differences, and Sexism. *Sex Roles, 55*, 111–121, doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9062-7

Pratto, E, Sidanius, J., & Stallworth, L.M. (1993). Sexual selection and the sexual and ethnic basis of social hierarchy. In Ellis, L. (Ed.), *Social stratification and socioeconomic inequality: A comparative biosocial analysis* (pp. 111–137). New York: Praeger.

Ramiro-Sánchez, T., Ramiro, M.T., Bermúdez, M.P., & Buela-Casal, G. (2018). Sexism in adolescent relationships: A systematic review. *Psychosocial Intervention,27*(3), 123–132, doi: 10.5093/pi2018a19

Rudman, L.A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counter stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 629–645, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629

Rudman, L.A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counter stereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(2), 157–176, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157

Rudman, L.A., & Glick, P. (2002). Prescriptive Gender Stereotypes and Backlash Toward Agentic Women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 743–762, doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00239

Rudman, L.A., & Glick, P. (2008). *Texts in social psychology. The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Rudman, L., & Fetterolf, J.C. (2014). How accurate are meta-perceptions of sexism? Evidence for the illusion of antagonism between hostile and benevolent sexism. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 17*(3), 275–285, doi: 10.1177/1368430213517272

Sanchez, L., & Hall, C.S. (1999). Traditional values and democratic impulses: The gender division of labor in contemporary Spain. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 30*, 659–685.

Schaefer, R.T. (1996). Education and prejudice: Unraveling the relationship. *Sociological Quarterly, 37*, 1–16.

Sidanius, J. (1993). The interface between racism and sexism. *Journal of Psychology, 127*, 211–322, doi: 10.1080/00223980.1993.9915565

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Studzińska, A., & Wojciszke, B. (2014). Przekonania o genezie różnic płci a legitymizacja nierówności kobiet i mężczyzn. *Psychologia Społeczna, 9*(4, 31), 396–408, doi: 10.7366/1896180020143102

Sutherland, O., Lamarre, A., Rice, C., Hardt, L., & Le Couteur, A. (2017). New Sexism in couple therapy: A discursive analysis. *Family process, 56*(3), 686–700, doi: 10.1111/famp.12292

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, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199

Swim, J.K., & Cohen, L.L. (1997). Overt, Covert, And Subtle Sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 103–118, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00103.x

Szastok, M., Kossowska, M., & Pyrkosz-Pacyna, J. (2019). Women Can't Have It All: Benevolent Sexism Predicts Attitudes Toward Working (vs. Stay-at-Home) Mothers. *Social Psychological Bulletin, 14*(1), doi: 10.32872/spb.v14i1.29461

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Unger, R., & Crawford, M. (1992). *Women & Gender: A feminist psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Viki, G.T., Abrams, D., & Hutchison, P. (2003). The "True" Romantic: Benevolent Sexism and Paternalistic Chivalry. *Sex Roles, 49*(9/10), 533–537, doi: 10.1023/A:1025888824749

Waddell, N., Sibley, C.G., & Osborne, D (2018). Better off Alone? Ambivalent Sexism Moderates the Association Between Relationship Status and Life Satisfaction Among Heterosexual Women and Men. *Sex Roles, 80*(5–6), 347–361, doi: 10.1007/s11199-018-0935-3

Wilcox, C., & Jelen, T.G. (1991). The effect of employment and religion on women's feminist attitudes. *International Journal for the Study of Religion, 1*, 161–171, doi: 10.1207/s15327582ijpr0103_3

Zawisza, M., Luyt, R., & Zawadzka, A.M. (2015) Societies in transition: Are they more sexist? A comparison between Polish, South African and British samples, *Journal of Gender Studies, 24*(1), 38–55, doi: 10.1080/09589236.2013.803952

Zell, E., Strickhouser, J.E., Lane, T.N., & Teeter, S.R. (2016). Mars, Venus, or Earth? Sexism and the Exaggeration of Psychological Gender Differences. *Sex Roles, 75*, 287–300, doi: 10.1007/s11199-016-0622-1

UPRZEDZENIA WOBEC KOBIET I MĘŻCZYZN –
KORELATY, PREDYKTORY ORAZ ICH KONSEKWENCJE
DLA ROMANTYCZNYCH ZWIĄZKÓW

Streszczenie. Celem artykułu jest pokazanie, że współcześnie pomimo przemian obyczajowych, w wielu społeczeństwach występują różne formy uprzedzeń społecznych wobec kobiet i mężczyzn. Wskazano na seksizm tradycyjny i seksizm współczesny, seksizm ambiwalentny, seksizm wrogi i seksizm życzliwy. Zaakcentowano wzajemne związki i komponenty tych zjawisk. Opisano zjawisko poznawczego usprawiedliwiania seksizmu oraz efekt odwetu. Omówiono główne badania naukowe pokazujące związki uprzedzeń ze względu na płeć ze zmiennymi demograficznymi i psychologicznymi. Pokazano konsekwencje seksizmu w bliskich związkach kobiet i mężczyzn.

Słowa kluczowe: uprzedzenie, kobieta, mężczyzna, seksizm, związki romantyczne