Make It Safe at Night or Teach Women to Fight? Sexism Predicts Views on Men's and

Women's Responsibility to Reduce Men's Violence toward Women

Jessica Brownhalls, Amanda Duffy, and Li Eriksson

Griffith University

Nickola Overall and Chris G. Sibley

University of Auckland

Helena R. M. Radke

University of Edinburgh

Fiona Kate Barlow

University of Queensland

Author Note

Jessica Brownhalls, School of Applied Psychology, Griffith University; Amanda Duffy, School of Applied Psychology, Griffith University; Li Eriksson, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University; Nickola Overall, School of Psychology, University of Auckland; Chris G. Sibley, School of Psychology, University of Auckland; Helena R. M. Radke, School of Philosophy, Psychology, and Language Sciences, University of Edinburgh; Fiona Kate Barlow, School of Psychology, University of Queensland

Correspondence concerning this manuscript should be addressed to Jessica Brownhalls, Griffith University, School of Applied Psychology, Gold Coast QLD 4222. Email: jessica.brownhalls@griffithuni.edu.au

Abstract

The current study explores associations among sexism, gender, and support for two approaches to reduce men's violence toward women targeting (a) men's behavior to reduce male violence toward women and (b) women's behavior so that they can avoid male violence. The associations between sexism and support for these two interventions were examined in 21,937 participants in the New Zealand Attitudes and Values Survey. For both women and men, hostility toward nontraditional women (hostile sexism) was associated with lower support for targeting men to reduce men's violence against women. To a lesser degree, stronger attitudes that women who adhere to traditional feminine roles should be rewarded (benevolent sexism) were associated with greater support for targeting men to reduce men's violence. In contrast, both hostile and benevolent sexism were positively associated with support for targeting women to avoid men's violence. These complex and nuanced relationships could suggest that sexism perpetuates the idea that women are responsible for keeping themselves safe from men's violence while excusing men from accountability. This possibility has implications for addressing how society can be best engaged in the campaign against men's violence toward women.

Keywords: ambivalent sexism, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, sexual and non-sexual violence, gender inequality, gendered violence

Make It Safe at Night or Teach Women to Fight? Sexism Predicts Views on Men's and

Women's Responsibility to Reduce Men's Violence toward Women

Within a 7-month period in 2018-2019, two women, Eurydice Dixon and Aiia Maasarwe, were physically and sexually assaulted and then murdered by male strangers in Melbourne, Australia (Cuthbertson, 2019). In both cases, the women had been walking home alone at night and had used their phones to notify a loved one of their whereabouts shortly before the attacks. In response to the death of Ms. Dixon, a senior police officer made a public statement that appeared to place responsibility on women to avoid men's violence. He encouraged women to consider their own personal safety, carry their mobile phones, and be aware of their surroundings (Davey, 2018). Conversely, the Victorian State Premier responded by suggesting women should go about their daily activities and that men should change their behavior to reduce such violence toward women.

Evidently these and similar incidents typically elicit two distinct responses: that women should take measures to avoid and protect themselves from men's violence and that men should take measures to stop being violent toward women. These responses are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but the point of intervention is different in each: one targets women as a mechanism of change whereas the other targets men as a mechanism of change. It seems likely that support for each response may be linked to underlying attitudes toward the group most impacted by this violence: women. In the present study we aim to clarify the roles played by gender and hostile and benevolent sexism toward women in determining support for intervening with men and women in the prevention of men's violence against women. Findings of the study provide insight relevant to the campaign against men's violence toward women.

Men's Violence toward Women

In the current study, we focus specifically on men's physical and sexual violence toward women because these behaviors act as dangerous and extreme manifestations of gender inequality that maintain the status quo of a patriarchal society (Turquet et al., 2011). For the purpose of the current research, the terms "men" and "women" are primarily used to refer to cisgender men and cisgender women (i.e., men and women whose gender identity matches their biological sex or sex assigned at birth). We want to note, however, that we recognize that men's violence is often enacted on transgender women (Rodrígues-Madera et al., 2016; Wirtz, Poteat, Malik, & Glass, 2020). Further, gender identities beyond the male/female binary are worthy of study and attention. Within the present work, however, we focus narrowly on understanding responses to cisgender men's violence toward cisgender women.

Population studies conducted within New Zealand (where participants in the present study are located) suggest that over the course of their lifetime an estimated 12% to 17% of women are targeted with sexual and/or physical violence by a stranger or acquaintance and 39% of women are sexually and/or physically abused by a male intimate partner (Fanslow & Robinson, 2004). In North America, estimates suggest approximately 25% of young adult men (18 to 35 years) self-report that they have knowingly forced or coerced a woman to engage in some form of sexual activity to which she did not, or was not able to, consent (Jacques-Tiura et al., 2015). Women targeted with sexual and physical violence by men have an increased risk of emotional and health problems (Fanslow & Robinson, 2004), with mental health problems such as anxiety and depression being the most common (Ayre, Lum On, Webster, Gourley, & Moon, 2016). Furthermore, the risk of suicide attempts is significantly elevated among women who have been physically or sexually abused (Fanslow & Robinson, 2004). The cost to society in policing, legal, and healthcare provisions for violence against women is estimated to be $22

billion over a 12-month period in Australia (KPMG, 2016). Thus, men's violence toward women

carries severe costs for the impacted individual, women as a group, and the broader community.

Addressing Men's Violence

Although men's violence toward women is a pervasive and enduring issue at the

individual and societal level, exploration of what solutions people see as appropriate is

understudied. To contribute to the growing body of literature in this field, the present study

identifies two possible approaches to preventing men's violence toward women: (a) target men

to not be violent and (b) target women to avoid men's violence. Although both interventions may

appear to share a common goal of reducing men's violence, they vary in the specific means by

which this change in conditions is achieved—targeting men or targeting women—which has

important implications for assigning or communicating responsibility for men's violence toward

women.

Intervening by targeting men to reduce their violence toward women considers men,

broadly, as the mechanism of change. This strategy does not imply that all men are violent

toward women or that all men are responsible for men's violence toward women. Rather, it

positions men's violence toward women within a larger societal structure where norms implicitly

allow or even encourage men's physical dominance over women. In line with this notion,

research suggests the ways in which women, sexual behavior, and sexual consent are discussed

in male peer groups influences men's violence behaviors. For example, male perpetrators of

sexual violence toward women report perceived pressure from male peers to have sex "by any

means" and identify that, within male friendship groups, there is frequent use of language that

objectifies women (Jacques-Tiura et al., 2015). Public movements, such as the White Ribbon

Campaign, aim to eradicate violence toward women by focusing on the roles of peer pressure

and male norms in either promoting or preventing violence against women (White Ribbon

Campaign, 2019). Such campaigns appeal to all men to participate in education programs and to

be advocates and activists in the prevention of violence toward women (Flood, 2011).

Intervening by targeting women to protect themselves from men's violence toward

women considers women, broadly, as the mechanism of change. This approach suggests that

women should be encouraged to avoid (e.g., don't walk alone at night) or protect themselves

from (e.g., carry pepper spray or learn self-defense) men's violence. In doing so, women are

tasked with taking responsibility for securing their own safety from men's violence. This

perspective positions male violence as inevitable (at least in the current social environment) and

may reflect common beliefs about male sexuality: that men (but not women) have an

uncontrollable need to have sex and a right to act violently if disrespected (Messerschmidt, 2000;

Torbenfeldt Bengtsson, 2016). Popular media, a common reflection of social and cultural

expectations (Rakow, 2001), often adopts this viewpoint by suggesting that (some) women are

guilty of putting themselves in the wrong place at the wrong time and, thus, make themselves

vulnerable to men's sexual and dominance desires (Nettleton, 2011). Hence, if men's violence

toward women is to be prevented, from this perspective, it is women who are responsible for

avoiding such behavior.

Gender

Limited literature explores differences in men's and women's beliefs about, and

responses to, men's violence toward women. Radke, Hornsey, and Barlow (2018) labelled

behaviors associated with responses to gender inequality as *feminist action* (i.e., action that

intends to challenge sexism) and *protective action* (i.e., action that intends to guard women from

men's inevitable violence), and they conducted preliminary studies exploring gender differences

in willingness to engage in either of these responses. They identified that women and men were equally likely to report willingness to engage in behaviors that guard women from men's violence (protective action, such as sponsor a woman to take self-defense classes) and that women, compared to men, were more likely to report willingness to engage in actions that challenge gender inequality (feminist action, such as boycott companies that do not support women's rights). Thus, it seems men and women equally believe that women need protection, and thus they may be equally supportive of educating women to avoid men's violence. Extending from Radke et al., however, women may be more supportive than men of efforts to challenge the existing gender status quo. Finally, given that the ways in which women and men broadly view women is likely involved in such responses, we also explore how sexism interacts with gender to predict support for educating women or men to prevent men's violence toward women.

Sexism

Benevolent sexism and hostile sexism are components of ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996), a construct that conceptualizes sexism as comprising both negative and positive appraisals of women that serve to maintain male dominance. *Hostile sexi*sm fits with a classic conceptualization of discrimination that views the disadvantaged group (in this case, women) negatively, and it frames women's rejection of a patriarchal society (e.g., feminist ideology, campaigning for equal pay) as a threat to men. Consequently, from a hostile sexism perspective, women who violate traditional gender norms should be punished (Glick & Fiske, 2000). On the other hand, *benevolent sexism* refers to a subjectively positive, although patronizing, appraisal of women that is characterized by the idealization of women who embrace traditional, stereotypically feminine gender roles. Thus, benevolently sexist ideas suggest that women who

adhere to roles that support male dominance and express femininity (e.g., damsel in distress, sexually chaste) should be rewarded with protection and care from men (Glick & Fiske, 2000).

Both men and women can and do hold sexist attitudes toward women (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2000) and, consequently, although we explore possible interactions with participants' gender, we make all our predictions about how sexism should be related to responses to men's violence toward women for both men *and* women. With hostile sexism, our predictions are relatively clear. Targets of men's sexual violence are frequently subjected to victim-blaming and rape myth acceptance in which their character, motives, and prior behavior are scrutinized in a way that minimizes harm to the victim and attempts to diminish perpetrator responsibility (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2007; Koepke, Eyssel, & Bohner, 2014). In such cases, high levels of hostile sexism among men are associated with victim-blaming and approval of the aggressor's behavior (Koepke et al., 2014), which tends to shift responsibility for preventing such violence onto female victims. Consequently, we propose that people who report higher levels of hostile sexism would be less supportive of targeting men's behavior to reduce violence against women.

Predictions around benevolent sexism are more closely associated with support for targeting women to avoid male violence. There is some evidence that people who have high levels of benevolent sexism view a woman who leaves herself vulnerable to rape as having violated her expected role of chastity and purity (Viki, Abrams, & Masser, 2004). From this perspective a "good" woman is one who can navigate the bestial world of men and avoid sexual assault, an idea which places the responsibility for avoiding men's violence with women. An examination of the table of correlations reported in Radke et al. (2018) further reveals that men high in benevolent sexism were more willing to sponsor women to protect themselves (e.g.,

through self-defense classes). Thus, we propose that benevolent sexism may be associated with higher levels of support for educating women to avoid male violence.

The Current Study

In the current study we examined the degree to which hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and gender were associated with support for two responses to men's violence toward women: targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women and targeting women to avoid men's violence. We also explored the degree to which gender, hostile sexism and benevolent sexism interact to predict differences in support for these two responses to men's violence toward women.

Consistent with past research (Koepke et al., 2014), in Hypothesis 1a, we expect that hostile sexism will be negatively associated with support for targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women. In terms of targeting women's behavior, the predictions are less clear. Although it is possible that those high in hostile sexism are simply more likely to oppose any effort to reduce male violence, some work suggests that hostile sexism is associated with victim-blaming (Koepke et al., 2014) and, thus, it is possible that those high in hostile sexism would expect women to change their behavior to avoid the possibility of men's violence. Therefore, in Hypothesis 1b we propose that hostile sexism will be positively associated with support for targeting women to avoid men's violence.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b relate to benevolent sexism. Benevolently sexist ideas position women as weak and dependent on men who take the role of strong protectors. Indeed, benevolent sexism is theorized to appeal to some men and women based on the guise of protection it offers women (Glick et al., 2000). This reasoning suggests those high in benevolent sexism may also believe men should modify their behavior to reward and protect the perceived

weaker sex. Therefore, we expect benevolent sexism to be positively associated with support for targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women (Hypothesis 2a). Further, people high in benevolent sexism tend to see women's behavior as crucial in determining whether sexual assault takes place or not (Viki et al., 2004) and so we propose that benevolent sexism will be positively associated with support for targeting women to change their behavior to avoid male violence (Hypothesis 2b).

In relation to gender, Hypothesis 3a predicts that women will be more likely than men to believe that men's behavior should be targeted to reduce men's violence toward women. This hypothesis is based on prior research (i.e., Radke et al., 2018) which suggests men are less inclined to support action that challenges male dominance. As per Radke et al. (2018), we expect men and women to display similar levels of support for encouraging women to avoid men's violence. As we expect there to be no variation within our explored variables here (i.e., we expect to find support for the null hypothesis) we label this as Prediction 3b.

Finally, a series of exploratory research questions investigated interactions among hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and participants' gender in the prediction of both dependent variables. We make no specific predictions in relation to these exploratory research questions. There is research to support links between both types of sexism and rape myth acceptance (Chapleau et al., 2007), although there is little clarity on whether hostile sexism and benevolent sexism interact. Thus, in Research Question 1 we explore whether hostile sexism and benevolent sexism interact when predicting support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women (i.e., Is there a two-way interaction between hostile sexism and benevolent sexism?). Much research focuses on men's sexist attitudes and perceptions of women's culpability in relation to men's violence (Koepke et al., 2014). Thus, in the current

study, we also test two-way interactions between hostile sexism and participants' gender (Research Question 2) and benevolent sexism and gender (Research Question 3) to explore the possibility that hostile sexism and benevolent sexism may be more relevant to either men's or women's support for targeting men and targeting women to deal with men's violence toward women. Similarly, to the authors' knowledge, there is no existent literature from which to draw in order to understand whether the relationship between hostile and benevolent sexism might be more relevant to either men or women (i.e., gender) in relation to their support for interventions that target men or women. Therefore, in Research Question 4, we explore the three-way interaction among hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and participants' gender in predicting targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women.

Method

Sampling Procedure

The data were drawn from Wave 8 of the New Zealand Attitudes and Values Study (NZAVS), which is conducted by the University of Auckland. The NZAVS commenced in 2009 and is an annual, longitudinal, national probability study of New Zealand's adult residents randomly selected from the electoral roll. The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee reviews the NZAVS approximately every 3 years. Wave 8 of the data is covered by the most recent renewal, which was initiated in September 2017 and lasts until June 2021 (reference number: 014889). All participants provided written informed consent and identifying details were removed from questionnaires prior to analysis.

The initial wave of NZAVS surveys was posted to participants by mail, with a follow up copy posted 2 months later. In Wave 8, participants who had completed earlier waves of the study and had provided an email address were also emailed and invited to complete the

questionnaire online if preferred. The NZAVS survey included measures assessing a range of

attitudes and values and, from these, scales and items used to test the current research questions

were drawn. Note that the items included in the present study were designed by the research

team and only introduced in this wave.

Participants

A total of 21,937 participants aged 18 to 97 years-old (*M* = 49.62, *SD* = 13.93) completed

the targeted items in Wave 8 and were included in the current study. The final sample included

more women (*n* = 13,722, 62.61%) than men, with the majority of the sample being born in New

Zealand (*n* = 17, 396, 79.32%) and of European (Pākēha) ethnicity (*n* = 17,417, 79.44%). The

remainder were of Maori (*n* = 2544, 11.60%), Asian (*n* = 943, 4.3%), Pacific (*n* = 504, 2.3%), or

other (*n* = 526, 2.3%) ethnicity. At the time of completing the survey, most participants were in a

serious relationship (*n* = 16,540, 75.4%) and were parents (*n* = 16, 079, 73.3%).

Measures

Hostile and benevolent sexism. Hostile and benevolent sexism toward women were

measured as separate constructs using a subset of items from the corresponding subscales of the

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996). The use of short forms of the ASI has

been validated via previous EFA of full-scale data within community samples (Bendixen &

Kennair, 2017; de Lemus, Moya, & Glick, 2010; Rollero, Glick, & Tartaglia, 2014). Further,

extensive pilot testing was conducted to ensure the suitability of the 10 ASI items included

within the current survey (Sibley, 2009). Participants used a 7-point response scale from 1

(*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*) to rate five items that formed the hostile sexism scale

(i.e., women are too easily offended; women exaggerate problems they have at work; women

seek to gain power by getting control over men; once a woman gets a man to commit to her; she

usually tries to put him on a short leash; when women lose to men in a fair competition they typically complain about being discriminated against; $\alpha = .84$) and five items that formed the benevolent sexism scale (i.e., women, compared to men, tend to have greater moral sensibility; many women have a quality of purity that few men possess; women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste; women should be cherished and protected by men; every man ought to have a woman whom he adores; $\alpha = .75$). Each scale provided a composite measure for hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, separately, such that higher averaged scores indicated stronger endorsement of sexism.

Responses to men's violence toward women. Two separate outcome measures were developed specifically for the NZAVS to assess endorsement of targeting men and targeting women as mechanisms of change to prevent men's violence toward women. Drawing from previous research (Radke et al., 2018) and public discussion surrounding men's violence toward women, a single item was developed for each outcome variable. (Note that only one item for each construct was possible, due to space constraints in the nationally representative survey.) The item targeting men was developed to measure the belief that men's behavior should be the focus in reducing men's violence toward women: "We should invest more in educating men to not be physically/sexually violent toward women." The item targeting women was developed to measure the belief that women's behavior should be the focus in reducing men's violence toward women: "We should invest more in educating women how to avoid physical/sexual violence from men." Each of the items was rated on a 7-point response scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*).

Control variables. We suspected there could be some overlap between the two dependent variables (i.e., targeting men and targeting women) that could reflect a general

willingness to support any intervention to reduce men's violence. Thus, to partial out any shared variance between the two dependent variables, we controlled for support for targeting women when predicting support for targeting men and vice versa. Additionally, several factors were expected to potentially influence results, so these were included as control variables. These controls were age, country of birth, relationship status (whether a participant was involved in a serious romantic relationship such as de facto or marriage at the time of responding), and parental status (whether a participant had children). We controlled for age due to the large age range in our sample (18–97 years-old), and country of birth (New Zealand = 1, Other = 0) was included to control for cultural influence. Relationship status (Serious Relationship = 1, Other = 0) and parental status (Parent = 1, Non-Parent = 0) were controlled for because close interpersonal relationships between men and women (i.e., husband – wife, mother – son) might influence an individual's perceptions and expectations of gendered interactions.

Analysis Strategy

We used a series of hierarchical regressions to assess the relationships among hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, participants' gender, and participants' expectations that interventions should target men or target women to reduce violence toward women. All control variables were entered at Block 1 of the regressions. At Block 2, participants' gender, benevolent sexism, and hostile sexism were added. Two-way interactions (i.e., hostile sexism x benevolent sexism, gender x hostile sexism, and gender x benevolent sexism) were entered at Block 3, with the three-way interaction among hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and gender added at Block 4. For any significant interactions, simple slopes analysis was conducted to determine the nature of the interaction.

To confirm results, we also conducted follow-up analyses in which the alternate

dependent variable was not controlled for in Block 1 of each regression. For full analyses

without controlling for the alternate dependent variables, refer to Online Resource 1 in our online

supplement. The pattern of results remained consistent with the exception of two interactions

(see Online Resource 1, Table 2s, parts a and b in the online supplement). When predicting

support for targeting women without controlling for support for targeting men (Online Resource

1, Table 2s, part b), the interaction between hostile sexism and benevolent sexism, and also

between gender and hostile sexism, differed to results (reported here) that did control for support

for targeting men. Consequently, on the following, we interpret these interactions cautiously. To

depict the unique effects of predictor variables on each specific type of intervention, we report

herein the analyses controlling for the other targeted intervention.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for all relevant variables are

displayed in Table 1. There was a positive association between targeting men to reduce men's

violence toward women and targeting women to avoid violence from men. Hostile sexism was

negatively associated with support for targeting men to not be violent toward women and

positively associated with support for targeting women to avoid violence from men. Benevolent

sexism was positively associated with support for targeting both men and women to reduce

men's violence toward women. Prior to further analysis, gender was contrast coded (women = -1

and men = 1), and hostile and benevolent sexism were mean centered to aid in the interpretation

of results. Table 2 displays beta values and change statistics for the hierarchical regressions.

As displayed in Tables 2a and 2b, a significant amount of variance in targeting men

(Block 2, Adj. R^2 = .20), $F(3, 20301) = 626.61$, $p < .001$, and targeting women (Block 2, Adj. R^2

= .25), $F(3, 20301) = 859.77$, $p < .001$, to reduce men's violence toward women was accounted

for by hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and participants' gender. In Hypothesis 1a we predicted that hostile sexism would be negatively associated with support for targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women, whereas in Hypothesis 1b we predicted that hostile sexism would be positively associated with support for targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. In relation to Hypothesis 1a and as displayed in Table 2a, results indicated that higher levels of hostile sexism were associated with less support for targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women (β = -.32, p < .001). According to guidelines for effect sizes in multiple regression (small = .10, medium = .30, large = .50; Cohen, 1992), the variance explained by hostile sexism in relation to targeting men was of medium effect size (i.e., > .30 and < .50). In relation to Hypothesis 1b and as displayed in Table 2b, results indicated higher levels of hostile sexism were associated with more support for targeting women to avoid men's violence (β = .20, p < .001). Here, in relation to predicting support for targeting women to reduce men's violence, the variance explained by hostile sexism was of small effect size (i.e., > .10 and < .30). Thus, the specific effects of hostile sexism support both Hypotheses 1a and 1b, with hostile sexism having a stronger relationship with (low support for) targeting men than with targeting women.

In Hypotheses 2a and 2b we expected benevolent sexism to be positively associated with support for targeting men as well as targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. In relation to Hypothesis 2a and as displayed in Table 2a, higher levels of benevolent sexism were positively associated with support for targeting men (β = .10, p < .001). In relation to Hypothesis 2b and as displayed in Table 2b, higher levels of benevolent sexism were also positively associated with targeting women (β = .15, p < .001). The specific effects of benevolent sexism support Hypotheses 2a and 2b, although with small effect sizes in both cases (Cohen,

1992).

In Hypothesis 3a we predicted that women, more so than men, would support targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women. In Prediction 3b, however, we did not expect gender to impact support for targeting women to reduce men's violence. In relation to Hypothesis 3a and as displayed in Table 2a, gender did not account for a significant amount of variance in targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women. In relation to Prediction 3b, women, more so than men, expected that women should be targeted to avoid men's violence (β = -.11, p = .001) although this produced only a small effect size (Cohen, 1992). Thus, the specific effects for gender did not support Hypothesis 3a or Prediction 3b.

Research Question 1 involved exploring the two-way interaction between hostile sexism and benevolent sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. The two-way interactions entered at Block 3 (see Tables 2a and 2b) accounted for a significant amount of variance in relation to targeting men (Adj. R^2 = .22), $F(3, 20298)$ = 509.93, $p < .001$, and targeting women (Adj. R^2 = .26), $F(3, 20297)$ = 636.37, $p < .001$. For targeting men and as displayed in Table 2a, there was a significant two-way interaction between hostile and benevolent sexism (β = .13, $p < .001$). Simple slopes analysis indicated that when benevolent sexism was low, hostile sexism was negatively associated with targeting men (β = -.45, $p < .001$). The negative association between hostile sexism and support for targeting men remained, but was weaker, when benevolent sexism was high (β = -.20, $p < .001$).

In relation to targeting women and as displayed in Table 2b, a significant two-way interaction between hostile and benevolent sexism (β = -.06, $p < .001$) also emerged. Simple slopes analysis indicated that when benevolent sexism was low, hostile sexism was associated with support for targeting women to reduce men's violence (β = .25, $p < .001$). The association

between hostile sexism and support for targeting women remained, but was weaker, when

benevolent sexism was high (β = .15, p < .001). The variance explained by this interaction does

not reach the threshold of a small effect (Cohen, 1992) and is smaller than the same interaction in

relation to targeting men. Therefore, analyses examining Research Question 1 revealed that

benevolent sexism appears to slightly dampen the effects of hostile sexism in relation to support

for both targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women.

      Research Question 2 involved exploring the two-way interaction between gender and

hostile sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's

violence toward women. This interaction was only significant in relation to targeting men, as

displayed in Table 2a (β = -.02, p < .001). The association between hostile sexism and support

for targeting men was slightly stronger among men (β = -.33, p < .001) than women (β = -.30, p

< .001). The variance explained was below the threshold of a small effect (i.e., <.10; Cohen,

1992). Therefore, analyses for Research Question 2 indicated that hostile sexism might be

slightly more relevant to men than women in relation to predicting support for targeting men but,

in relation to support for targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women, the impact

of hostile sexism did not differ across men and women.

      Research Question 3 involved exploring the two-way interaction between gender and

benevolent sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's

violence toward women. This interaction was only significant in relation to targeting men, as

displayed in Table 2a (β = .02, p = .002). Benevolent sexism was a slightly better predictor for

women (β = .11, p < .001) than for men (β = .10, p < .001). This effect was below the threshold

of a small effect (i.e., <.10; Cohen, 1992). Therefore, analyses for Research Question 3 indicated

that benevolent sexism might be slightly more relevant to women than men in relation to

predicting support for targeting men but, in relation to support for targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women, the impact of benevolent sexism did not differ across women and men.

Research Question 4 involved exploring the three-way interactions among gender, hostile sexism, and benevolent sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. There were no significant three-way interactions at Block 4.

Discussion

In the present paper we looked at how sexism and gender related to support for two approaches to reduce men's violence toward women: (a) targeting men to not be physically and sexually violent toward women and (b) targeting women to avoid men's physical and sexual violence. Results were broadly in line with our hypotheses, with the most substantial finding being the support for Hypotheses 1a and 1b. This pattern of findings saw the emergence of hostile sexism as a predictor of reduced support for intervening with men to reduce men's violence toward women, but *increased* support for intervening with women to caution them to avoid men's violence. The effects for benevolent sexism were weaker but also supported Hypotheses 2a and 2b: Greater benevolent sexism predicted increased support for intervening with both men and women to reduce male violence. In terms of gender, Hypotheses 3a and 3b were not supported because we found that women were slightly more supportive than men of tackling violence against women by targeting women to avoid such behavior, but both men and women were equally supportive of intervening with men.

Additionally, several significant, although weak, interactions emerged in our examination of our exploratory research questions. Higher levels of benevolent sexism attenuated the strength

with which hostile sexism related to both of the approaches to reducing men's violence. In our

data, the association between hostile sexism and support for intervening with men was slightly

larger for men than for women, whereas benevolent sexism was a slightly stronger predictor for

women. It is also important to note that, in general, levels of support for both forms of

intervention (i.e., targeting men, targeting women) were very high and that support for targeting

men to reduce violence toward women approached the ceiling (5.80 on a possible 7-point scale).

Consequently, there appears to be a public appetite for reducing male violence toward women, in

particular by talking to and engaging men.

As we mentioned, and consistent with our predictions, participants who expressed greater

hostility toward women who challenge male dominance (i.e., high hostile sexism) were less

supportive of targeting men to change their behavior around violence toward women, while also

being more supportive of targeting women to avoid men's violence. It seems logical that people

who believe women deserve punishment if they step out of line (i.e., report high levels of hostile

sexism) would also be less inclined to value the physical safety of women. From this perspective,

men's violence toward women may be viewed as a viable means to maintain male dominance or

the result of aberrant female behavior (i.e., she must have done something to deserve

punishment). Accordingly, both men and women with high levels of hostile sexism are likely to

oppose the idea that intervening with men is either appropriate or necessary (at least compared to

those with lower levels of hostile sexism). Comparatively, the expectation that women should

modify their own behavior to avoid men's violence removes the onus from men to reduce

violence and aligns with the motives underpinning hostile sexism (i.e., to protect men from

women who threaten men's power). This competitive picture of gender relations is consistent

with the victim-blaming literature showing that women targeted with sexual violence by men are

often condemned whereas the man's culpability is minimized (Chapleau et al., 2007; Koepke et al., 2014; Viki et al., 2004). The current results extend that literature by providing support that, when it comes to interventions to reduce men's violence, both men and women high in hostile sexism excuse men's responsibility and place obligation on women to accept and adapt to the inevitability of men's violence.

Our results also revealed that participants with stronger beliefs that women should be cherished and protected by men (i.e., high benevolent sexism) were more supportive of targeting both men and women to make changes to reduce men's violence toward women. The harm of benevolent sexism to women is well documented: It predicts greater blame of female victims for men's sexual violence (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003; Viki et al., 2004), lack of support for abortion of rape-related pregnancy (Osborne & Davies, 2012), and general restriction of women to remain in traditional gender roles (Dardenne, Dumont, & Bollier, 2007). The current results, however, indicate that higher levels of benevolent sexism appear to promote interventions that benefit women by reducing men's violence. As we speculated in the introduction, it could be that people who view men as the protectors of women (i.e., endorse high benevolent sexism) oppose violations of this role (e.g., men's violence against women) and endorse any action that reinstates women being guarded by men. However, this likely comes at a "cost" to women; namely that in order to receive men's protection, women must adhere to a restrictive, traditional, stereotyped role of a "good woman." Indeed, our results are consistent with the idea that benevolent sexism coerces women into accepting gender inequality.

Theoretically, benevolent sexism is conceived to be the "carrot" to the "stick" of hostile sexism; that is, benevolent sexism affords benefits to women and protects them from the harsh consequences of hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2000). Our results fit with this understanding, as

does the two-way interaction between hostile and benevolent sexism that we found. Higher levels of benevolent sexism attenuated the strength with which hostile sexism related to both support for targeting men to not be violent toward women as well as support for targeting women to avoid men's violence. Past work has established that when hostile sexism is high, women are likely to accept benevolent sexism as a means of reducing the negative impact (punishment) of hostile sexism (Fischer, 2006; Glick et al., 2000). In practical terms, this means that women modify their behavior to seek protection (benevolent sexism) from the very group (i.e., men) who are perceived to pose a threat (hostile sexism). Thus, consistent with our results, benevolent sexism reduces the impact of hostile sexism, and together hostile and benevolent sexism operate in tandem to maintain a cycle of male dominance.

Turning to participants' gender, we found that women were slightly more supportive than men of tackling violence against women by targeting women's behavior. In retrospect, this finding seems obvious. Women, compared to men, likely have a greater personal awareness and fear of the personal costs of men's violence (e.g., physical and psychological injury, victim-blaming) and as a consequence may be more invested in, and willing, to learn to stay out of the pathway of male violence as a means of self-defense. We note, however, that in past work men have been more willing than women to sponsor women to attend self-defense classes and gun safety training (Radke et al., 2018). Although the difference between men's and women's support for targeting women in the current study was small, the pattern is inconsistent with Radke et al. (2018). It is possible that when thinking about intervening with women to avoid male violence, participants in our study were thinking about a vast range of behaviors (e.g., walking with groups of friends, avoiding certain areas late at night). It may be the case that whereas men see physical self-defense as a viable route to avoiding male violence (the dependent

variable in Radke et al., 2018), in relative terms, women do not. A broader definition of

avoidance, however, appears to see women showing more support for the initiative than men.

Gender was also found to interact with each type of sexism in relation to targeting men to

reduce men's violence toward women. As previously established, both men and women can hold

benevolent and hostile sexism toward women and, for both genders, these attitudes are linked to

perceptions of men's violence toward women (Koepke et al., 2014; Viki et al., 2004). In our

data, the association between hostile sexism and support for targeting men was slightly larger for

men than for women, whereas benevolent sexism was a slightly stronger predictor for women.

Although these gender differences were small, it is possible that, when considering intervening

with men to not be violent, hostile sexism is more impactful for men because men with this

attitude perceive gender equality to be a threat. Conversely, benevolent sexism may be more

impactful for women because women with this perspective view men as potential protectors

from threat and so would expect men's behavior to change accordingly.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

The current study is limited in the sense that it did not explicitly explore violence or

sexism within lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or queer (LGBTQ) populations, and it relied on

a narrow conceptualisation of gender. Thus, it is unclear if sexism toward women would have a

similar impact on support for men's violence interventions when specifically explored among

members of the LGBTQ population or outside cisgender populations. It could be that attitudes

toward women and perspectives of responsibility for change in relation to men's violence vary

according to sexual and gender identities. We know that violence toward transgender women is

extremely high (Wirtz et al., 2020), and so future work would benefit by working to understand

how people decide what action is appropriate when aiming to target this problem. Similarly, the

current study does not explore sexism and support for targeting men and women to reduce men's

violence among other dimensions of identity (e.g., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status). An

intersectional perspective recognises that people face disadvantage (and advantage) on multiple

fronts (Cole, 2009; Crenshaw, 1991). Future research could benefit from taking an intersectional

approach to understand how people respond to gendered violence.

Because the data in the current study were drawn from a larger survey, abbreviated

versions of sexism measures were essential to avoid attrition. This limits the current study

because we could not explore the three sub-domains of benevolent sexism (i.e., protective

paternalism, complementary gender differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy; Glick & Fiske,

1996; Glick et al., 2000). Given that each subdomain of benevolent sexism relates differently to

rape myth acceptance (Chapleau et al., 2007), it seems reasonable to expect these constructs

might also differentially relate to perspectives of whether men or women should be held

responsible for making changes to reduce men's violence toward women. It could be that

protective paternalism, specifically, drives the belief that men, as women's protectors, should be

responsible for keeping them safe from violence. We encourage future research to incorporate

the full-scale versions of hostile and benevolent sexism measures to enable precise evaluation of

the mechanisms that drive relationships between benevolent sexism and beliefs regarding

preventing men's violence toward women. Further, we recommend future studies explore the

relationship between sexism toward men (e.g., Ambivalence toward Men Inventory, Glick &

Fiske, 2006) and support for targeting men and women in relation to reducing men's violence.

The current study was limited to the exploration of sexism toward women, and it could be that

sexism toward men also plays a role in how men and women are held accountable in reducing

men's violence toward women.

Also related to the avoidance of attrition from the larger survey, the dependent measures used in the current study were single-item measures that were developed specifically for the NZAVS. It is possible that these targeting constructs were not adequately described by these single items, suggesting that participants could have interpreted the items with slightly different meanings. Thus, further work to validate these items is required. Additionally, these items were introduced to the NZVAS at Wave 8 and, as such, the constructs cannot yet be analysed longitudinally from our sample. The current study is also limited by the cross-sectional and self-report nature of the data, which means causality cannot be inferred. Given the significance of results that emerged in our study, future longitudinal and observational research is encouraged to determine possible changes in these relationships over time.

Practice Implications

Our findings have implications for the social campaigns against men's violence toward women. The strongest and most relevant finding from the current study was that both men and women who hold prejudices about women who challenge the status quo (i.e., those who report high levels of hostile sexism) are less likely to expect men to play a role in reducing men's violence toward women and, so, likely excuse violent men from accountability. Providing education to reduce hostile sexism in the general public could improve public dialogue around gender equality and increase expectations for men to be accountable for their own, and their group's, violence toward women. This approach is consistent with the work of the White Ribbon Campaign (2019), who aim to engage boys and men in the movement against men's violence. However, given that hostile sexism is relevant to both men's and women's beliefs about men's role in reducing male violence, it seems such campaigns could be better supported by engaging both men and women to challenge their perceptions of women.

Further, peer group discussions that disrespect women are known to have an impact on how male perpetrators of violence justify their actions (Jacques-Tiura et al., 2015). Addressing hostile sexism among male and female peer groups is likely to promote more gender-equal discussions that challenge such justifications and, therefore, make the behavior less socially acceptable. Additionally, education that addresses hostile sexism by challenging traditional role norms to promote respect for women and their autonomy could reduce both public and self-directed stigma and shame for women targeted by men's violence. This might liberate women to feel less vilified (either by themselves or others), promote help-seeking behaviors, and increase offence reporting. Overall, it seems addressing hostile sexism is crucial if we are to create a society in which women can live without fear of men's violence.

From a clinical perspective, the current findings support the implementation of therapeutic interventions that target sexist attitudes for men who enact violence toward women as well as for those who are complicit in men's violence. This proposition is consistent with recent research that revealed that men who are high in hostile sexism tend to become aggressive toward female intimate partners in contexts where they perceive male power is being undermined (e.g., perceived low relationship commitment by female partner; Cross, Overall, Hammond, & Fletcher, 2017). Thus, therapy that targets hostile sexism might reduce the perception of gender equality as a threat and, consequently, reduce aggression toward women who actually have or are perceived to have power. Our suggested approach is consistent with the Duluth Model, a commonly used court-sanctioned intervention for male offenders of intimate partner violence (Corvo, Dutton, & Chen, 2009). The Duluth Model views that male privilege promotes men's violence toward female intimate partners as a means of control, however, its application is most commonly specific to intimate partner violence rather than men's violence

toward women more broadly. Thus, according to the current findings, there is scope for similar programs to be extended to men's violence toward all women.

Additionally, links have been established between the unwanted pursuit of a romantic partner (a form of dating violence) and the defense mechanisms by which an individual justifies and legitimizes such pursuit behaviors (Brownhalls, Duffy, Eriksson, & Barlow, 2019). In relation to the current study, hostile sexism could be viewed as a rationalization defense that serves to justify and legitimize men's violence (i.e. she deserves it as punishment for not complying with male dominance). In legitimizing his violence, a man may be able to avoid negative feelings that he would otherwise experience for being violent toward a woman (e.g., guilt, shame). In the absence of these negative feelings, the man's violent behavior is able to continue. Interventions such as Intensive Short-Term Dynamic Psychotherapy (ISTDP; Davanloo, 1990) support clients to identify and turn against unhelpful defenses (in this case rationalizations) and to process the emotions that lie underneath. It could be, then, that men's violence toward women can be reduced with ISTDP that assists perpetrators to recognize and turn against the underlying processes on which they rely to legitimize violence toward women (e.g., hostile sexism) and then deal with the emotions underneath.

Lastly, it has been established that men have lower intentions to be sexually violent toward women when they also experience positive interactions with counter-stereotypical women (e.g., women who do not adhere to traditional feminine stereotypes such as feminists, activists, and career-focused women) and that hostile sexism mediates this relationship (Taschler & West, 2017). Thus, we suggest therapy could include either *in vivo* or imagined contact (see Crisp & Turner, 2012 for a full review) with such counter-stereotypical women to challenge hostile sexism and, possibly, increase beliefs that men should stop being violent toward women.

Conclusion

The current study examined the associations among sexism, gender, and support for holding men and women accountable for reducing men's violence toward women. Our results demonstrate that men's and women's sexist attitudes toward women are key to understanding support for interventions to reduce men's violence toward women. Specifically, men and women who express hostility (i.e., hostile sexism) toward women who challenge male dominance demonstrated greater support for targeting women's behavior to reduce male violence, but not men's. However, men and women who agreed that women who comply with traditional feminine behavior should be protected and cherished (i.e., benevolent sexism) were generally supportive of targeting men and women to reduce male violence. To a lesser degree, exploratory analyses also suggest that benevolent sexism reduces. but does not eliminate, the association between hostile sexism and support for targeting both men and women to reduce violence toward women.

Our results build upon and extend literatures on sexism and violence by demonstrating that the impact of hostile sexism, in particular, extends to attributions of men's and women's responsibility for change in reducing men's violence. Further, our findings provide insight to societal reactions to men's violence toward women, such as the murders of Eurydice Dixon and Aiia Maasarwe (Cuthbertson, 2019). Extending from the current results, reactions that push men to consider their behavior and that of their male peers (e.g., make it safe at night) and reactions that appear to place responsibility on women to avoid men's violence (e.g., teach women to fight) might be driven by sexism toward women. In sum, our findings confirm that both men's and women's sexist attitudes toward women are associated with beliefs about how society should respond to men's violence toward women, and they provide a guide for future interventions and policies in helping reduce this significant problem.

References

Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and

acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape

proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 111-125.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111

Ayre, J., Lum On, M., Webster, K., Gourley, M., & Moon, L. (2016). *Examination of the burden*

of disease of intimate partner violence against women in 2011: Final report (ANROWS

Horizons, 06/2016). Sydney: ANROWS. Retrieved November 2017 from

<http://media.aomx.com/anrows.org.au/s3fs-public/BoD%20Horizons.pdf>

Bendixon, M, & Kennair, L. E. O. (2017). When less is more: Psychometric properties of

Norwegian short-forms of the Ambivalent Sexism Scales (ASI and AMI) and the Illinois

Rape Myth Acceptance (IRMA) Scale. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 58,* 541-

550. https://doi.org/10.1111.sjop.12392

Brownhalls, J., Duffy, A., Eriksson, L., & Barlow, F. K. (2019). Reintroducing rationalization: A

study of relational goal pursuit theory of intimate partner obsessive relational intrusion.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence. Advanced online publication.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518822339

Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward

women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles, 57*(1-2), 131-136.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9196-2

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112(1),* 155 – 159.

https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64*(3),

170-180. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564

Corvo, K., Dutton, D., & Chen, W. (2009). Do Duluth Model interventions with perpetrators of

domestic violence violate mental health professional ethics? *Ethics and Behavior, 19(4),*

323-340. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508420903035323

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence

against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review, 43,* 1241-1299.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2012). The imagined contact hypothesis. *Advances in Experimental*

Social Psychology, 46, 125-182. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394281-4.00003-9

Cross, E. J., Overall, N. C., Hammond, M. D., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (2017). When does men's

hostile sexism predict relational aggression? The moderating role of partner commitment.

Personality Science, 8, 331-340. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616672000

Cuthbertson, D. (2019, January 17). Everyone has the right to get home safely. *The Age.*

Retrieved from http://www.theage.com.au

Dardenne, B., Dumont, M., & Bollier, T. (2007). Insidious dangers of benevolent sexism:

consequences for women's performance. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, *93*, 764-779. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.764

Davanloo, H. (1990). *Unlocking the unconscious*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley.

Davey, M. (2018, June 15). Men need to change: Anger grows over police response to Eurydice

Dixon's murder. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com.au

de Lemus, S., Moya, M., & Glick, P. (2010). When contact correlates with prejudice:

Adolescents' romantic relationship experience predicts greater benevolent sexism in boys

and hostile sexism in girls. *Sex Roles, 63,* 214-225. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-

9786-2

Fanslow, J., & Robinson, E. (2004). Violence against women in New Zealand: Prevalence and

   health consequences. *The New Zealand Medical Journal, 117(1206),* 1-12. doi: U117-

   1206/1173

Fischer, A. R. (2006). Women's benevolent sexism as reaction to hostility. *Psychology of*

   Women Quarterly, 30, 410-416. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00316.x

Flood, M. (2011). Involving men in efforts to end violence against women. *Men and*

   Masculinities, 14, 358-377. https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X10363995

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and

   benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 491-512.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2000). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as

   complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56,* 109-118.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). The ambivalence toward men inventory: differentiating hostile

   and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23(3),*519-536.

   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., … Wilemsen, T.

   (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across

   cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 763-775.

Jacques-Tiura, A. J., Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Pierce, J., Pegram, S. E., & Woerner, J. (2015).

   Friends matter: Protective and harmful aspects of male friendships associated with past-

   year sexual aggression in a community sample of young men. *American Journal of*

   Public Health, *105*, 1001-1007. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302472

Koepke, S., Eyssel, F., & Bohner, G. (2014). "She deserved it: Effects of sexism norms, type of

   violence, and victim's pre-assault behavior on blame attributions toward female victims

and approval of the aggressor's behavior. *Violence Against Women, 20,* 446-464.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801214528581

KPMG. (2016). *The cost of violence against women and their children in Australia: Final report May 2016*. Canberra: Department of Social Services. Retrieved November 15, 2018 from https://www.dss.gov.au/women/ publications-articles/reducing-violence/the-cost-of-violence-against-women-and-their-children-in-australia- may-2016

Messerschmidt, J. (2000). Becoming ''real men'': Adolescent masculinity challenges and sexual violence. *Men and Masculinities, 2,* 286-307.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X00002003003

Nettleton, P. H. (2011). Domestic violence in men's and women's magazines: Women are guilty of choosing the wrong men, men are not guilty of hitting women. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *34*(2), 139-160.

Osborne, D., & Davies, P. G. (2012). When benevolence backfires: Benevolent sexists' opposition to elective and traumatic abortion. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(2), 291-307. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00890

Radke, H. R. M., Hornesy, M. J., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Changing versus protective the status quo: why men and women engage in different types of action on behalf of women. *Sex Roles, 79,* 505-518. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0884-2

Rakow, L. (2001). Feminist approaches to popular culture: Giving patriarchy its due. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader* (pp. 275–291). Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Rodríguez-Mandera, S. L., Padilla, M., Varas-Díaz, N., Neilands, T., Vasques Guzzi, A. C., Florenciani, E. J., … Ramos-Pibernus, A. (2016). Experiences of violence among

transgender women in Puerto Rico: An underestimated problem. *Journal of Homosexuality, 64,* 209-217. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1174026

Rollero, C., Glick, P., & Tartaglia, S. (2014). Psychometric properties of short versions of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory. *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 21*(2), 149-159.

Sibley, C. G. (2009). *The New Zealand Attitudes and Values Study 2009: Questionnaire items and details for researchers.* Unpublished technical report, The University of Auckland.

Taschler, M., & West, K. (2017). Contact with counter-stereotypical women predicts less sexism, less rape myth acceptance, less intention to rape (in men) and less projected enjoyment of rape (in women). *Sex Roles, 76,* 473-484. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0679

Torbenfeldt Bengtsson, T. (2016). Performing hypermasculinity: Experiences with confined young offenders. *Men and Masculinities, 19,* 410-428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X15595083

Turquet, L., Seck, P., Azcona, G., Menon, R., Boyce, C., Piernon, N., … Harbour, E. (2011). Progress of the world's women: In pursuit of Justice. *United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.* Retrieved from http://menengage.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Progress_of_the_Worlds_Women _2011.pdf

Viki, G. T., Abrams, D., & Masser, B. (2004). Evaluating stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent sexism in perpetrator blame and recommended sentence length. *Law and Human Behavior*, *28*, 295-303.

White Ribbon Campaign. (2019, November 8). *About white ribbon.* Retrieved from https://www.whiteribbon.ca/about.html

Wirtz, A. L., Poteat, T. C., Malik, M., & Glass, N. (2020). Gender-based violence against

transgender people in the United States: A call for research and programming. *Trauma,*

Violence & Abuse, 21, 227-241. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018757749

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Study Variables

Variables	*Men M (SD)*	*Women M (SD)*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						Correlations			
1. Age	51.42 (13.95)	48.58 (13.78)	--	.01	.43**	.01	.06**	.05**	.04**
2. Country of Birth	.78 (.42)	.80 (.40)	-.03*	--	.02*	-.06**	-.01	-.02*	-.02*
3. Parental Status	.73 (.44)	.73 (.44)	.44**	-.02	--	.22**	.09**	.05**	-.03**
4. Relationship Status	.79 (.41)	.73 (.44)	.17**	-.06**	.41**	--	.05**	.03**	-.04**
5. Benevolent Sexism	3.96 (1.16)	3.57 (1.23)	.18**	.02	.14**	.02	--	.48**	.02**
6. Hostile Sexism	3.32 (1.26)	2.72 (1.21)	.01	.02*	-.02	.13**	.34**	--	-.18**
7. Targeting Men	5.64 (1.35)	5.89 (1.22)	.12**	-. 01	.07**	.05**	.13**	-.21*	--
8. Targeting Women	4.71 (1.71)	4.89 (1.83)	.22**	-.0	.11**	.01	.29**	.16**	.40**

Note. Correlations for women (*n* = 13,722) are presented above the diagonal, and correlations for men (*n* = 8,215) are presented below

the diagonal. Country of Birth: New Zealand = 1, Other = 0. Parental Status: Parent = 1, Non-Parent = 0. Relationship Status: Serious

Relationship = 1, Other = 0. Gender: Men = 1, Women = 0. All other variables had a possible range from 1 to 7.

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

Table 2

Predicting (a) Targeting Men to Not be Violent Toward Women and (b) Targeting Women to Avoid Men's Violence as a Function of Control Variables, Gender, and Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

Block	(a) Targeting Men				(b) Targeting Women			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Controls								
Age	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.01	.21***	.20***	.20***	.20***
Country of Birth	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.02**	-.02**	-.02**	-.02**
Parental Status	-.03**	-.04***	-.03**	-.03***	.05***	.03***	.03***	.03***
Relationship Status	.01	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.05***	-.02**	-.02**	-.02**
Targeting women	.35***	.38***	.38***	.38***				
Targeting men					.32***	.35***	.36***	.36***
Variables								
Gender		-.01	-.01	-.01		-.11***	-.11***	-.11***
Hostile Sexism (HS)		-.32***	-.32***	-.32***		.20***	.20**	.20***
Benevolent Sexism (BS)		.10***	.12***	.18***		.15**	.14***	.14***
HS x BS			.13***	.13***			-.06***	-.06***
Gender x HS			-.02**	-.02**			-.01	-.06
Gender x BS			.02**	0.02**			-.01	-.01
Gender x HS x BS				-.01				.01
ΔR^2	.12***	.08***	.02***	.00	.17***	.08***	.01***	.00
Adj. R^2	.12***	.20***	.22***	.22	.17***	.25***	.26***	.26
ΔF	530.17***	696.52***	159.62***	.04	836.67***	744.99***	30.56***	1.24

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

Analysis Strategy

We used a series of hierarchical regressions to assess the relationships among hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, participants' gender, and participants' expectations that interventions should target men or target women to reduce violence toward women. All control variables were entered at Block 1 of the regressions. At Block 2, participants' gender, benevolent sexism, and hostile sexism were added. Two-way interactions (i.e., hostile sexism x benevolent sexism, gender x hostile sexism, and gender x benevolent sexism) were entered at Block 3, with the three-way interaction among hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and gender added at Block 4. For any significant interactions, simple slopes analysis was conducted to determine the nature of the interaction.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for all relevant variables are displayed in Table 1s. There was a positive association between targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women and targeting women to avoid violence from men. Hostile sexism was negatively associated with support for targeting men to not be violent toward women and positively associated with support for targeting women to avoid violence from men. Benevolent sexism was positively associated with support for targeting both men and women to reduce men's violence toward women. Prior to further analysis, gender was contrast coded (women = -1 and men = 1), and hostile and benevolent sexism were mean centered to aid in the interpretation of results. Table 2s(a) and Table 2s(b) displays beta values and change statistics for the hierarchical regressions.

As displayed in Tables 2s(a) and 2s(b), a significant amount of variance in targeting men (Block 2, R^2_{adj} = .07, F (3, 20346) = 532.58, p < .001) and targeting women (Block 2, R^2_{adj} = .07, F (3, 20326) = 580.97, p < .001) to reduce men's violence toward women was accounted for by hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and gender. In Hypothesis 1a we predicted hostile sexism to be negatively associated with support for targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women, whereas in Hypothesis 1b we predicted hostile sexism to be positively associated with support for targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. In relation to Hypothesis 1a and as displayed in Table 2s(a), results indicated higher levels of hostile sexism were associated with less support for targeting men to reduce men's violence toward women (β = -.28, p < .001). According to guidelines for effect sizes in multiple regression (small = .10, medium = .30, large = .50; Cohen, 1992), the variance explained by hostile sexism in relation to targeting men was of small effect size (i.e., > .10 and < .30). In relation to Hypothesis 1b and as displayed in Table 2s(b), results indicated higher levels of hostile sexism were associated with more support for targeting women to avoid men's violence (β = .01, p < .001). The variance explained by hostile sexism in relation to targeting women did not reach the threshold for a small effect (i.e., < .10). Thus, both Hypotheses 1a and 1b were supported.

In Hypotheses 2a and 2b we expected benevolent sexism to be positively associated with support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. In relation to Hypothesis 2a and as indicated in Table 2s(a), higher levels of benevolent sexism were positively associated with support for targeting men (β = .18, p < .001). In relation to Hypothesis 2b and as indicated in Table 2s(b) higher levels of benevolent sexism were positively associated with support for targeting women (β = .21, p < .001). This supports Hypotheses 2a and 2b, although with small effect sizes (Cohen, 1992).

In Hypothesis 3a we predicted that women, more so than men, would support targeting

men to reduce men's violence toward women. In Prediction 3b, however, we did not expect

gender to impact support for targeting women to reduce men's violence. In relation to

Hypothesis 3a and as displayed in Table 2s(a), gender accounted for a significant amount of

variance in targeting men (β = -.06, p < .05) with women, more so than men, expecting that men

should be taught to avoid men's violence. In relation to Prediction 3b and as displayed in Table

2s(b), gender also accounted for a significant amount of variance in targeting women (β = -.13, p

= .001) with women, more so than men, expecting that women should be taught to avoid men's

violence. This produced a small effect size. Thus, Hypothesis 3a was supported although the

variance explained did not reach the threshold for a small effect size, and Prediction 3b was not

supported.

Research Question 1 explored the two-way interaction between hostile sexism and

benevolent sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's

violence toward women. The two-way interactions entered at Block 3 (Table 2s) accounted for a

significant amount of variance in relation to targeting men (R^2_{adj} = .09, F (3, 20343) = 131.04, p

< .001) and targeting women (R^2_{adj} = .14, F (3, 20323) = 2.70, p = .04). For targeting men and as

displayed in Table 2s(a), there was a significant two-way interaction between hostile and

benevolent sexism (β = .13, p < .001). Simple slopes analysis indicated that when benevolent

sexism was low, hostile sexism was negatively associated with targeting men (β = -.41, p <

.001). The negative association between hostile sexism and support for targeting men remained,

but was weaker, when benevolent sexism was high (β = -.17, p < .001). For targeting women,

there was no significant two-way interaction between hostile and benevolent sexism. Therefore,

analyses examining Research Question 1 revealed that benevolent sexism appears to slightly

dampen the effects of hostile sexism in relation to support for targeting men only.

In Research Question 2 we explored the two-way interaction between gender and hostile sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. As displayed in Table 2s(a), there was a significant two-way interaction between gender and hostile sexism in relation to targeting men (β = -.03, p < .001). The association between hostile sexism and targeting men was slightly stronger among men (β = -.29, p < .001) than women (β = -.26, p < .001). As displayed in Table 2s(b), there was also a significant two-way interaction between gender and hostile sexism in relation to targeting women (β = -.02, p = .03). Simple slopes analysis revealed that hostile sexism was a better predictor of support for targeting women among women (β = .10, p < .001) than men (β = .08, p < .001). Therefore, analyses for Research Question 2 indicated that hostile sexism might be slightly more relevant to men than women in relation to predicting support for targeting men but, in relation to support for targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women, hostile sexism is slightly more relevant to women than men.

In Research Question 3 we explored the two-way interaction between gender and benevolent sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. This two-way interaction between gender and benevolent sexism was only significant in relation to targeting men, as displayed in Table 2s(a) (β = .02, p = .003). Simple slopes analysis revealed benevolent sexism was a better predictor for men (β = .21, p < .001) than for women (β = .14, p < .001). Therefore, analyses for Research Question 3 indicated that benevolent sexism might be slightly more relevant to men than women in relation to predicting support for targeting men but, in relation to support for targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women, the impact of benevolent sexism did not differ across women and men.

In Research Question 4 we explored the three-way interactions between gender, hostile

sexism, and benevolent sexism in relation to support for targeting men and targeting women to reduce men's violence toward women. There were no significant three-way interactions at Block 4.

Table 1s

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Study Variables

Variables	Men M (SD)	Women M (SD)	Correlations						
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age	51.42 (13.95)	48.58 (13.78)	--	.01	.43**	.01	.06**	.05**	.04**
2. Country of Birth	.78 (.42)	.80 (.40)	-.03*	--	.02*	-.06**	-.01	-.02*	-.02*
3. Parental Status	.73 (.44)	.73 (.44)	.44**	-.02	--	.22**	.09**	.05**	-.03**
4. Relationship Status	.79 (.41)	.73 (.44)	.17**	-.06**	.41**	--	.05**	.03**	-.04**
5. Benevolent Sexism	3.96 (1.16)	3.57 (1.23)	.18**	.02	.14**	.02	--	.48**	.02**
6. Hostile Sexism	3.32 (1.26)	2.72 (1.21)	.01	.02*	-.02	.13**	.34**	--	-.18**
7. Targeting Men	5.64 (1.35)	5.89 (1.22)	.12**	-. 01	.07**	.05**	.13**	-.21*	--
8. Targeting Women	4.71 (1.71)	4.89 (1.83)	.22**	-.0	.11**	.01	.29**	.16**	.40**

Note. Correlations for women (*n* = 13,722) are presented above the diagonal, and correlations for men (*n* = 8,215) are presented below

the diagonal. Country of Birth: New Zealand = 1, Other = 0. Parental Status: Parent = 1, Non-Parent = 0. Relationship Status: Serious

Relationship = 1, Other = 0. Gender: Men = 1, Women = 0. All other variables had a possible range from 1 to 7.

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

Table 2s

Predicting Targeting Men to Not be Violent Toward Men, and Targeting Women to Avoid Men's Violence as a Function of Control Variables, Gender, and Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

Block	(a) Targeting Men				(b) Targeting Women			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Controls								
Age	.07***	.08***	.08***	.08***	.23***	.23***	.23***	.23***
Country of Birth	-.01	-.02*	-.02*	-.02*	-.02**	.-03***	-.02***	-.03***
Parental Status	.-01	-.03***	-.03**	-.03**	.05***	.02**	-02**	.02**
Relationship Status	-.02*	-.02**	-.02**	-.02**	-.05***	-.03***	-.03***	-.03***
Variables								
Gender	-	-.06**	-.05***	-.05***	-	-.13***	-.13***	-.13***
Hostile Sexism	-	-.28***	-.29***	-.29***	-	.01***	.01***	.10***
Benevolent Sexism	-	.18***	.20***	.20***	-	.21***	.21***	.21***
Hostile Sexism x Benevolent Sexism	-	-	.13***	.13***	-	-	-.01	-.01
Gender x Hostile Sexism	-	-	-.03***	-.03***	-	-	-.02*	-.02*
Gender x Benevolent Sexism	-	-	.02**	.02**	-	-	.01	.01
Gender x Hostile Sexism x Benevolent Sexism	-	-	-	.01	-	-	-	.01
ΔR^2	.01***	.07***	.02***	.00	.07***	.07***	.00*	.00
Adj. R^2	.01***	.08***	.09***	.09	.07***	.14***	.14*	.14
ΔF	23.26***	532.58***	131.04***	.05	364.47***	580.97***	2.70*	1.42

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