EXAMINING SEXISM THROUGH THE LENS OF THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL:
A FACET LEVEL APPROACH

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of
Western Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology.

By

Sean Vick

Director: Dr. Erin Myers
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department

Committee Members: Dr. David McCord, Psychology
David Scales, Psychology

March 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

EXAMINING SEXISM THROUGH THE LENS OF THE FIVE-FACTOR MODEL:

A FACET LEVEL APPROACH

Sean Stapleton Vick

Western Carolina University (March 2014)

Director: Dr. Erin Myers

The relationship between personality and generalized prejudice has been an important area of research in social psychology. Early literature posited that those individuals with high levels of right-wing authoritarianism were more likely to display overt attitudes of prejudice. Social dominance orientation was also shown to correlate highly with generalized prejudice. Recent criticisms of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation, however, regard both traits as relating more to social behaviors than as legitimate personality characteristics. As such, there has been a shift towards examining the relationship between generalized prejudice and the five broad domains of personality (i.e., the Five-Factor Model of personality). Sexism, specifically, has been underused when studying specific forms of prejudice and their relationship with the Five-Factor Model. The goal of the present study was to determine which factors and facets of the Five-Factor Model significantly correlate with sexism. Results showed that of the five factors, Neuroticism and Openness to Experience were significantly negatively correlated with sexism while Extraversion was significantly positively correlated with sexism. On a facet level, Excitement-Seeking, Anxiety, Anger, Artistic Interests,

Emotionality, Intellect, and Liberalism were identified as significant predictors for

predicting sexism.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Sexist attitudes remain a prevalent form of prejudice in society today and

evidence of negative attitudes toward women can be found in cultures around the world.

For example, sexist attitudes underlie the poor treatment and daily harassment of women

in Egypt. Thousands of women suffer daily from belittlement, harassment, and—in

severe cases—violence because of long-standing cultural ties to sexist attitudes (Al-

Aswany, 2012). Here in the United States, one particularly salient form of sexism is

directed toward female politicians, many of whom face daily harassment and scrutiny

over every action. Recent political campaigns such as the 2008 vice-presidential

campaign of former Governor Sarah Palin resulted in a litany of sexist remarks belittling

her capabilities as a politician and leader. Particular emphasis on disparaging her

intelligence—while maintaining a sharp focus on her clothing and hairstyle— became

commonplace on nightly news networks. As a result of her treatment by an often sexist

media, Palin became a farce in the eyes of the public (Brown, 2008).

Sexism is one of many forms of prejudice, but it is important to first understand

the concept of prejudice, from a more generalized standpoint, in order to provide a more

robust foundation for the explanation of sexism.

Prejudice, within the context of the present study, involves any preconceived

opinion or judgment directed toward persons or groups of a different culture, ethnicity,

and gender that is usually negative in nature and unwarranted. The mechanics of

prejudice often involve a pattern of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that are typically

not grounded in fact. Discriminatory or thoughts of inferiority directed towards others

are often seen as examples of prejudice. For sexism, these discriminatory thoughts, feelings, and behaviors are often directed to the female population although sexism directed towards males is also prevalent (Webster, Saucier, & Harris, 2010; Swim, Mallett, & Stangor, 2005).

Earlier research on personality and prejudice focused on two major aspects of personality in an attempt to explain generalized prejudice: right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. Right-wing authoritarianism is considered a form of personality characterized by conservative attitudes and a belief in more traditional ways of life. Altemeyer (2004) identified those with more conservative ("right-wing") attitudes as rating higher on generalized prejudice while the opposite effect was found with those who held more liberal values. Social-dominance orientation is defined as a group or system of groups who hold similar values and who desire to be superior or more dominate to outgroups (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Ekehammar and Akrami (2003) reported that individuals who endorsed traits of social dominance orientation also held highly prejudiced attitudes toward groups unlike their own. These two personality traits were often considered the best explanation for the relationship between personality and prejudice. Mounting criticisms involving right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation's place as personality traits weakened their influence on personality and prejudice. In addition, Costa and McCrae's (1992) popularization of the Five-Factor Model introduced a shift in how personality's relationship with prejudice was viewed.

Costa and McCrae, through the introduction of the NEO-PI-R (1992), introduced a new set of personality traits which included five broad factors to explain the range of

personality. These five factors (i.e., Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience) were found to provide stronger and more detailed explanations of personality than previous models, specifically due to the 30 specific personality characteristics that underlie the five broad factors (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). In doing so, a large body of research emerged which evaluated the interaction of prejudice with the new Five Factor model of personality (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Akrami, Ekehammar, & Bergh, 2011).

Recent research on personality and prejudice has looked specifically at sexism and the Big Five personality factors (Akrami, Ekehammar, & Bergh, 2011; Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2000; Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003). The results of these studies have shown significant negative correlations between sexism and Agreeableness as well as between sexism and Openness to Experience (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2000; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). Along with the five broad factors, significant correlations have been found with several of the facets of Agreeableness and Openness to Experience with the two highest correlated facets (i.e., Sympathy and Liberalism) being strong predictors of sexism. Agreeableness, which is characteristic of empathy, sympathy, and the opposite of antagonism, can be expected to negatively correlate with sexism. Openness to Experience, which contains characteristics of nonconformity and liberal tendencies and has been shown to correlate negatively with right-wing authoritarianism, can also be expected to negatively correlate with sexism (John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & Costa, 1997).

The purpose of this study is to replicate past findings with a college-aged sample as well as to explore correlations between sexism and the facets of the Five-Factor

Model. Previous research has indicated Agreeableness and Openness to Experience to significantly negatively correlate with sexism. Several of the facets of Agreeableness and Openness to Experience have also shown to significantly negatively correlate with sexism, as has Warmth—a facet of Extraversion (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007). It is believed that the facets of the Five-Factor Model can provide a deeper and richer interpretation of how personality can predict sexism.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Context of Prejudice and Race Psychology

Human history is marked by the pervasiveness of intergroup prejudice and the subsequent conflicts caused by this issue. Prejudice remains a pertinent issue and it wasn't until the early 1900s that psychologists and sociologists began to turn their focus to the manifestation of prejudice. Early research focused on attempting to explain the causal mechanisms behind prejudicial attitudes.

Webster, Saucier, and Harris (2010) highlighted the contributions of William Hazlitt and his work on prejudice as being one of the first major influences on the study of prejudice from a psychological and sociological standpoint. Hazlitt's work—*On Prejudice* (1830/2000)—not only defined prejudice, but it also explored the formation, functions, and consequences of prejudicial attitudes. Hazlitt defined prejudice as the prejudgment of any opinion without having properly examined it and maintaining this prejudgment through perseverance and ignorance even when presented with information to the contrary (Hazlitt, 1830/2000). Hazlitt postulated that prejudice was the result of intergroup violence stemming from the disagreement of individual group attitudes or beliefs. In other words, people tend to associate with others who are like-minded and tend to find fault in others who do not share the same opinion.

The widely held belief that African-Americans and other minorities were inherently inferior to their white counterparts was a heavy influence on early psychological and sociological research. These attitudes, however, were not seen as prejudiced as ample research had been performed to support the commonly held

assumption that men were superior to women and that Whites were superior to Blacks and other minorities. It existed as common knowledge and "race psychology" was devoted to the study of Black inferiority (Duckitt, 1992; Webster et al., 2010). Race psychology was used as a means to support the idea of Black inferiority with the concept of prejudice being regarded as a natural reaction to the "backwardness" and "inferiority" of minority races. However, Samelson (1978) points out that the Black civil rights movements of the 1920s as well as the ramifications of World War I caused a shift in perspective for psychologists and sociologists. Floyd Allport posited that weaker mental ability was not a strong enough claim to validate the subjugation and racist attitudes towards Blacks. By the 1930s, psychologists and sociologists turned their attention to how to properly define and explain prejudice (Samelson, 1978).

Early Views of Personality

During this time period, the psychodynamic perspective was the dominant point of view in psychology, and it was this method of psychology which first provided an explanation for prejudice. Several early works detailed several psychodynamic processes as being the catalyst or force behind prejudice. Processes like projection, scapegoating, frustration, and displacement of hostility were given as reasons for prejudice. Of these, particular emphasis was given to aggression and hostility as it was believed that Whites experiencing social frustrations would displace or project this frustration on minorities, making them scapegoats for their failures (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, & Sears, 1939; Duckitt, 1992). This psychodynamic approach initiated the research into the relationship between personality and prejudice. As the 1950s approached, extensive research would be given to the concept of the right-wing authoritarian personality and its

relation with high levels of general prejudice. Of great importance is the seminal work of Gordon Allport.

Gordon Allport (1954) suggested that individuals with a highly right-wing authoritarian personality (RWA) displayed greater levels of generalized prejudice than those on the low end. This has been corroborated in numerous other empirical studies (Altemeyer, 1998; Duckitt & Sibley, 2007; Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003). This authoritarian personality is highlighted by strong conservative values as well as a strong inclination to submit to established authorities. Altemeyer (1988, 2004) reasoned that such high levels of prejudice in individuals with elevated scores in RWA were instigated by high levels of fear which lead to prejudiced attacks because of a sense of self-righteousness and perceived approval from authorities. Right-wing authoritarianism, then, can be seen as the submissive side of personality.

Along with RWA, social dominance orientation was seen as another possible personality trait indicative of overt prejudice. Unlike RWA, however, social dominance orientation represented a more dominant or assertive set of personality traits (Pratto et al., 1994). Social dominance orientation (SDO) is defined as an individual's preference for a group-based hierarchy. The resulting intergroup attitude is one of superiority and research has shown SDO to be a predictor of generalized prejudice towards an extensive variety of ethnicities, cultures, and gender orientations (Ho et al., 2012). Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov, and Duarte (2003) observed that SDO was a good predictor of prejudice when used as a mediating variable between academic major and level of prejudice. Pratto et al. (1994) observed strong positive correlations between SDO and anti-Black racism, elitism, conservatism, and sexism. Negative correlations were also

observed between SDO and gay rights, women's rights, social welfare programs, ameliorative racial policy, miscegenation, and environmental policy. Therefore, both RWA and SDO are seen as predictors of generalized prejudice although each personality factor defines two unique sides: one of the submissive individual and one of the dominating individual.

It has been argued, however, that both RWA and SDO can be defined better as social dimensions of societal attitudes and values rather than as personality factors (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). That is, instead of viewing them as determinants of personality, they should be viewed as mediators of the influence of personality on prejudice. Regardless, personality has been an important attribute in the measurement and determination of generalized prejudice. While a wealth of research has been done on the racial attitudes of individuals, far less research has focused solely on the personality attributes associated with sexism. It is important, therefore, to define sexism and its current role in society as well as its historical context in psychology and sociology.

Forms of Sexism and Prior Research

Sexism is a form of prejudice based on a person's sex. It can be observable through discriminatory behaviors as well as through emotions relating to negative thoughts or attitudes towards a particular sex. It is different from other forms of prejudice, notably racism, because of the dual interdependence and close intimacy between men and women (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Roets, Van Hiel, & Dhont, 2012). Like racism, sexism has become more subtle in today's society (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997, 2011). While stereotypical associations are still maintained, its expression—in a cultural context—is far less overt than in years prior (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995).

Recent forms of sexism can often appear nondiscriminatory and this makes it difficult to

both measure the subtler forms of gender discrimination as well as make it more difficult

to understand the true consequences of these behaviors (Nier & Gaertner, 2012). While it

can be said that current discrimination regarding race is far more prevalent than that of

gender, sexism is still a prominent, albeit subtle, factor in the current workplace. For

example, according to the Census Bureau, women workers' average salary totaled

$33,900 per year versus $47,700 for their male counterparts (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, &

Smith, 2011). Presently, three forms of sexism exist: overt, covert, and subtle sexism.

Of the three forms, subtle sexism is seen as the current form of gender discrimination.

Subtle sexism has been seen as a product of ambivalence; in other words, the sexist

attitudes are caused by the conflicting feelings, both positive and negative, towards a

particular gender (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Nier & Gaertner, 2012).

Overt sexism involves the outright unequal and harmful treatment of a differing

sex that is visible or observable and can be documented easily. This form of sexism is

considered classical—or old-fashioned—sexism as its characteristics are reminiscent of

attitudes held decades ago. Covert sexism, similar to its overt counterpart, only differs in

the expression of sexist attitudes; that is, harmful treatment and discrimination is enacted

in a hidden or discrete way.

Subtle sexism involves the endorsement of sexist attitudes or beliefs, but at an

automatic level. This form of sexism is seen as unintentional and is considered by some

to be a product of automatic cognitive processes; in other words, the individual doesn't

know that the way they are acting is endorsing a sexist attitude (Swim & Cohen, 1997).

Subtle sexism is primarily communicated through sexist language which oftentimes can

go undetected because it is ingrained in the language, it is traditional and commonplace, and is difficult to change (Swim, Mallett, & Stangor, 2004). This type of sexist language is also characteristic of modern, rather than old-fashioned or classical, sexism. This is because most of the sexist language has become so engrained in normal speech that it is often overlooked and goes unnoticed—as opposed to old-fashioned sexism which conveys sexist attitudes blatantly and outright (e.g., "Women are generally not as smart as men.").

Swim et al. (2004) investigated this phenomenon with the intention of better highlighting what constitutes sexist language. One measure (i.e., *Personal Definitions of Sexist Language*) asked participants to define their personal definition of sexist language while another measure (i.e., *Detecting Sexist Language*) contained an inventory of subtly sexist statements which participants were asked to find any grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors as well as examples of discriminatory language. Using the Modern Sexism Scale (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995), the researchers found that those participants who endorsed more Modern Sexist beliefs detected less sexist language. This was also reflected in their definition of sexist language; that is, those participants who endorsed more Modern Sexist beliefs had a more narrow definition of what constituted sexist language and were less likely to agree that language identified as sexist are actually sexist. This study highlights the subtlety of sexist language and the difficulty of detecting it among highly modern sexist individuals. It also illustrates the extent of subtle sexism; in that, it has become a part of societies' vernacular and is becoming more difficult to eradicate, mainly because it is often being undetected.

Overt and covert sexism can be considered a form of hostile sexism, characterized by intentional mistreatment or discrimination towards someone of a different sex. Benevolent sexism, on the other hand, is characterized by a general acceptance of stereotypical gender attitudes although it is communicated and maintained in a non-hostile or friendly way. Subtle sexism tends to follow this train of thought as sexist attitudes are implicitly communicated and does not involve purposeful mistreatment or discrimination against another sex (Swim & Cohen, 1997; Roets, Hiel, & Dhont, 2012). Both benevolent and hostile sexism are components of an umbrella term called ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Previous research on ambivalent sexism has shown that, while prejudicial attitudes may be fueled by a general feeling of hostility, more often than not, sexist attitudes are reflective of both negative and positive feelings about the opposite sex, although sexism towards women remains the prominent form (Nier & Gaertner, 2012).

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale

Early work on sexism dealt with the question: are men and women actually different? It was this question that fueled a deviation away from the biological to the psychological. The catalyst for this was the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This act was a landmark piece of legislation that spurred the feminist movements of the 1960s and 1970s. These movements, considered second-wave feminism, focused on gender equality in the work place (equal pay for equal work); Affirmative Action; Title IX; and the abolishment of gender privilege (Biklen, Marshall, & Pollard, 2008). Social psychologists explored the phenomena of gender inequality that was so embedded in American culture during this time. It was found that there was a sharp decline in overt

sexism, being replaced with a more covert (Nier & Gaertner, 2012), subtle (Swim & Cohen, 1997), and hostile and benevolent form of sexism (Swim, Mallett, Russo-Devosa, & Stagnor, 2005). Subtle sexism is also considered the "modern" form of gender discrimination as current gender discrimination is far more discrete than old-fashioned, classical, or overt sexism. Swim et al. (1995) showed that, when selecting a senatorial candidate, individuals were more likely to utilize modern forms of sexism when choosing a male candidate over a female candidate. Gender roles, therefore became a huge area of interest as the term *gender* became a multifaceted concept; ripe with a wide array of beliefs and actions that extended beyond the division of masculinity and femininity (Deaux, 1999). It became essential then to create a tool that could measure society's attitude toward women and gender stereotypes. Spence, Helmrich, & Stapp (1973) introduced the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, a scale designed to measure sexist attitudes and gender stereotypes.

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) is a measure used to determine an individual's endorsement of sexist or stereotyped attitudes towards women. Any agreement made with the statements in the questionnaire indicated support of differential treatment between men and women (Swim & Cohen, 1997). Spence and Hahn (1997) noticed a gradual change in responses to their measure over the two decades since its inception. These changes highlighted a decline in the endorsement of overt sexist beliefs and a rise in egalitarian beliefs for both men and women. This was attributed to several key areas of advancement following the feminist movements from years prior. Married women were joining the labor force in growing numbers which was dissolving the sexist hiring practices by employers evidenced during this time period (Spence & Hahn, 1997).

Glick and Fiske (2011) noted that the AWS had consistently shown a decline in overt

sexism to the point where sexism was becoming more difficult to detect and therefore the

AWS had to be revised to include more subtle sexist statements (e.g. "Economic and

social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of

femininity which has been set up by men."). Thus the AWS became a vital tool for social

psychologists during the 1970s through the 1980s as it offered an opportunity to provide

data on society's perspective of women's rights and deserved treatment as well as offer

clues as to the progression of female equality as the decades progressed. In fact, between

1972 and 1978, the AWS was used in more than 90 psychological studies further

enhancing its importance in the psychology field. The popularity of the AWS inevitably

led to a re-evaluation of the personality factors that were affecting sexism. Extending

beyond right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation, psychologists

began to study sexism within the confines of a five factor model of personality.

Historical Context of the Five-Factor Model

The roots of the Five Factor Model lie within the theoretical context of

personality. Personality theories exist to serve three functions. First these theories exist

to explain the philosophical nature of human behavior. Second, personality theories

serve as the collective bin for all explanations regarding human traits and psychological

mechanisms. Although the Five Factor Model's origins rest in the lexical studies of the

early 20th century, it should not be considered simply a categorization of natural-language

terms relating to personality but also an organization of constructs developed by

psychology's most prolific contributors. It encompasses the relevant research towards

explaining the phenomena of human personality. Lastly, personality theories identify the

scope and barriers of personality psychology as well as provide direction for what personality phenomena should be studied. These functions provide the guidance researchers need. Of great importance is the role of the Five Factor Model of personality and its relationship with prejudice (McCrae & Costa, 1996).

The Five Factor Model of personality has existed in various forms for decades. Raymond Cattell, using the previous work of Allport, produced a set of 16 personality factors (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970). These factors were derived as part of a scientific taxonomy of personality. This taxonomy was the brainchild of Allport and Odbert (1936) and their lexical hypothesis that stated that nearly all salient social and personality traits were engrained in our everyday language (John & Srivastava, 1999). However, their hypothesis and subsequent research yielded a vast list of personality terms (originally 17,953 before being weaned down to approximately 4,500); a list that was corralled by Cattell into what would eventually be his 16 personality factors. Cattell then created a set of rating scales to contrast the synonymic cluster of personality adjectives which were factor analyzed by Tupes and Christal (1961). Norman (1963) then used the best 20 rating scales from the Tupes and Christal study and it was this set that was replicated in many later studies. Later editions of Cattell's 16PF questionnaire included five global factors that were very similar to Costa and McCrae's five-factor model, seen originally in the NEO Personality Inventory (1992). These five global factors included Extraversion/Introversion which seemed to relate to the Big-Five trait of Extraversion, Anxiety to Neuroticism, Independence/Accommodation to Agreeableness, Self-Control to Conscientiousness, and Tough-Mindedness to Openness to Experience (Cattell & Mead, 2008; Costa & McCrae, 1985, 1992). While not as widely used today as it was at

its conception, Cattell's 16 personality factors helped lay the foundation for the Five-Factor Model of personality.

The Five-Factor Model of Personality

The Five Factor Model of personality is defined as a set of five broad personality factors that describe the five basic traits of human personality. These five traits, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience are further refined by six facets that underlie each factor (e.g. Agreeableness includes Trust, Straightforwardness, Altruism, Compliance, Modesty, and Tender-Mindedness). A list of the facets can be found in Table 1.

Commonly referred to as the "Big Five," the Five Factor model should not be considered "big" in the grandiose sense, but should instead be interpreted as factors representing five *broad* domains of human personality. Along with a total of 30 facets, the Five-Factor Model encompasses the broad domains and specific traits of personality (John & Srivastava, 1999).

While right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation are still studied within the context of personality, it has seen its popularity diminish with the rise of the Five Factor Model. As was stated earlier, the biggest reason for this was the growing debate of RWA and SDO and their place in personality measurement. Sibley and Duckitt (2008) noted that several items on both the RWA scale and the SDO scale do not pertain to behavior dispositions as most personality scales do. Instead, they tend to focus on social attitudes and beliefs that are upheld within a group context.

Table 1

The Factors and Facets of the Five-Factor Model

Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience
Friendliness	Trust	Self-Efficacy	Anxiety	Imagination
Gregariousness	Morality	Orderliness	Anger	Artistic Interests
Assertiveness	Altruism	Dutifulness	Depression	Emotionality
Activity Level	Cooperation	Achievement-striving	Self-consciousness	Adventurousness
Excitement-seeking	Modesty	Self-discipline	Impulsiveness	Intellect
Cheerfulness	Sympathy	Cautiousness	Vulnerability	Liberalism

Therefore, both RWA and SDO have been criticized as actually being a measure of social attitudes and beliefs, and not personality traits or behaviors. This gives the Big Five the advantage as it has been shown to consistently and reliably measure personality traits without the risk of crossing into social attitudes (McCrae & Costa, 1996; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008).

Although a useful tool for personality measurement, the Five-Factor Model is not without its criticisms. Block (1995) and McAdams (1992) discussed several issues related to the Five-Factor Model including: the atheoretical nature of the lexical hypothesis, the shift towards a unidimensional interpretation of personality, and cross-culture difficulties stemming from the model's development within the confines of the English language. McCrae and John (1995) responded to Block's claims, stating that the lexical hypothesis was a "starting point" (p. 217) subject to being empirically tested. They emphasized that this hypothesis was needed in order to begin a taxonomic organization of personality terms and traits that could be improved upon in future research. It wasn't an attempt to provide a complete overview of personality but to spur the process of personality taxonomy itself. Regarding the Five-Factor Model's cross-cultural difficulties, Rolland's (2002) meta-analysis showed the cross-cultural validity of the Five-Factor Model across 16 culture samples; coefficient of congruence ranged from .80 to .98 when comparing the United States with the other 15 samples; in other words, the model was easily interpretable across several cultures. It is important to note, however, that adjectives pertaining to personality vary from culture to culture. While some have a variety of personality adjectives at their disposal, several cultures have a

limited range of terms that are commonly used in the vernacular and thus might interpret personality traits differently than others.

The Relationship between the Five-Factor Model and Sexism

Research exploring the relationship between the Five-Factor Model and sexism has tended to find Agreeableness and Openness to Experience to be the best predictors of sexism (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Akrami, Ekehammar, & Bergh, 2011; Ekehammar & Akrami, 2004). Ekehammar and Akrami (2007) performed two studies to measure the correlations between prejudice, the five factors of personality and their underlying facets. For generalized prejudice, it was found that Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Openness to Experience correlated negatively with generalized prejudice. On a facet level, one Conscientiousness (i.e., Self-efficacy), one Neuroticism (i.e., Impulsiveness), three Extraversion (i.e., Friendliness, Gregariousness, and Cheerfulness), five Openness (i.e., Imagination, Artistic Interests, Emotionality, Adventurousness, and Liberalism), and five Agreeableness (i.e., Trust, Morality, Altruism, Modesty, and Sympathy) facets were significantly negatively related to prejudice with correlations ranging from -.18 to -.61. When measuring just sexism, Ekehammar and Akrami (2007) found similar results to their earlier study although only Agreeableness and Openness to Experience were significantly negatively correlated with sexism. On a facet level, four of the Openness facets (i.e., Artistic Interests, Emotionality, Adventurousness, and Liberalism) and three of the Agreeableness facets (i.e., Trust, Cooperation, and Modesty) were significantly negatively related to sexism with correlations ranging from -.18 to -.43. Krings and Facchin (2009) found that males low in Agreeableness displayed higher levels of hostile sexism and were more likely to sexually harass fellow employees. They found that

Agreeableness was a strong indicator of sexist attitudes—in line with Ekehammar and Akrami's (2007) research. Miller, Wagner, and Hunt (2012) also found that Openness to Experience correlated negatively with sexism and sexual prejudice. On a facet level, they found that three Openness traits (i.e., Artistic Interests, Intellect, and Liberalism) were strong negative predictors of sexism and sexual prejudice.

Overview and Predictions

Recent research has utilized the Five-Factor Model to measure the relationship between personality and generalized prejudice. It has been shown that, of the five broad personality factors, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience tend to significantly correlate negatively with generalized prejudice (Akrami, Ekehammar, & Bergh, 2011; Akrami, Ekehammar, & Yang-Wallentin, 2011; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). However, little research exists that includes the facets of the Five-Factor Model and their relationship with sexism.

When looking at just individual forms of prejudice, however, there is very little correlational data in the literature. Racism has been the primary form of prejudice that has been studied significantly in the fields of personality and social psychology. There is far less data concerning the relationship between personality and sexism. Although similar to racism, sexist attitudes have received very little attention since second wave feminism eroded a fair amount of overt sexist attitudes in American culture. When looking at data concerning sexism and the relationship with the facets of the Five-Factor Model, only one study is currently cited in the literature (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007).

Therefore, it is important to explore this relationship at a far richer level than simply measuring the five broad domains. Based on previous research concerning generalized

prejudice, two hypotheses can be made regarding the current study: 1) Of the five broad domains, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience will negatively correlate and will be the significant predictors of sexism; 2) The facets of Agreeableness and Openness to Experience (notably Sympathy and Liberalism, respectively) will correlate negatively and be significant predictors of sexism.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Data were collected from 115 participants, 29 males and 86 females. Participants were students enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses who participated in exchange for partial fulfillment of a research participation requirement. The mean age of the participants was 18.61 years (SD = 1.04). The racial/ethnic composition was 84% White, 4% Black, and 12% Other.

Participants were recruited for a study concerning their opinion on various social topics. Each laboratory session began with participants being greeted and asked to sit at any of the available computer stations within the lab. Following completion of the informed consent forms, participants were then asked to complete each questionnaire. Questionnaires were presented electronically through Qualtrics software. Upon completion of all the questionnaires and demographic information, participants were thanked for their participation and allowed to leave.

Measures

Demographics. The demographic form asked participants to answer questions regarding sex, race, and age.

M5-120. The M5-120 (Johnson, 2011) is a personality measure that utilizes the Five-Factor model of personality to derive a general overview of an individual's personality characteristics. The M5-120 asks respondents to provide ratings of accuracy and inaccuracy related to statements assessing personality characteristics. Each personality factor is measured: Extraversion (e.g., "I feel comfortable around people.");

Agreeableness (e.g., "I am interested in other people."); Conscientiousness (e.g., "I get chores done right away."); Neuroticism (e.g., "I am easily disturbed."); and Openness to Experience (e.g., "I have a vivid imagination."). The present study utilized the M5-120 to measure all five broad domains of the Five-Factor Model as well as the 30 underlying facets.

Modern Sexism Scale (MS). The Modern Sexism Scale (Swim et al., 1995) is an 8-item sexism inventory that measure three aspects of modem sexism: denial of continuing discrimination against women (items 1-5), antagonism toward women's demands for equitable treatment (items 6 and 7) and resentment about special favors for women (item 8) (Yoder & McDonald, 1997). The MS asks respondents to provide ratings of agreement on a 6-point Likert scale with 0 indicating *strongly disagree* and 5 indicating *strongly agree*. Past research has shown the MS to have acceptable internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .75 (Swim et al., 1995) to .82 (Swim & Cohen, 1997). Internal consistency for the denial of discrimination subscale was the strongest of the three subscales for the MS, so it was the only subscale used in the present analysis.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1997) is a 22-item self-report measure that evaluates both Hostile Sexism ("Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.") and Benevolent Sexism ("Women should be cherished and protected by men."). The ASI asks respondents to provide ratings of agreement related to ambivalently sexist attitudes on scales ranging from 0 indicating *disagree strongly* and 5 indicating *agree strongly*. Past research has

shown the ASI to have acceptable internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .8 to .9 (Glick & Fiske, 1997).

Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale is a widely-used measure of both sexism and traditional gender roles (Spence et al., 1973; Daugherty & Dambrot, 1986). The 25-item scale is a self-report measure that evaluates contemporary attitudes towards women on a 0 to 3 scale (although it appears as A, B, C, and D on the actual form). The AWS asks respondents to provide ratings of agreement or disagreement with 0 reflecting strong conservative or traditional attitudes (e.g., "Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good housewives and mothers.") and 3 reflecting highly liberal attitudes (e.g., "Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day."). For the sake of consistency across all three sexism scales, the scores for this scale were reversed so that higher scores reflected more conservative values. Past research has shown the AWS to have strong internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alpha for the 25-item form equal to .89 (Daugherty & Dambrot, 1986).

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Analyses

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, internal consistency coefficients,

minimum and maximum values, and intercorrelations for the measures in the present

study.

Table 2
Intercorrelations and Descriptive Statistics.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. ASI	—							
2. AWS	.53***	—						
3. MSS - Denial	.30***	.38***	—					
4. Extraversion	.20*	.03	.00	—				
5. Agreeableness	-.02	-.15	.03	.15	—			
6. Conscientiousness	-.015	-.02	.06	.08	.42***	—		
7. Neuroticism	-.17	-.28**	-.22**	-.43***	-.23*	-.37***	—	
8. Openness	-.33***	-.41***	-.20*	.15	.24*	-.05	.05	—
M	2.65	1.52	1.71	3.23	3.86	3.56	2.70	3.22
SD	.70	.68	.96	.42	.37	.44	.47	.40
α	.85	.86	.77	.84	.77	.88	.85	.71
Minimum	.36	.04	.00	1.42	2.96	2.42	1.63	2.33
Maximum	4.05	3.12	4.80	4.00	4.71	4.54	4.08	4.21

$^*p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$; $^{***}p < .001$.

Bivariate Correlations for the Factors

The first step in the analyses was to examine the bivariate correlations to

determine any possible relationships between the five factors and the three sexism scales.

Of the five factors, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience correlated

significantly with the sexism measures.

Extraversion. A significant positive correlation was found between the ASI and

Extraversion (r = 0.20, p < 0.05). This indicates that those who scored higher on the trait

of Extraversion also scored higher in regards to ambivalent and hostile forms of sexism.

People who are more assertive in their decision-making and beliefs would potentially rate

higher on sexism as they could respond to such questions in a more upfront manner than

those who are less sociable or disaffiliative.

Neuroticism. Significant negative correlations were found between Neuroticism

and the AWS ($r = -0.28$, $p < 0.01$) as well as between the denial trait of the MS and

Neuroticism ($r = -0.22$, $p < .01$). Both of these negative correlations indicate that an

individual high in Neuroticism tended to score lower on sexism ratings. They were less

likely to deny that sexist issues still exists within one's culture as well as hold generally

equal and less sexist attitudes towards women than individuals with lower Neuroticism

scores.

Openness to Experience. Significant negative correlations were found between

Openness and all three sexism measures: ASI ($r = -0.33$, $p < 0.001$); AWS ($r = -0.41$, $p <$

0.001); and the denial trait of the MS ($r = -0.20$, $p < .05$). All of these negative

correlations indicate that an individual high in Openness to Experience are less likely to

display hostile or benevolently sexist opinions of women, have generally equal and less

sexist attitudes towards women than those low in Openness, and are less likely to deny

that sexist issues still exists within one's culture.

Stepwise Regression for the Facets

Bivariate correlational analyses revealed significant relationships between the

sexism scales and three of the five personality factors (i.e., Extraversion, Neuroticism,

and Openness to Experience). To further explore these associations, a stepwise multiple

regression procedure was utilized for each sexism scale. The goal of each analysis was to

determine which facets were contributing significantly to each factor's correlation with

the three sexism scales. Because only three of the five factors were significant to any of

the three sexism scales used, only those 18 facets were entered as predictors into each

analysis. Cronbach's alphas, as reliability coefficients for these 18 facets are presented in

Table 3.

These facet-level predictors used in each regression were dictated by the results of

the bivariate correlations between the personality factors and each sexism scale. Results

for each measure of sexism are presented in Tables 4, 5, and 6.

Table 3
Reliability Coefficients for the Facets

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Extraversion Facets (E)	.70	.73	.80	.62	.64	.73
2. Neuroticism Facets (N)	.72	.85	.83	.62	.33	.69
3. Openness Facets (O)	.69	.68	.55	.49	.68	.15

Modern Sexism Scale.

Table 4

Analysis Regressing Facets of Openness and Neuroticism onto the MS-Denial

	Modern Sexism Scale – Denial of Discrimination		
	Cumulative R^2	Increase in R^2	β
Step 1	.10***	.10***	-.28**
Liberalism (O6M)			
Step 2	.15***	.05*	-.21*
Anger (N2M)			
Step 3	.19***	.04*	.25**
Emotionality (O3M)			
Step 4	.23***	.04*	-.21*
Artistic Interests (O2M)			

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$.

The first stepwise regression model examined the facets of Openness (i.e.,

Imagination, Artistic Interests, Emotionality, Adventurousness, Intellect, and Liberalism)

and Neuroticism (i.e., Anxiety, Anger, Depression, Self-Consciousness, Immoderation,

Vulnerability) as potential predictors of scores on the denial subscale of the Modern

Sexism Scale. This model, $F(4, 110) = 8.16$, $R = .48$, $p < .001$, indicated that of the 12

facets, 4 of them contributed significantly to sexism scores: Liberalism

(β = -.28, $p < .01$), Emotionality (β = .25, $p < .01$), Anger (β = -.21, $p < .05$), and Artistic

Interests (β = -.21, $p < .05$). Anger was the strongest facet in predicting sexism for the

Neuroticism factor. For Openness, the facets Liberalism, Emotionality, and Artistic

Interests were the strongest facets in predicting sexism for the Openness factor.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory.

Table 5
Analysis Regressing Facets of Openness and Extraversion onto the ASI

	Ambivalent Sexism Inventory		
	Cumulative R^2	Increase in R^2	β
Step 1	.12***	.12***	-.37***
Artistic Interests (O2M)			
Step 2	.19**	.07*	.26**
Excitement-Seeking (E5M)			

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$.

The second stepwise regression model examined the facets of Openness (i.e.,

Imagination, Artistic Interests, Emotionality, Adventurousness, Intellect, and Liberalism)

and Extraversion (i.e., Friendliness, Gregariousness, Assertiveness, Activity Level,

Excitement-Seeking, and Cheerfulness) as potential predictors of scores on the

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. This model, $F(2, 112) = 13.05$, $R = .44$, $p < .001$,

indicated that of the 12 facets, 2 of them contributed significantly to sexism scores:

Artistic Interests (β = -.37, $p < .001$) and Excitement-Seeking (β = .26, $p < .01$). For

Extraversion, Excitement-Seeking was a positive predictor in predicting sexism

indicating that those who rate high in Excitement-Seeking also rated high in sexism. For

Openness, Artistic Interests was a negative predictor for predicting sexism indicating that

those who have numerous Artistic Interests tended to show low levels of sexism.

Attitudes Toward Women Scale.

Table 6

Analysis Regressing Facets of Openness and Neuroticism onto the AWS.

	Attitude Toward Women Scale		
	Cumulative R^2	Increase in R^2	β
Step 1	.10***	.10***	-.22*
Artistic Interests (O2M)			
Step 2	.17**	.07**	-.27**
Liberalism (O6M)			
Step 3	.21*	.04*	-.23**
Anxiety (N1M)			
Step 4	.25*	.04*	-.22*
Intellect (O5M)			

$^*p < .05;$ $^{**}p < .01;$ $^{***}p < .001.$

The third stepwise regression model examined the facets of Openness (i.e.,

Imagination, Artistic Interests, Emotionality, Adventurousness, Intellect, and Liberalism)

and Neuroticism (i.e., Anxiety, Anger, Depression, Self-Consciousness, Immoderation,

Vulnerability) as potential predictors of scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale.

This model, $F(4, 110) = 9.02$, $R = .50$, p < .001, indicated that of the 12 facets, 4 of them

contributed significantly to sexism scores: Liberalism (β = -.27, p < .01), Anxiety (β = -

.23, p < .05), Artistic Interests (β = -.22, p < .05), and Intellect (β = -.22, p < .05). For

Neuroticism, the Anxiety facet was the strongest negative predictor for predicting sexism

indicating that those who scored higher in Anxiety tended to rate lower on sexism. For

Openness, the Liberalism, Artistic Interests, and Intellect facets were the strongest

negative predictors for predicting sexism indicating that those who rated higher in these

three traits tended to rate lower on sexism.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Although previous research has examined the relationship between prejudice and personality factors, very few studies have looked at the facets of personality and their relationship with prejudice, specifically sexism. On a factor level, this researcher predicted that Agreeableness and Openness to Experience would be significantly negatively correlated with sexism based on previous research (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003, 2007; Akrami, Ekehammar, & Bergh, 2011; Akrami, Ekehammar, & Yang-Wallentin, 2011). Although Agreeableness was not a significant factor, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience were seen as being significantly correlated. On a facet level, the researcher predicted Sympathy—a facet of Agreeableness—and Liberalism—a facet of Openness—to be significant predictors for sexism. While Liberalism was found to be a significant predictor, Sympathy was not.

Oddly, the facet Excitement-Seeking for Extraversion was found to be a positive predictor for sexism. Content for this facet included enjoying and seeking adventure and acting wild and crazy. Other notable significant predictors were Anxiety and Anger, facets of Neuroticism, which were found to be significant negative predictors for sexism. Content for the Anxiety facet included worrying about things and feeling stressed out. This could indicate that those who are highly anxious chose not to identify themselves as sexist, worrying what other people would think. Content for the Anger facet included getting frustrated and annoyed easily as well as having a quick temperament. Anger as a predictor for sexism has not been indicated in the research literature, although it appears that those participants who rated high in Anger tended to rate themselves as less sexist than those lower in Anger. This could be indicative of a more neurotic tendency to where

people who are angrier are likely driven by a feeling of unfairness and would therefore empathize with others who are victims of sexual prejudice.

Lastly, Artistic Interests was also found to be a significant negative predictor for sexism. Ekehammar and Akrami (2007) found similar results when correlating the Big Five with sexism, although the facet in their study was worded as "Aesthetics". Emotionality and Intellect were also found to be significant negative predictors indicating that those who are in touch with their emotions and display high levels of intelligence tend to rate lower on sexism than those who are out of touch with their emotions and rate lower on intelligence. These three facets are subsumed within the Openness to Experience factor, which influences acceptance of others, of ideals and morals, and the application of intelligence and knowledge towards solving complex problems. Sibley and Duckitt (2008) observed in their meta-analysis that Openness was viewed as the determining factor in explaining the individual differences in political conservatism and values so that those who were low in Openness were more likely to adhere to the structured and present social order and are likely to be inflexible to change while those who are high in Openness are likely to accept others' point-of-view and are more likely to accept stereotype-disconfirming information.

Limitations

Although significant correlations were found between sexism and the factors and facets of the Five-Factor Model, they were not directly in line with the previous literature. This could most likely be because of the limited sample that was available. For the present study, all participants were from an introductory psychology course with a mean age of 18.61 years. This was particularly detrimental regarding questions about political

orientation. The facet Liberalism, while significant, also had low internal consistency. This could be explained in a couple of reasons: first, an analysis of the items for the Liberalism facet revealed that the primary content in each statement pertained to an individual's social orientation as being either liberal or conservative. Secondly, intercorrelations of those facet items showed that participants did not display an understanding of the definition of liberal and conservative, as there was no significant correlation among the items, which was unexpected. Also, the majority of the research done on prejudice and personality has been conducted primarily in Sweden, bringing into question possible cultural differences when responding to these items.

Lastly, the M5-120, while sufficient, did not provide a desirable amount of facet level questions, resulting in four questions per facet. For more subjective facets, such as those found within the Openness to Experience factor, fewer questions results in lower-than-expected reliability as the instrument does not offer enough information per facet to achieve desirable reliability. For other facets, however, reliability was sufficient given that the factors themselves were more objective than the Openness factor. Other versions, such as the M5-300, provide more items per facet, aiding in internal consistency and future correlations with sexism or prejudice. Because of the amount of questionnaires used in the study, an M5-120 was selected instead of an M5-300 as to not fatigue participants.

Future Directions

There are numerous studies that look at the factors of personality and their correlations with prejudice; however, few studies have looked at this correlation at a facet level. The aim of this study was to find what facets could predict sexism as the facets

provide a clearer, more specific trait of personality than its broad parents. Stronger reliability for some of the facets, notably those pertaining to the Openness factor, needs to be established in future research as the facets themselves are more subjective in nature than the facets of the other four factors.

A larger, more diverse sample size would also benefit the current research as the present study was constrained to a very specific sample. Multiple age groups, ethnicities, and a better male-to-female ratio could offer a richer view of personality and correlations with sexism.

A confirmatory factor analysis would also be a useful tool in future studies. By simply using the facets of each factor as independent variables and analyzing each set of facets against each sexism measure, one could better establish the discriminant and convergent validity as the M5-120 relates to the three sexism measures and vice versa.

Regardless, looking at personality at a facet level offers a more detailed explanation of human behavior and human insight when looking at how individuals view themselves personally and on a social level. Prejudice, a social construct that is still prevalent in modern society, is tied to personality. It is important, then, that research indicate what types of personalities are synonymous with various forms of prejudice.

REFERENCES

Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2006). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Their roots in Big-Five personality factors and facets. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *27*, 117-126.

Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B., & Bergh, R. (2011). Generalized prejudice: Common and specific components. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 57-59.

Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., & Yang-Wallentin, F. (2011). Personality and social psychology factors explaining sexism. *Journal of Individual Differences*, *32*(3), 153-160.

Al-Aswany, A. (2012). Sexual Harassment in Egypt: Women are People, Too. *Al-Monitor*. Retrieved from www.al-monitor.com.

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. University of Michigan: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Allport, G. W., & Odbert, H. S. (1936). Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study. *Psychological Monographs*, *47*(211).

Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 47-92). New York: Academic Press.

Altemeyer, B. (2004). Highly dominating, highly authoritarian personalities. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *144*(4), 421–447.

Block, J. (1995). A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(2), 187-215.

Brown, C. (2008). Commentary: Sexist treatment of Palin must end. *CNN Politics*. Retrieved from www.articles.cnn.com.

Cattell, R.B., Eber, H.W., & Tatsuoka, M.M. (1970). Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). The NEO personality inventory manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO PI-R professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Daughtery, C.G., & Dambrot, F.H. (1986). Reliability of the Attitudes toward Women Scale. *Educational and Psychological Assessment*, *46*, 449-453.

Deaux, K. (1999). An overview of research on gender: Four themes from 3 decades. In W.B. Swann, Jr., J.H. Langlois, & L.A. Gilbert (Eds.), *Sexism and Stereotypes in Modern Society* (pp. 11-34). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Smith, J. (2011). Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2010. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Digman, J. (1996). The curious history of the Five-Factor model. In J.S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality*: *Theoretical Perspectives* (pp. 1-20). New York: Guildford.

Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N.E., Mowrer, O., & Sears, R. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Duckitt, J. (1992). Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, *47*(10), 1182-1193.

Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2007). Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality, 21*, 113-130.

Ekehammar, B., & Akrami, N. (2003). The relation between personality and prejudice: A variable- and person-centered approach. *European Journal of Personality*, *17*, 449-464.

Ekehammar, B., & Akrami, N. (2007). Personality and prejudice: From Big Five personality factors to facets. *Journal of Personality*, (*75*)5.

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2000). Development and validation of Swedish classical and modern sexism scales. *Scandinavian Journal of Personality*, *41*, 307-314.

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., Gylje, M., & Zakrisson, I. (2004). What matters most to prejudice? Big Five personality, social dominance orientation, or right-wing authoritarianism? *European Journal of Personality*, *18*, 463-482.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*, 1149-1160.

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.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 119-135.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (2011). Ambivalent sexism revisited. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *35*(3), 530-535.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe*, *Vol. 7* (pp. 7-28). Tilburg, Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 84-96.

Ho, A.K., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Levin, S., Thomsen, L., Kteily, N., & Sheehy-Skeffington, J. (2012). Social dominance orientation: Revisiting the structure and function of a variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(5), 583-606.

International Personality Item Pool: A Scientific collaboratory for the development of advanced measures of personality traits and other individual differences. Retrieved from http://ipip.ori.org/

John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement,

and theoretical perspectives. In L. Pervin and O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford.

Johnson, J. (2011). *Development of a short form of the IPIP-NEO personality inventory.* Poster presented at the second biennial ARP Conference, Riverside, CA.

Krings, F., & Facchin, S. (2009). Organizational justice and men's likelihood to sexually harass: The moderating role of sexism and personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(2), 501-510.

McAdams, D.P. (1992). The Five-Factor Model of personality: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Personality*, *60*(2), 329-361.

McCrae, R.R., & John, O.P. (1992). An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, *60*(2), 175-215.

McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T., Jr. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the Five-Factor Model. In L.S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality* (pp. 51-88). New York: Guilford.

Nier, J.A., & Gaertner, S.L. (2012). The challenge of detecting contemporary forms of discrimination. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(2), 207-220.

Norman, W.T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *66*, 574-583.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(4), 741-763.

Reynolds, K.J., Turner, J.C., Haslam, S.A., & Ryan, M.K. (2001). The role of personality

and group factors explaining prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*, 427-434.

Roets, A., Van Hiel, A., & Dhont, K. (2012). Is sexism a gender issue? A motivated social cognition perspective on men's and women's sexist attitudes toward own and other genders. *European Journal of Personality*, *26*, 350-359.

Rolland, J.P. (2002). The cross-cultural generalizability of the Five-Factor Model of personality. In R.R. McCrae, & J. Allik (Eds.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Cultures* (pp. 7-28). New York, New York: Springer.

Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L.R. (1996). The language of personality: Lexical perspectives on the Five-Factor Model. In L.S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality* (pp. 21-50). New York: Guilford.

Sibley, C.G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *12*(3), 248-279. DOI: 10.1177/1088868308319226.

Spence, J.T., & Hahn, E.D. (1997). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 17-34.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *2*, 219-220.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

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*, 199-214.

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.

Swim, J.K., Mallett, R., & Stangor, C. (2004). Understanding subtle sexism: Detection and use of sexist language. *Sex Roles*, *51* (3/4), 117-128.

Swim, J.K., Mallett, R., Russo-Devosa, Y., & Stangor, C. (2005). Judgments of sexism: A comparison of the subtlety of sexism measures and sources of variability in judgments of sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*, 406-411.

Tupes, E.C., & Christal, R.E. (1961). *Recurrent personality factors based on trait ratings*. (USAF ASD Tech. Rep. No. 61-97). Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: U.S. Air Force.

Webster, R.J., Saucier, D.A., & Harris, R.J. (2010). Before the measurement of prejudice: Early psychological and sociological papers on prejudice. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, *46*(3), 300-313.

Yoder, J.D., & McDonald, T.W. (1997). The generalizability and construct validity of the Modern Sexism Scale: Some cautionary notes. *Sex Roles*, *36*, 655-663.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: M5-120

M5-120 Questionnaire

David M. McCord, Ph.D., Western Carolina University

Name: _____ Age: _____ M   F   Date: _____

This is a personality questionnaire, which should take about 15 minutes. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions; you simply respond with the choice that describes you best.

If you feel that you cannot see the questions appropriately because of sight difficulties, cannot use a pencil well because of hand-motor problems, or know of any other physical, emotional, or environmental issues which would affect your performance on this test, please notify the testing administrator now.

If you feel extremely nervous about this testing process and feel that your nervousness will affect your performance, please notify the testing administrator so that they can answer any questions about this process and alleviate any fears. Please recognize that a degree of nervousness is normal for most testing.

The *M5 Questionnaire* is used primarily for research purposes, though in certain cases individual results may be shared with the test-taker through a professional consultation. In general, results are treated anonymously and are combined with other data in order to develop norms, establish psychometric properties of these scales and items, and to study various theoretical and practical issues within the field of personality psychology.

By proceeding with the process and responding to these questionnaire items, you are expressing your understanding of these terms and your consent for your data to be used for research purposes. You are also agreeing to release and forever discharge *Western Carolina University* and *David M. McCord, Ph.D.,* from any and all claims of any kind or nature whatsoever arising from the assessment process.

- Without spending too much time dwelling on any one item, just give the first reaction that comes to mind.

- In order to score this test accurately, it is very important that you answer *every* item, without skipping any. You may change an answer if you wish.

- It is ultimately in your best interest to respond as honestly as possible. Mark the response that best shows how you really feel or see yourself, not responses that you think might be desirable or ideal.

Turn the page over now

M5-120 Questionnaire		Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Page 2 Accurate
1	Worry about things.	O	O	O	O	O
2	Make friends easily.	O	O	O	O	O
3	Have a vivid imagination.	O	O	O	O	O
4	Trust others.	O	O	O	O	O
5	Complete tasks successfully.	O	O	O	O	O
6	Get angry easily.	O	O	O	O	O
7	Love large parties.	O	O	O	O	O
8	Believe in the importance of art.	O	O	O	O	O
9	Use others for my own ends.	O	O	O	O	O
10	Like to tidy up.	O	O	O	O	O
11	Often feel blue.	O	O	O	O	O
12	Take charge.	O	O	O	O	O
13	Experience my emotions intensely.	O	O	O	O	O
14	Love to help others.	O	O	O	O	O
15	Keep my promises.	O	O	O	O	O
16	Find it difficult to approach others.	O	O	O	O	O
17	Am always busy.	O	O	O	O	O
18	Prefer variety to routine.	O	O	O	O	O
19	Love a good fight.	O	O	O	O	O
20	Work hard.	O	O	O	O	O
21	Go on binges.	O	O	O	O	O
22	Love excitement.	O	O	O	O	O
23	Love to read challenging material.	O	O	O	O	O
24	Believe that I am better than others.	O	O	O	O	O
25	Am always prepared.	O	O	O	O	O
26	Panic easily.	O	O	O	O	O
27	Radiate joy.	O	O	O	O	O
28	Tend to vote for liberal political candidates.	O	O	O	O	O
29	Sympathize with the homeless.	O	O	O	O	O
30	Jump into things without thinking.	O	O	O	O	O
31	Fear for the worst.	O	O	O	O	O
32	Feel comfortable around other people.	O	O	O	O	O
33	Enjoy wild flights of fantasy.	O	O	O	O	O
34	Believe that others have good intentions.	O	O	O	O	O
35	Excel in what I do.	O	O	O	O	O
36	Get irritated easily.	O	O	O	O	O
37	Talk to a lot of different people at parties.	O	O	O	O	O
38	See beauty in things that others might not notice.	O	O	O	O	O
39	Cheat to get ahead.	O	O	O	O	O
40	Often forget to put things back in their proper place.	O	O	O	O	O
		Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Accurate

M5-120 Questionnaire					Page 3
		Innacurate	Moderately Innacurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Accurate
41	Dislike myself.	O	O	O	O	O
42	Try to lead others.	O	O	O	O	O
43	Feel others' emotions.	O	O	O	O	O
44	Am concerned about others.	O	O	O	O	O
45	Tell the truth.	O	O	O	O	O
46	Am afraid to draw attention to myself.	O	O	O	O	O
47	Am always on the go.	O	O	O	O	O
48	Prefer to stick with things that I know.	O	O	O	O	O
49	Yell at people.	O	O	O	O	O
50	Do more than what's expected of me.	O	O	O	O	O
51	Rarely overindulge.	O	O	O	O	O
52	Seek adventure.	O	O	O	O	O
53	Avoid philosophical discussions.	O	O	O	O	O
54	Think highly of myself.	O	O	O	O	O
55	Carry out my plans.	O	O	O	O	O
56	Become overwhelmed by events.	O	O	O	O	O
57	Have a lot of fun.	O	O	O	O	O
58	Believe that there is no absolute right or wrong.	O	O	O	O	O
59	Feel sympathy for those who are worse off than myself.	O	O	O	O	O
60	Make rash decisions.	O	O	O	O	O
61	Am afraid of many things.	O	O	O	O	O
62	Avoid contacts with others.	O	O	O	O	O
63	Love to daydream.	O	O	O	O	O
64	Trust what people say.	O	O	O	O	O
65	Handle tasks smoothly.	O	O	O	O	O
66	Lose my temper.	O	O	O	O	O
67	Prefer to be alone.	O	O	O	O	O
68	Do not like poetry.	O	O	O	O	O
69	Take advantage of others.	O	O	O	O	O
70	Leave a mess in my room.	O	O	O	O	O
71	Am often down in the dumps.	O	O	O	O	O
72	Take control of things.	O	O	O	O	O
73	Rarely notice my emotional reactions.	O	O	O	O	O
74	Am indifferent to the feelings of others.	O	O	O	O	O
75	Break rules.	O	O	O	O	O
76	Only feel comfortable with friends.	O	O	O	O	O
77	Do a lot in my spare time.	O	O	O	O	O
78	Dislike changes.	O	O	O	O	O
79	Insult people.	O	O	O	O	O
80	Do just enough work to get by.	O	O	O	O	O
		Innacurate	Moderately Innacurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Accurate

M5-120 Questionnaire					Page 4
		Moderately Innacurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Accurate
		Innacurate			
81	Easily resist temptations.	O	O	O	O	O
82	Enjoy being reckless.	O	O	O	O	O
83	Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.	O	O	O	O	O
84	Have a high opinion of myself.	O	O	O	O	O
85	Waste my time.	O	O	O	O	O
86	Feel that I'm unable to deal with things.	O	O	O	O	O
87	Love life.	O	O	O	O	O
88	Tend to vote for conservative political candidates.	O	O	O	O	O
89	Am not interested in other people's problems.	O	O	O	O	O
90	Rush into things.	O	O	O	O	O
91	Get stressed out easily.	O	O	O	O	O
92	Keep others at a distance.	O	O	O	O	O
93	Like to get lost in thought.	O	O	O	O	O
94	Distrust people.	O	O	O	O	O
95	Know how to get things done.	O	O	O	O	O
96	Am not easily annoyed.	O	O	O	O	O
97	Avoid crowds.	O	O	O	O	O
98	Do not enjoy going to art museums.	O	O	O	O	O
99	Obstruct others' plans.	O	O	O	O	O
100	Leave my belongings around.	O	O	O	O	O
101	Feel comfortable with myself.	O	O	O	O	O
102	Wait for others to lead the way.	O	O	O	O	O
103	Don't understand people who get emotional.	O	O	O	O	O
104	Take no time for others.	O	O	O	O	O
105	Break my promises.	O	O	O	O	O
106	Am not bothered by difficult social situations.	O	O	O	O	O
107	Like to take it easy.	O	O	O	O	O
108	Am attached to conventional ways.	O	O	O	O	O
109	Get back at others.	O	O	O	O	O
110	Put little time and effort into my work.	O	O	O	O	O
111	Am able to control my cravings.	O	O	O	O	O
112	Act wild and crazy.	O	O	O	O	O
113	Am not interested in theoretical discussions.	O	O	O	O	O
114	Boast about my virtues.	O	O	O	O	O
115	Have difficulty starting tasks.	O	O	O	O	O
116	Remain calm under pressure.	O	O	O	O	O
117	Look at the bright side of life.	O	O	O	O	O
118	Believe that we should be tough on crime.	O	O	O	O	O
119	Try not to think about the needy.	O	O	O	O	O
120	Act without thinking.	O	O	O	O	O
		Innacurate	Moderately Innacurate	Neither	Moderately Accurate	Accurate

Appendix B: Modern Sexism Scale

Modern Sexism Scale (MS)

Following are several statements about various social issues. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements by using the following scale.

0	1	2	3	4	5
disagree	disagree	disagree	agree	agree	agree
strongly	somewhat	slightly	slightly	somewhat	strongly

1._____Women often miss out on good jobs due to sexual discrimination.

2._____It is rare to see women treated in a sexist manner on television.

3._____Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement.

4._____It is easy to understand the anger of women's groups in America.

5._____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.

6._____Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States.

7._____On average, people in our society treat husbands and wives equally.

8._____It is easy to understand why women's groups are still concerned about societal limitations of women's opportunities.

Appendix C: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below:

0	1	2	3	4	5
disagree	disagree	disagree	agree	agree	agree
strongly	somewhat	slightly	slightly	somewhat	strongly

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

____ 2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

____ 3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.

____ 4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

____ 5. Women are too easily offended.

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

____ 7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

____ 8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

____ 9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

____ 10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

____ 11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

____ 12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

____ 13. Men are complete without women.

_____ 14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

_____ 15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

_____ 16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

_____ 17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

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

_____ 19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

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

_____ 21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

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

Appendix D: Attitudes Toward Women Scale

Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS)

Instructions: The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the roles of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you (A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly.

1.   Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.

          A   B   C   D
   Agree strongly Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

2*   Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.

          A   B   C   D
   Agree strongly Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

3.*   Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.

          A   B   C   D
   Agree strongly Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

4.   Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.

          A   B   C   D
   Agree strongly Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

5.   Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.

          A   B   C   D
   Agree strongly Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

6.*   Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.

          A   B   C   D
   Agree strongly Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

7.*   It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.

          A   B   C   D
   Agree strongly Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

8.*   There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.

              A   B   C   D
        Agree strongly Agree mildly Disagree mildly Disagree strongly

9.*   A woman should be free as a man to propose marriage.

              A   B   C   D
        Agree strongly Agree mildly Disagree mildly Disagree strongly

10.   Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.

              A   B   C   D
        Agree strongly Agree mildly Disagree mildly Disagree strongly

11.*   Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.

              A   B   C   D
        Agree strongly Agree mildly Disagree mildly Disagree strongly

12.*   Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.

              A   B   C   D
        Agree strongly Agree mildly Disagree mildly Disagree strongly

13.   A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.

              A   B   C   D
        Agree strongly Agree mildly Disagree mildly Disagree strongly

14.   Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.

              A   B   C   D
        Agree strongly Agree mildly Disagree mildly Disagree strongly

15.   It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.

              A   B   C   D

Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

16.   In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.

A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

17.   Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiancés.

A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

18.*   The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.

A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

19.   Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending rather than with desires for professional or business careers.

A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

20.   The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.

A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

21.*   Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.

A   B   C
D Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

22.   On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.

A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

23.   There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

A   B   C   D

Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

24.*   Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.

     A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

25.*   The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.

     A   B   C   D
Agree strongly   Agree mildly   Disagree mildly   Disagree strongly

In scoring the items, A=0, B=1, C=2, and D=3 except for the items with an asterisk where the scale is reversed. A high score indicates a profeminist, egalitarian attitude while a low score indicates a traditional, conservative attitude.

B. **References**:

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *2*, 219-220.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.