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Abstract

The present study investigates potential sociocultural predictors of perceived sexism on the individual and institutional levels using the Blodorn et al. (2012) Individual and Institutional Perception of Sexism Measure. One hundred and seventy-seven undergraduate students from an urban college and another group of thirty-six college graduates participated in the study. The participants in the undergraduate group who had mothers who were born outside of the United States predicted perceived institutional sexism. The degree of intent predicted the perception of institutional sexism as well. Women in the college graduate sample rated institutional sexism as being more intentional than the men in the sample. For both samples, no gender differences were found in the perception of either individual or institutional sexism.
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Introduction

Perceived discrimination can be defined as the subjective experience of being unfairly treated because of a personal attribute or identity or it can be an individual interpretation of events as discriminatory (Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998). Defining perceived discrimination in the social sciences is particularly difficult because it is a very complex, and sometimes ambiguous concept that has a number of variables and contexts that can considerably change its interpretation. Examining perceived discrimination as a construct is different from examining explicit discrimination as a construct; perceived discrimination is more implicit and involves actions that can be interpreted in different ways. It focuses on the subjective experience of someone who believes they are either witnessing discrimination or being personally discriminated against. Exploring the concept of perceived discrimination does not exclusively involve verifying whether discrimination has actually occurred (Borders & Liang, 2011).

Researchers have long examined the types of impact that perceived discrimination has on people who are members of traditionally subordinated groups, contributing to a relatively small, but growing body of literature.

Perceived Sexism

Perceived sexism is the perception of unfair treatment based solely on biological sex or gender. Although the current study investigated the perception of sexism, it is important to explore the breadth of literature that covers perceived discrimination, in part because there are many shared elements among what constitutes perceived discrimination based on any personal attribute, including gender. In addition, there are limited specific research investigations of
perceived sexism. Therefore, the proceeding review of literature will focus on perceived
discrimination, providing relevant examples of investigations into perceived sexism.

**Perceived discrimination and health outcomes.** Current research has investigated
perceived discrimination mainly in three ways: The first and most popular way that it has been
studied has been as a predictor variable of a health-related or educational outcome. This research
has demonstrated that perceived personal discrimination is a fairly reliable predictor of issues
ranging from various psychopathologies to poorer academic performance among school-aged
children. Borders and Liang (2011) found that perceived ethnic discrimination predicted
hostility, aggressive behavior, and depressive symptoms among ethnic minorities. Chou,
Asnaani, and Hofmann (2012) found that perceived discrimination predicted panic disorder,
agoraphobia, and posttraumatic stress disorder among African-Americans. Perceived
discrimination also predicted panic disorder, agoraphobia, and major depressive disorder among
Latinos. Craig and Smith (2011) found that perceived discrimination among LGBT youth,
perceived discrimination among obese men and women, stating that this population was more at
risk for depression and low self-esteem. Wang, Leu, and Shoda (2011) found that perceived
discrimination predicted emotional distress among Asian-Americans. This type of research,
while helpful in understanding the negative effects of perceived discrimination, offers little
understanding of the possible factors that could predict the perception of discrimination.

**Group differences in perceiving discrimination.** The second prominent line of
investigation from the body of literature on perceived discrimination has been to make
comparisons of one or more groups that are traditionally subordinated in some respect to another
group that is privileged, and measure these respective groups’ differences in the perception of a
particular type of discrimination (Blodorn, O’Brien, & Kordys, 2012; Borders & Liang, 2011; Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, & Taylor, 2002). Craig and Richeson (2011) found that perceived discrimination toward one’s ethnic minority group might be positively associated with feelings of closeness and common fate with another ethnic minority group. For example, in their study after being primed with discrimination, Asian-Americans participants reported higher feelings of similarity and higher positive attitudes toward African-Americans, than the Asian-American participants that were not primed with discrimination.

Research investigations linking perceived discrimination and negative health outcomes have offered little insight into what could predict perceived discrimination. However, the research investigations of group differences have offered evidence that people from different racial and ethnic backgrounds perceive discrimination in different ways. Modest efforts made have been made to investigate thoroughly the predictors of perceived discrimination and the contexts that influence the perception of discrimination as well.

**Sociocultural and attributional theoretical models.** The third and least explored avenue of research on perceived discrimination involves using explanatory models of perceived discrimination (Inman and Baron, 1996; Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998). Among the research investigations that use a model to explain what predicts the perception of discrimination, there are two main theoretical perspectives: The sociocultural perspective and the attributional perspective.

**Sociocultural Perspective.** The sociocultural model is a theoretical perspective that asserts personal characteristics such as race, ethnicity, gender, etc. could predict perceived discrimination (Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney, et al. 1998). Demographic factors such as gender, ethnicity, age and place of birth are a few examples of the characteristics that
could predict discriminatory perceptions. For example, Phinney et al. (1998) found an indirect link between the birthplace of their participants and the perception of being discriminated against.

**Attributional Perspective.** The other model is the *attributional perspective*, which emphasizes the participants’ relatively stable psychological characteristics in relation to perceived discrimination. Example of these characteristics are self-esteem, mastery (or sense of control), or depression/anxiety (Inman and Baron, 1996; Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney et al., 1998). For example, based on this perspective, mastery would have a negative relationship with perceived discrimination. Another important component of this perspective involves prototypical culturally influenced beliefs that allow the perceiver to make assessments on potential discriminatory events. An example of a prototypical culturally influenced belief would be the common belief that women are not capable of excelling in mathematics. This belief is not innate but rather learned and reinforced through societal norms.

Another example of an attributional component with respect to the perception of discrimination is intentionality. Intentionality is the degree which a person believes a discriminatory act to be deliberate or purposeful. Intentionality is determined in part by how explicit the discriminatory act is; it is also influenced by personal bias and previous experiences with discrimination. The likelihood of perceiving discrimination goes up when the perceiver views a particular act as intentional (Blodorn, O’Brien, & Kordys, 2011; Phinney et al., 1998). This construct is investigated and will be discussed further in the present study.

**Historical Social Hierarchies and Discrimination**

Social identities often serve as markers for the way people may perceive discrimination against them (Deaux, 2001). Most research concerning perceived discrimination has focused on
single identities or group memberships such as race/ethnicity or gender, because these are the primary and most visible identities that have historically served, and currently serve, as the basis for discrimination. In many cases, these identities serve as the most tangible reason for the perception of personal discrimination (Robinson, 1999; Settles, 2006). There have been a number references by researchers to “social location” or social hierarchy, in further exploring the concept of discrimination, which are tied to social identities. Robinson (1999) asserts that identities are visible, have personal value, are ranked, and hierarchical. For example, in most societies, being a woman is less valuable than being a man. A woman is relatively easy to distinguish from a man. Because of this, it can be easy to think of sociocultural norms that are usually applied to women, that can include being too emotional, weak, or less intelligent.

Robinson further argued that those who deviate from the preferred standard are often devalued in some respect and more susceptible to occurrences of discrimination. This standard is not only reinforced by cultural norms, but also by traditional and historical precedent. This experience is not unique to the United States. These social hierarchies based on group prejudices and historical social inequalities are the norm for societies around the world.

Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle (1994), explored the theory of Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). SDO is the degree of preference for social inequality. This theory provided some explanation why societies uniformly have culturally enforced hierarchy and social inequalities. For example, among an ethnically diverse sample of college students in the study, the authors found that the men in the sample scored relatively high in SDO and were more likely than women to endorse beliefs that maintained gender inequality. Women scored relatively lower in SDO and were more likely to endorse beliefs that seek to bolster gender equality. The authors also asserted that those who have a high SDO also have high levels of identifying with their “in-
group.” These individuals tend to keep their in-group in power though means of discrimination against others on the institutional and individual levels. Because these types of discrimination reinforce on another, it makes the social hierarchies hard to challenge.

It is perhaps because of this notion, that members of historically subordinated groups are more likely to perceive discrimination against their own social groups. For example, in comparison to White men, Kobrynowicz and Branscombe (1997) found that a sample of White women—a group subordinated by gender—tend to have greater perceptions of discrimination both on a personal level and on the group level. Similarly, in comparison to a sample of White participants Major, Quinton, and McCoy, (2002) found that African-Americans tend to have greater perceptions discrimination against themselves and their social group. These researchers speculate that this may be because there is a socio-historical precedent of both women and people of color being discriminated against on the individual and institutional levels.

There is also some evidence that members of groups that are subordinated may recognize discrimination against members of other traditionally subordinated groups whose membership they do not hold (Inman and Baron, 1996; Martin, Reynolds, & Keith, 2002; Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz & Owen, 2002). For example, Martin, Reynolds & Keith, (2002) found among a sample of attorneys that African-American men are more likely than White women to recognize gender bias toward women than White men. Craig, DeHart, Richeson, and Fiedorowicz (2012) found that White women who were primed with sexism had less anti-minority bias in comparison to a similar group of White women that were not primed.

**Perceived Individual and Institutional Discrimination**

Perceived discrimination does not only occur on a person-to-person basis. Institutions have the capacity to engage in structural discrimination as well. Institutional discrimination
refers to the “organizational practices or policies that subordinate a given group of people” (O’Brien, et al., 2009; Jones, Dovidio & Vietze, 2013, in press.). Perceived institutional discrimination is a relatively new construct that has only been recently explored (Blodorn, O’Brien, & Kordys, 2011; O’Brien et al., 2009). According to O’Brien and colleagues (2009), people are less likely to perceive institutional forms of discrimination than individual forms of discrimination. This could be likely due to the ambiguity of intent behind policies or practices that discriminate against others. Previous research investigations included comparisons of both individual and institutional perceived discrimination. These studies have primarily sampled historically privileged groups -- i.e. White college students. There is scant literature that demonstrates that this construct has been researched among those who belong to historically subordinated groups.

Differences in How Discrimination is Perceived

In a descriptive study, Levin, Sinclair, Veniegas, & Taylor (2002) investigated the possible “joint impact” that ethnicity and gender could have on the expectations of discrimination. The authors hypothesized that expectations of discrimination would be strongly linked with perceptions of sexism among White women. The authors also hypothesized that between African-American women and Latinas, expectations of general discrimination would be linked to perceptions of ethnic discrimination.

The sample consisted of 248 White, 179 African-American and 260 Latino participants (55% of the African Americans, 52% of the Latinos, and 54% of the Whites were women.). The participants were questioned about both perceived sexism and perceived racial discrimination on the personal and group levels. Participants were asked two questions to measure general discrimination: “To what extent will prejudice and discrimination against you impose barriers to
your future outcomes?” and “To what extent will prejudice and discrimination against others like you impose barriers to their future outcomes?” These questions were designed to capture personal and group general discrimination respectively. Similar items were used to measure perceived sexism and perceived ethnic discrimination. Both a two-way ANOVA and a regression analysis were used on their dataset.

The authors found that women perceived more gender discrimination than men both personally and for their groups $F(1, 674) = 241.68, p < .001$ and $F(1, 674) = 509.13, p < .001$. African–Americans perceived the greatest ethnic discrimination, with Latinos and Whites following $F(2, 669) = 149.18, p < .001$ and $F(2, 671) = 329.05, p < .001$ for personal and group discrimination respectively. A significant interaction was also found between gender and ethnicity for general discrimination on the group level $F(2, 673) = 5.73, p < .01$. The researchers also found that that White women expected more personal general discrimination than did White men $F(1, 673) = 20.22, p < .001$, but that male and female African Americans and male and female Latinos expected similar levels of personal general discrimination $F(1, 673), p < 1$ and $F(1, 673) = 1.42, p > .05$ respectively.

A regression analysis further supported the hypotheses posited by Levin and her colleagues. It was found that perceived gender discrimination explained a significant portion of the variance in expectations of general discrimination for White women in the sample. Perceived ethnic discrimination explained a significant portion the variance in general discrimination for African-American and Latina women. This research captured the importance that sociocultural factors such as ethnicity and gender may have on the perceptions of discrimination, further supporting the conception of a historical social hierarchy. One of the main drawbacks of the study is that the items designed to measure the three different types of perceived discrimination
on two levels (personal and group) lacked comprehensiveness and did not give a more complete understanding how discrimination is perceived.

Inman and Baron (1996) examined the impact of cultural stereotypes and sociocultural factors on the perception of both racial discrimination and sexism. Alluding to the earlier referenced concept of a social hierarchy dominated by race and gender, the authors asserted that perceived discrimination could be influenced by “specific expectations regarding who are the prototypic perpetrators and victims of prejudice.” They hypothesized that prototypic situations, would be more likely to be labeled as an act of discrimination than a non-typical discriminatory event. For example, with respect to perceived sexism, men and women alike are less likely to perceive sexism in a situation where the woman was the perpetrator in the discriminatory event and the man was the victim, than if those roles were reversed. Inman and Baron also made a similar hypothesis regarding perceived ethnic discrimination, a scenario involving a White perpetrator and a Black victim would more likely be label as a discriminatory event than an event involving a White perpetrator and a White victim.

The first of two studies examining these hypotheses tackled perceived ethnic discrimination. Using White and African-American players, the authors developed 15 small vignettes, eight that covered each permutation of discriminatory events twice, and 7 benign “filler” stories that showed the least amount of discrimination. All of the characters in each story were men. 93 White and 23 African-American participants (N = 119) were recruited and were asked for their impression on a short stories of “interpersonal interactions.” They were instructed to read over each of the 15 vignettes and then were asked to indicate two or three of the strongest personal traits exhibited by the perpetrator in the story.
In each case, the perpetrator’s names were spelled in capital letters. Pictures from an old college yearbook were used to manipulate the perpetrator and victim’s race. The follow-up to the first open-ended question was having the participant rate on a 7-point scale that ranged from *slightly displayed* (1) to *extremely displayed* (7), the degree to which the perpetrator displayed the listed traits. Traits were coded by two independent raters as 1, indicating perceived discrimination, or 0, failing to perceive the perpetrator as racial biased. According to a modified version of Cohen's kappa Inter-rater agreement, was 87% ($K = .87$).

The data were analyzed using a 2 (perpetrator race) X 2 (victim race) X 2 (participant gender) X 2 (participant race) between-subjects ANOVA). The analysis of variance was conducted each of the stories seen as prejudiced for the four replications (B/W, W/B, B/B, W/W). The findings from the study showed that the discriminatory events involving the prototypic perpetrators (White perpetrator, black victim) were found to be the most significant. However, discriminatory events involving a black perpetrator and White victim were more likely to be labeled as discriminatory by White participants than by African-American participants. Other notable findings were related to the participant variables African-American participants were more like to label discriminatory events involving race as more discriminatory than White participants; women participants were more also likely to perceive an event as discriminatory than the participants who were men.

Inman and Baron took a similar approach in seeking to understand what influences the perception of sexism. Sixty-two (24 men and 38 women) students were recruited for participation in this study. Like the previous study, participants were asked to read 19 vignettes and write down two or three of the "*strongest qualities or traits exhibited by the actor in (that)*
episode" participants afterwards were asked to rate the degree to which the actor displayed that behavior on a 7-point scale ranging from “slightly displayed” to “extremely displayed.”

Six of the 19 stories described actions demeaning women (three with a male perpetrator and three with a female perpetrator). Six of the stories described actions demeaning men (three with a female perpetrator and three with a male perpetrator). Seven stories were “filler” stories that displayed minimal instances of sexism. Two independent raters were instructed to give each critical story a one if they thought the participant perceived discrimination. The raters were blind to perpetrator gender. If the participant did not perceive any discrimination, the raters were instructed to give him or her a zero. A reliability check showed that there was agreement between the coder on their ratings. Inter-rater agreement, was 94%, using Cohen's kappa, ($K = .94$). Four 2 (perpetrator gender) X 2 (participant gender) ANOVAs were conducted on the number of critical stories surprisingly showed no gender main effects. The author concluded that sociocultural characteristics of the participants, the perpetrator of the discriminatory event and the victim determined the perception of discrimination.

The above studies provide evidence that the socio-cultural characteristics of the participants could have a direct or indirect impact of the perceptions of discrimination. Cultural stereotypes have served to reinforce these perceptions. Lastly, those who identify with a group that is lower on the historical social hierarchy are more likely to perceive discrimination than those who do not belong to such groups.

Factors That Explain Perceived Discrimination

Among the few research investigations that attempted to construct an explanatory model of perceived discrimination, Kobrynowicz and Branscombe (1997) sought to find predictors of perceived sexism, choosing to explore these predictors through the attributional perspective. The
Sociocultural Predictors of Perceived Sexism

Authors hypothesized that variables such as self-esteem, need for approval, personal assertiveness, depression, and feminist ideology could predict the perception of personal and group gender discrimination for men and women. Two hundred ninety-five White undergraduates (138 women, 157 men) were recruited. To assess perceived gender discrimination on the personal level, participants were asked to indicate on an eight-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) a response to two items: “I feel like I am personally a victim of society because of my gender” and “I have personally been a victim of sexual discrimination.” Reliability $\alpha = .76$. To assess perception of discrimination against their respective genders, participants were asked to indicate on the eight-point Likert scale a response to the following items (for the women participants ‘women’ was in place of ‘men’ in each item) “Men as a group have been victimized by society” “Men have been systematically prevented from attaining their full potential” Reliability $\alpha = .61$). Participant completed then completed measures for self-esteem ($\alpha = .79$), attitude toward feminism ($\alpha = .87$), need for social approval, (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), depression ($\alpha = .82$), and happiness ($\alpha = .72$). All of the items in each of the measures were reverse-scored so that high scores indicated a higher degree of each construct.

An analysis of variance was conducted to assess gender differences between the men and women participants in how they perceive discrimination. There was no difference in the men and women participants’ perception of discrimination against women in general $F < 1$. In addition, men perceived more discrimination against men than women perceived against men $F (1, 299) = 5.10, p < .03$. A regression analysis was used to assess which predictor accounted for a significant part of the variance. For men only personal assertiveness and self-esteem predicted personal discrimination. Personal assertiveness was positively related to perceptions of discrimination in men, $t (1, 150) = 3.46, p < .0007$. Self-esteem was negatively correlated to
perceptions of personal discrimination in men $t(1, 150) = 3.26, p < .002$. For women, a need for approval accounted for a significant amount of variance in women’s perceptions of personal discrimination $t(1,131) = -3.09, p < .003$. Men with low self-esteem were more likely to believe that men as a group are victims of gender discrimination than are men with high self-esteem. The authors also found that men who are more feminist perceive greater amounts of discrimination against women than less feminist men. The results of this study suggested again, that while participant variables do factor in the perception of discrimination, personality (attributitional) characters play a key role as well.

Phinney and colleagues (1998) also developed an explanatory model of perceived discrimination using both attributional and sociocultural factors to predict the perception of discrimination. They hypothesized that ‘positive’ attributional factors such as a sense of mastery, a positive evaluation of oneself, intergroup competence, and a secure ethnic identity would predict lower levels of perceived discrimination. These researchers also hypothesized that ‘negative’ attributional factors such as depression and anxiety were expected to predict higher levels of perceived discrimination. The authors made no prediction involving sociocultural factors, choosing to focus primarily on personality characteristics. However, they did include ethnicity, birthplace (U.S. or Foreign-born), and socioeconomic status as sociocultural factors which could influence perceived discrimination. The authors recruited a sample of 59 Mexican-American, 50 Armenian, and 55 Vietnamese adolescent participants (60 men and 104 women, $N = 164$) from randomly selected public high schools to determine the impact of attributional factors on the perception of discrimination. Parents were administered questionnaires that measured perceived discrimination, mastery, self-esteem, depression, intergroup competence, and ethnic identity. They were also asked to indicate their ethnicity, their birthplace (U.S. or
foreign), and highest level of education completed on a seven-point scale from 1 = Some Elementary School to 7 = Graduate Education. The highest educational level of either parent was used as a proxy for SES.

Among the adolescents, a questionnaire consisting of seven total items was developed to measure perceived discrimination, three items to assess the frequency of perceived ethnic discrimination perpetrated by peers, teachers, and other authority figures, and four items to assess feeling unaccepted in society because of ethnic background. These items were answered on a five point Likert scale (1 = almost never to 5 = very often). The reliability of this measure was $\alpha = .81$. The participants were also given the following: A six-item mastery scale that measures the degree to which individuals feel a sense of mastery or control of their lives ($\alpha = .71$). Self-esteem was measured with a 10-item self-esteem inventory ($\alpha = .82$). A depression anxiety scale consisting of 30 questions measuring depression, anxiety, and somatic symptoms ($\alpha = .96$). Intergroup competence was measured using a three-item scale. It assesses how easy or difficult it is for the adolescent to socialize with people who are not of the same ethnic background ($\alpha = .90$). Ethnic identity was assessed using a four-item scale ($\alpha = .86$). The adolescents reported their ethnicity and that of their parents, their age, gender, and place of birth (U.S. or foreign-born). The data were then analyzed using multiple regressions.

The authors found that perceived discrimination was significantly related to intergroup competence and depression/anxiety only. The other variables of interest (mastery, self-esteem, ethnic identity) were interrelated. Gender, place of birth, and SES were found to be unrelated to perceived discrimination. The authors then developed a causal model of the factors that contribute to individual differences in perceived discrimination. Using a path analysis, they found two paths that led to perceptions of discrimination in their sample. Sociocultural factors
like SES and place of birth predicted intergroup competence, which in turn predicted the perception of discrimination. The participants in the sample who a higher socioeconomic status and were born in the United States predicted high intergroup competence which in turn led to lower perceptions of discrimination. The results of this research suggested that sociocultural factors did not have a direct impact on perceptions of discrimination. Instead, intergroup competence, which is an attributional variable, moderated the effects of birthplace on perceived discrimination. Intergroup competence also moderated the effects of socioeconomic status on perceived discrimination. It is unclear why sociocultural factors did not predict perceived discrimination. Further studies suggested by the authors included identifying factors that could influence perceived discrimination in alternative settings (i.e. employment or recreational).

**Perceived Institutional Discrimination**

In a longitudinal study, O’Brien et al. (2009) examined White Americans’ perceptions of discrimination in Hurricane Katrina-related events and how these perceptions developed over a period of time. This research also shed some light on the relatively new construct of perceived institutional discrimination, making a distinction between discrimination perpetrated by an individual person, or on an institutional level. The study’s primary purpose was to investigate whether White Americans conceptualized racial discrimination in terms of individual conduct instead of “*established laws, customs, and practices, which systematically reflect and produce racial inequalities in American society*” (Jones et al., 2013 in press).

The authors hypothesized that meritocratic cores beliefs, which emphasize that any person regardless of individual circumstance, or group membership, can prosper if that person works hard enough to achieve their goals directly influences the perceptions of institutional discrimination among White Americans. The very concept of institutional discrimination
threatens these meritocratic beliefs; because this type of discrimination suggests that extrinsic, systemic factors can negatively affect the aspirations of people who hold membership of historically subordinated groups. Because meritocratic beliefs may reduce the likelihood of perceiving institutionalized forms of discrimination, the authors posited the degree with which White Americans perceive post-Katrina related events as discrimination would be reduced.

Fifty-two White Tulane students were recruited for the study in exchange for extra credit in a psychology course. Seventy-five percent of participants were women. The authors chose a sample of students returning to Tulane University shortly after the reopening of Tulane University following Hurricane Katrina in January 2006. Participants completed a packet containing the dependent measures in early February 2006. Participants completed the packet ten weeks later for a second time. The researchers counterbalanced the measure across participants. Each of the participants was given the following measures: An eight-item scale that assessed meritocracy beliefs (Major et al., 2007). The range of scores was from zero to six with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of meritocracy beliefs. (Time 1 $\alpha = .86$, Time 2 $\alpha = .83$). A four-item private regard subscale from Luhtanen and Crocker’s Collective Self-Esteem Scale (1992) used to assess American private regard. Private regard refers to in this case, the extent to which a person feels positively or negatively toward African-Americans. The range of scores was from 0 to 6 with higher scores indicating higher levels of private regard. (Time 1 $\alpha = .90$, Time 2 $\alpha = .91$). An adapted version of the four-item identity centrality subscale from the Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) collective self-esteem scale assessed the importance of American nationality to the self-concept. The possible range of scores was from 0 to 6 with higher scores indicating higher levels of identity. The measure showed acceptable reliability (Time 1 $\alpha = .86$, Time 2 $\alpha = .83$).
Perceived discrimination was measured in two ways. For the first measure, Participants were provided with definitions of both individual and institutional racism. Individual racism was defined as “An individual’s prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior toward people of a given race.” (Myers, 2005, p. 334). Institutional racism was defined as “Institutional practices, which are not necessarily motivated by prejudice, that subordinate people of given race.” (Myers, 2005, p. 334). These definitions of racism were taken from a social psychology textbook (Myers, 2005). Each definition was placed on the opposite end of a 154-millimeter continuum. Participants were asked to indicate with an “X” on the continuum to show which definition is closest to what they believed racism is. The second measure of perceived discrimination had six items that assessed perceived racism in Katrina-related events. These items were developed from claims of racism that were made in the media in the immediate aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Example: “The U.S. Federal Government’s slow response to New Orleans residents during the Katrina disaster, media descriptions of White Americans as ‘finding’ food while Black Americans were labeled ‘looting.’” After reading each item, participants were instructed to indicate on a 7-point, Likert-type scale the extent to which they personally believed that racism played a role in each event. The range of scores was from 0 to 6 with higher scores indicating greater perceived racism. The measure showed acceptable internal consistency reliability (Time 1 Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$, Time 2 $\alpha = .81$).

A $t$-test showed that perceived racism in Katrina-related events decreased over the ten-week period. None of the other measures significantly changed during this time-period. A $t$-test conducted on the participants’ response to the bi-polar continuum with the definitions of individual and institutional racism, showed that there was a preference for the individualistic conceptual definition of racism. This preference did not change over time. In order to investigate
whether meritocratic beliefs influenced people to adopt an individualistic conception of racism, a regression analysis was conducted in which conceptions of racism from time 2 were regressed on the conceptions of racism from Time 1, meritocracy beliefs from Time 1 and all other predictor variables from Time 1. Consistent with the hypothesis meritocratic beliefs predicted individualistic beliefs about racism in the sample. The authors also found that the more participants preferred an individualistic conception of racism, the less racism they perceived in Katrina-related events 10 weeks later.

One of the limitations of this research is that a one item, bi-polar measure was used to assess perceived racism, requiring participants to choose between the two constructs. A measure with multiple items to assess both individual and institutional forms of discrimination would be more reliable. Further discussion from the authors also argues that the endorsement of the concept of individual racism may relate to agency. It is easier to ascribe negative intention from a prejudiced individual engaging in discrimination; it is more difficult to ascertain discrimination that originates from institutions and systemic practices.

**Individual and institutional sexism.** Blodorn, et al. (2012) continued the exploration of individual and institutional forms of discrimination with research that investigated perceived sexism. The authors wanted to examine possible gender differences in the perception of both individual and institutional sexism. In order to accomplish this, they designed a multi-item measure to describe examples of individual and institutional sexism. They hypothesized that there would be a gender difference in the perception of sexism, with more women perceiving sexism than men. They also hypothesized that there would be a greater gender difference in the perception of institutional sexism, with more women perceiving institutionalized forms of sexism than men.
The first of two studies that tested these hypotheses recruited 247 people (93 men, 154 women) who participated through Amazon.com’s Mechanical Turk website. Mechanical Turk is a web-based platform that is used for recruiting people to perform tasks. This platform has been used by other social scientists as an alternative source for a convenience sample. The website is relatively inexpensive in terms of the cost of subjects; the cost range per respondent for researched can range from .50 to .55 cents (Berinsky, Huber & Lenz, 2012). Participants were required to have been born in the United States and to have completed high school in order to be included in the sample. The majority of the sample identified as White (194 = White, 14 = Asian or Asian American, 9 = Black or African American, 4 = Native American or Indigenous Nation, 7 = Latino, 19 = other/did not report). According to the authors, including ethnicity as a covariate did not change the interpretation of the results. Therefore, ethnicity is not discussed further in either of the two studies, though it is unclear exactly how ethnicity was factored in the analysis.

The authors adapted nineteen items to assess perceived sexism in the real world. Eleven items were examples of individual sexism. Eight items were examples of institutional sexism (e.g., “Police protective wear was made to fit men, resulting in uncomfortable and less safe protective wear for women”). On a scale of 1 (definitely not an example of sexism) to 7 (definitely an example of sexism), Participants were asked to show the degree to which they believed sexism was responsible in each example. A maximum likelihood factor analysis was conducted and as a result, three of the individual items and two of the institutional items were taken out of the preliminary measure. The measures of individual and institutional perceptions of sexism were found to be reliable (Individual $\alpha = .81$, Institutional, $\alpha = .81$). A correlational analysis provided evidence that perceived individual discrimination and perceived institutional discrimination are two related but distinct constructs ($r = .44$, $p < .001$). A repeated measures
analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted, with type of sexism (individual, institutional) as the within-subjects variable and gender as the between-subjects variable. The analysis showed a significant effect for type of sexism; perceptions of individual sexism were greater than perceptions of institutional sexism in the sample. There was also a significant effect for gender and a significant interaction between type of sexism and gender. As hypothesized, perceptions of both individual sexism and institutional sexism were greater among women than women.

For the second study, the authors sought to validate their newly developed measure further in a more controlled environment, while also including an attributional factor--intentionality. Eight-nine undergraduate students (21 men, 68 women) enrolled in psychology courses at Tulane University were recruited to participate. Participants were required to have been born in the United States in order to participate. The majority of the participants in the sample identified as White (78 = White, 6 = Black or African American, 2 = Asian or Asian American, 1 = Latino, 2 = other).

Participants were asked to rate each of the fourteen examples of sexism from the first study on both institutionally and intentionality. The composites for institutionality (individual examples: $\alpha = .78$, institutional examples $\alpha = .72$) and intentionality (individual examples: $\alpha = .62$, institutional examples: $\alpha = .74$) were reliable (Blodorn et al. 2012). A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with type of sexism (individual, institutional) as the within-subjects variable and gender as a between-subjects variable. There was a significant effect of type of perceived sexism; participants saw a difference between the individual and institutional examples. The effect of gender on ratings of institutional sexism was not significant. There was however, a significant interaction between type of sexism and gender. Women in the sample gave higher institutional ratings than men in the sample. A repeated measures ANOVA for
intentionality ratings showed that examples of individual sexism were rated as more intentional than examples of institutional sexism; women rated the examples as more intentional than men.

The research done by Blodorn et al. (2012) was among the first to illuminate the clear distinction between individual and institutional gender-based discrimination. The study also provided evidence for differences in how men and women perceive sexism on an institutionalized level. One of the drawbacks of this report, however, was that the majority of the participants in the study were White and born in the United States, providing limited generalizability, but also providing an opportunity to further explore the concepts of individual and institutional sexism with another population.
Summation of Literature Review

Previous research has mainly investigated perceived discrimination in three ways: The first way it has been studied has been as a predictor variable of a health-related outcome. Past research has demonstrated that perceived personal discrimination is a reliable predictor of negative mental health outcomes or poor school performance among adolescents (Borders and Liang, 2011; Chou et al., 2012; Craig & Smith, 2011; Hannson et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2011). The second line of investigation has been to compare one group that is privileged in one respect to another group that is not privileged. In this research, perception of a particular type of discrimination is measured and compared for these two groups (Blodorn et al., 2012; Craig & Richeson, 2011; Levin et al., 2002). Research has shown that members of groups that are subordinated often recognize discrimination against members of other traditionally subordinated groups whose membership they do not hold. The third and least used avenue of research uses an explanatory model of perceived discrimination (Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998).

Predictors: attributional vs. socio-cultural factors. Among the researchers that used a model to explain perceived discrimination, there are two theoretical perspectives. One is the socio-cultural perspective, which focuses on participant characteristics or demographics such as race, ethnicity, gender, etc. that predict perceived discrimination. Those who hold membership to social groups who are traditionally underprivileged are usually surveyed using this perspective. The other theory is the attributional perspective, which emphases the participants’ psychological characteristics in relation to perceived discrimination. Example of these characteristics are self-esteem, mastery (or sense of control), or depression/anxiety (Inman and Baron, 1996;
Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998). Both perspectives are important in determining what predicts one’s perception of discrimination.

**Perceived individual & institutional discrimination.** Perceived institutional discrimination is a relatively new construct that needs further examination (Blodorn, et al. 2012; O’Brien et al., 2009). According to O’Brien and colleagues, (2009) people are less likely to perceive institutional forms of discrimination than individual forms of discrimination. Previous investigations included comparisons of both individual and institutional perceived discrimination. These studies have primarily sampled historically privileged groups -- i.e. White college students.

**Rationale for Study**

Few studies investigate predictors of most forms of perceived discrimination, including perceived individual and institutional sexism (Blodorn et al., 2012; Inman and Baron, 1996; Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998). There is a dearth of literature that investigates perceived institutional sexism as a distinct construct from perceived individual sexism (Blodorn et al., 2012).

There is a lack of research that explores perceptions of sexism among ethnic minorities. Research has suggested that perceptions of gender-based discrimination could differ between racial/ethnic groups that are privileged and groups that are historically subordinate (Levin et al., 2002; Martin, Reynolds, & Keith, 2002). There is little evidence in the literature that the relatively new construct of perceived institutional sexism has been widely researched among those who belong to traditionally subordinated groups.
The present study. The present study addressed this gap in the literature and examined the reliability of the measure of perceived sexism developed by Blodorn, et al. (2012). This study observed perceptions of sexism among a population not previously sampled—urban college students. The main purpose of this research was to explore some of the sociocultural variables that could influence perceived individual sexism and institutional sexism. These variables include ethnicity, gender, citizenship; time lived in the United States, and participant parents’ native-born status. The study addressed the scarcity in research on perceived sexism on an institutionalized level. It addressed the scarcity of research sampling ethnic minorities with respect to perceived sexism.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1: Is participant ethnicity a significant predictor of individual sexism?

Hypothesis 1.1: Participants who are ethnicity minorities will predict individual sexism.

Hypothesis 1.2: Participant native-born status is a significant predictor individual sexism.

Hypothesis 1.3: Years lived in the United States is a significant predictor of individual sexism.

Hypothesis 1.4: The native-born status of the participant’s parents is a significant predictor of individual sexism.

Research Question 2: Is participant ethnicity a significant predictor of the perception of institutional sexism?

Hypothesis 2.1: Participants who are ethnic minorities will predict institutional sexism.

Hypothesis 2.2: Participant native-born status is a significant predictor institutional sexism.

Hypothesis 2.3: Years lived in the United States is a significant predictor of institutional sexism.

Hypothesis 2.4: The native-born status of the participant’s parents is a significant predictor of institutional sexism.
Research Question 3: Is participant gender a significant predictor of the perception of individual sexism?

Hypothesis 3.1: Women participants will predict the perception of individual sexism.

Research Question 4: Is participant gender a significant predictor of the perception of institutional sexism?

Hypothesis 4.1: Women participants will predict the perception of institutional sexism.

Research Question 5: Is the participants’ view of intentionality a significant predictor of the perception of individual sexism?

Hypothesis 5.1: The participants’ view of intentionality is a significant predictor of the perception of individual sexism.

Research Question 6: Is there a relationship between the historical social hierarchy designation and the viewing of sexist acts as intentional?

Hypothesis 6.1: There is a relationship between the historical social hierarchy designation and the viewing of sexist acts as intentional?
Methods

Participant Recruitment

There were two different samples used in this study: A sample of undergraduates and a sample of college graduates. The participants were recruited in two ways. First, student participants were selected through a subject pool from an urban college enrolled in undergraduate level introductory psychology courses. In 2013, the undergraduate student ethnic makeup was as follows: American Indian/Native Alaskan .1%, Asian and Pacific Islander 24.1%, Black (non-Hispanic) 19.3% Hispanic 30.9%, Non-Resident Aliens 7.3%, and White (non-Hispanic) 18.4 % (City Facts, 2013). The other way that participants were recruited is by snowball sampling through public web postings on Facebook. The posts had a description of the study, contact information, and a link that lead directly to the online survey. The participants were invited to share the link to the survey with other friends on Facebook. Most of the participants recruited from the Facebook sample were college graduates. The Facebook recruits were to be used as a comparison sample to the subject pool participants.

An online a-priori sample size calculator was used to determine the sample size (Soper, 2012). This program was designed to calculate the minimum required sample size for a study that may require a multiple regression analysis. The anticipated effect size ($f^2$) plugged in the formula was .15. The statistical power level was set at .8. The number of predictors plugged in the a-priori formula was 6 (participant ethnicity, participant gender, native-born status, years living in United States, parents' native-born status, and participant view of intentionality). The power analysis showed that a minimum sample of 97 was required. This analysis determined the minimum number of participants that were to be recruited.
Measures and Materials

Perceptions of sexism. Perceptions of sexism were assessed by using the measure developed by Blodorn, O’Brien and Kordys, (2012). There are 14 items in the measure. Eight items assess individual sexism and six items assess institutional sexism. The items in the survey were randomized. Participants were asked to rate examples of sexism based on both institutionality and intentionality. In order to assess whether an example of sexism was individual or institutional in nature, participants were asked after each item to indicate on a seven point bipolar scale (1 = definitely individual, 4 = neither individual nor institutional, and 7 = definitely institutional), which type of sexism was being perpetrated in the example. Intentionality was also assessed in the measure after each item on a seven point bipolar scale (1 = extremely unintentional, 4 = not sure, and 7 = extremely intentional). The measure was implemented using the web-based survey program Survey Monkey.

An example of an item assessing individual sexism is “A man refuses to let a female valet park his expensive car.” An example of an item assessing institutional sexism is “Female professional athletes make less money than male professional athletes.” The authors of this measure constructed two composite variables for institutionality and intentionality. The alphas for the individual and institutional items for institutionality were $\alpha = .78$ and $\alpha = .72$ respectively. For intentionality, the alphas for individual and institutional items were $\alpha = .62$ and $\alpha = .74$ respectively.

Historical social hierarchy designation. Historical social hierarchy designation was assessed by a demographic survey that asks the participant to self-report their ethnicity, gender, native-born status, years living in the United States, the native-born status of their parents.
Procedure

In order to recruit the undergraduate participants, flyers detailing information about how to access the study were posted in communal areas of the main academic building of the urban college. Because the survey was administered online, participants who did not have access to a computer connected to the internet were excluded from the study. Because the survey is written in English and was to be administered in English, participants who did not speak and/or understand English were also excluded from the study. The study was accessed through the school’s subject pool website. Participants recruited from the college’s subject pool were required to login in order to receive class credit for participating in the study. A brief description of the study was posted on the available studies list. After the participants signed up, the URL of the web-based survey was made available to them. The subject pool website assigned a unique code to each student that was used only for issuing class credit. The same code was recognized by Survey Monkey in the results section to ensure that proper credit was issued. Each student was given class credit for their participation when they completed the survey.

For the participants recruited through Facebook, brief online posts about the study were publicly posted on Facebook. The posts had a description of the study, contact information, and a link that lead directly to the online survey. The participants were invited to share the link to the survey with other friends on Facebook. The participants who signed up through Facebook did not receive any type of compensation for taking the survey.

Each of the participants was shown a webpage that displayed a consent form informing them that they can able to stop at any time, or not participate without penalty. They were also given contact information if they chose to follow-up on the study’s results. After giving consent, the participants were presented with the definition of individual and institutional sexism for
review. Participants read definitions of both individual and institutional sexism, and then proceeded with the Individual and Institutional Perception of Sexism measure by Blodorn et al. (2012). The items of the perceived sexism measure were presented in random order. After completing the sexism measure, the participants were asked to complete the demographic measure. After completing the survey rating examples of sexism, and demographic questions, the participants submitted their answers. After the data were collected, each scale was exported from Survey Monkey and aggregated. No pieces of identifiable information were collected. Any IP address associated with the survey was deleted. The data were analyzed using version 22.0 of the IBM SPSS software package.

Results

An item analysis with Cronbach’s alpha was conducted, in order to determine the reliability of the perceived sexism measure. Analyses were also conducted to investigate inter-correlations among the two sexism variables, the intentionality composite variable of individual sexism and intentionality composite variable of institutional sexism, the demographic- or sociocultural variables. Analyses were then conducted to investigate potential sociocultural predictors of perceived individual sexism and perceived institutional sexism. Lastly, t-tests were used to investigate mean differences and gender differences for individual sexism, institutional sexism, and both intentionality variables.

Descriptive Data

Undergraduate sample. One hundred seventy-seven respondents who were undergraduates enrolled in a psychology class. For the psychology undergraduate sample, 70% of the sample was comprised of women and 30% were men. For ethnicity, the majority of the
respondents are Asian or Pacific Islanders, comprising 35% of the sample. Latinos comprised thirty one percent of the sample. Black participants comprise approximately 16% of the sample. White participants comprised 9% of the sample. Participants that identified with two or more ethnicities comprised approximately 6% of the sample. Lastly, biracial participants comprised approximately 3% of the sample.

The average age of the psychology undergraduate sample is approximately 20.4 years ($SD = 3.44$). Approximately sixty percent of the sample reported that they were born in North America. Almost sixty percent of the psychology undergraduate sample reported that they have lived in the US their entire life. Seventy-eight percent of the sample reported that both parents were born outside of the United States. Table 1 shows the sub-samples and percentages for the above-described data.

A reliability analysis was conducted on each composite for the psychology undergraduate sample. The alphas for the individual and institutional items for institutionality—or type of sexism were $\alpha = .73$ and $\alpha = .79$ respectively. For intentionality, the alphas for individual and institutional items were $\alpha = .84$ and $\alpha = .70$ respectively. Table 2 represents the means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis values for the psychology undergrad sample. Figures 1-4 show the histograms of the distributions all four respective composites. Individual Sexism, Institutional Sexism, and Intentionality (Individual) are all slightly non-normally distributed. Intentionality (Institutional) was normally distributed. The distribution that deviated the most from being normal was Intentionality (Individual) with a skewness of -1.7 ($SE = .183$) and kurtosis of 4.72 ($SE = .366$).
The data were analyzed for outliers after standardizing the values (z-scores). There were two outliers for individual sexism, one outlier for institutional sexism, and two outliers for intentionality-individual.

**College graduate sample.** Thirty-six participants completed the survey through Facebook. Approximately 70% of the participants were women and 30% of the participants were male. For ethnicity, the majority of the participants are White, comprising approximately 64% of the sample. Latinos comprised approximately 14% of the sample. Black participants comprised approximately 11% of the sample. Asians comprised approximately 8% of the sample. Participants identifying with two or more ethnicities comprised approximately 3% of the sample.

The average age of the college graduate sample is approximately 29.7 years ($SD = 6.31$). Eighty-six percent of the sample reported that they were born in North America. Eighty-one percent of the sample reported that they lived in the United States their entire lives. Sixty-four percent of the sample reported that both of their parents were born in the United States. Table 3 shows the sub-samples and percentages for the previously described data.

A reliability analysis was conducted on each composite for the college graduate sample. The alphas for the individual and institutional items for institutionality—or type of sexism were $\alpha = .82$ and $\alpha = .87$ respectively. For intentionality, the alphas for individual and institutional items were $\alpha = .82$ and $\alpha = .77$ respectively. Table 4 represents the means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis values for the college graduate sample. Figures 4-8 represent histogram distributions for Individual Sexism, Institutional Sexism, and Intentionality (Individual), Intentionality (Institutional) respectively.
Table 4 represents the means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis values for the Facebook sample. Figures 4-8 represent histogram distributions for Individual Sexism, Institutional Sexism, and Intentionality (Individual), Intentionality (Institutional) respectively.

Findings

**Psychology undergraduate sample.** Non-parametric correlational analyses were conducted for all of the sociocultural variables, the sexism variables, and the intentionality variables, in order to establish which variable should be tested in a regression analysis. First, a Kendall’s Tau-b correlational analysis was conducted on the four main composites and ethnic groups. Table 5 shows the inter-correlations among the variables. There was a positive correlation between the perception of individual sexism and the intentionality (individual) composite $\tau(176) = .15, p < .01$. There was a positive correlation between the perception of institutional sexism and the intentionality (institutional) composite $\tau(176) = .37, p < .01$. There was a significant positive correlation between black participants and the perception of individual sexism $\tau(176) = .15, p < .05$. There was a significant negative correlation between Asian and Pacific Islander participants and the perception of institutional sexism $\tau(176) = -.13, p < .05$. There was a significant positive correlation between Latino participants and institutional sexism $\tau(176) = .13, p < .05$. A Kendall’s tau-b correlation analysis was also conducted on the four main composites and the other sociocultural variables (Years in the United States, Mother’s native-born status, Father’s native-born status, and Birthplace.) Mother’s native-born status significantly correlated positively with the perception of institutional sexism $\tau(176) = .20, p < .002$. This meant that participants who’s mothers were born outside of the United States were associated with higher perceptions of institutional sexism.
Independent t-tests were conducted, in order to check for gender differences among the four main variables. No differences between men and women were found for either sexism variable or intentionality variable in the sample. Refer to Table 6 for t-values. Paired-sample t-tests were conducted in order to check for mean differences in the rating of both sexism and intentionality composites. There was a significant difference between the intentionality ratings for individual and institutional sexism (Individual $M = 6.11$, SD = .989), (Institutional $M = 4.53$, SD = 1.08), $t (172) = 18.6$, $p < .001$. Examples of individual sexism were rated as more intentional than the examples of institutional sexism. Refer to Table 7 for t-values.

After the association among the variables was established, regression analyses were conducted to determine whether the sociocultural variables predicted either form of sexism. A multiple regression analysis was used to test if intentionality and being a black participant predicted the perception of individual sexism. The results of the regression were not significant ($R^2 = .02$), $F (2, 171) = 1.86$, $p < .10$. A multiple regression analysis was used to test if being a Latino or Asian and Pacific Islander participant predicted the perception of institutional sexism. The results of the regression were not significant ($R^2 = .03$), $F (2,173) = 2.7$, $p < .07$.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to test if intentionality and participants’ mother’s native-born status predicted perceptions of Institutional Sexism. The results of the regression indicated that Mother’s native-born status and Intentionality (Institutional) explained 26% of the variance ($R^2 = .27$), $F (2, 172) = 31.16$, $p < .001$. It was found that the participants’ ratings of intentionality for the institutional sexism item significantly predicted the perception of institutional sexism as did the native-born status of the participants’ mothers (Intentionality, $\beta = .48$, $p < .000$), (Native-born Status $\beta = .19$, $p < .004$). In order to validate the analysis, the
residual plots were inspected. The plots indicated that there was no relationship among the residuals of institutional sexism, intentionality, and mother’s native-born status.

**College graduate sample.** As with the first dataset, in order to establish which variable should be tested in a regression analysis, non-parametric correlational analyses were conducted for all of the sociocultural variables, the sexism variables, and the intentionality variables. A Kendall’s Tau-b correlational analysis was conducted on the four main composites and ethnic groups. There was a positive correlation between individual and institutional sexism \( \tau(36) = .30, p < .04 \). There was a negative correlation between gender and Intentionality (Institutional) \( \tau(36) = -.38, p < .05 \). The analysis showed no other significant correlations among the variables of interest. A linear regression analysis was used to test if gender predicted the intentionality ratings for perceived institutional sexism. It was found that gender predicted Intentionality (Institutional) \( \beta = -.56, t(32) = -2.3, p < .03 \). Gender also explained a significant portion of the variance \( R^2 = .14, F(1, 32) = 5.31, p < .03 \).

In order to check for gender differences among the four main variables independent t-tests were conducted. A t-test showed that women perceived examples of institutional sexism as more intentional than men did (Women \( M = 5.00, SD = 1.00 \), (Men \( M = 4.09, SD = .83 \), \( t(32) = 2.78, p < .01 \). Refer to Table 8 for \( t \)-values. Paired-sample t-tests were conducted in order to check for mean differences in the rating of both sexism and intentionality composites, There was a significant difference between the ratings for individual sexism and institutional sexism (Individual \( M = 1.36, SD = .699 \), (Institutional \( M = 2.88, SD = .415 \), \( t(32) = 5.38, p < .001 \). The scores for institutional sexism were significantly higher than the scores for individual sexism. There was also a significant difference between the intentionality ratings for individual and institutional sexism (Individual \( M = 5.9, SD = .947 \), (Institutional \( M = 4.72, SD = 1.04 \), \( t(32) =
−11.5, \( p < .001 \). Examples of individual sexism were rated as more intentional than the examples of institutional sexism. Refer to Table 9 for \( t \)-values.
Discussion

The main purpose of this research is to explore some of the sociocultural variables that could influence the perception of both individual sexism and institutional sexism. This study was based upon the review of two theoretical perspectives. The first was the sociocultural perspective, which states that personal or demographic characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, birthplace, etc. could predict perceived discrimination (Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney, et al. 1998). In line with this theory, the sociocultural variables investigated in this study were gender, ethnicity, years lived in the United States, the native-born status of the participants and the native-born status of both parents of the participants.

The other theoretical perspective was the attributional perspective. This perspective emphasizes the importance of stable psychological characteristics such as self-esteem or anxiety (Inman and Baron, 1996; Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney et al., 1998). This study used one attributional variable, which was the participants’ rating of how intentional the examples of sexism described for them were, more specifically referred to as intentionality. As previously mentioned in the literature review, intentionality is the degree which a person believes a discriminatory act to be deliberate or purposeful. Intentionality is determined in part by how explicit the discriminatory act is and it is also influenced by personal bias and previous experiences with discrimination. The likelihood of perceiving discrimination goes up when the perceiver views a particular act as intentional (Blodorn, O’Brien, & Kordys, 2011; Phinney et al., 1998).

In the discussion below, there will be the following: (1) A review of the primary research findings. (2) A discussion of the primary research findings. (3) A discussion of the generalizability of the perceived sexism measure developed by Blodorn et al. (2012). (4) A
discussion of the limitations of the present study. (5) Recommendations for future research. (6) A summation and conclusion.

**Review of Primary Research Findings**

**Sociocultural predictors of perceived institutional sexism.** There was one sociocultural variable that predicted the perception of institutional sexism. A parent of a participant who was not born in the United States was one of the designated variables of historical subordination. Results showed that the participants who had mothers that were born outside of the United States predicted perception of institutional sexism. This finding is consistent with what was hypothesized. However, it was also hypothesized that gender, ethnicity, native-born status, time lived in the United States, and the native-born status of the participant’s parents would each predict the perception of institutional sexism. Though a correlational analysis showed that being Latino or Asian/Pacific Islander was associated with perceiving institutional sexism, the results showed that none of the aforementioned variables predicted the perception of institutional sexism.

**Sociocultural predictors of perceived individual sexism.** It was hypothesized that gender, ethnicity, native-born status, time lived in the United States, and the native-born status of the participant’s parents would each predict the perception of individual sexism. Though a correlational analysis showed that there was an association between black participants and the perception of individual sexism, the results showed that none of the aforementioned variables predicted the perception of individual sexism.

**Intentionality as a predictor of perceived sexism.** The results showed that the participants’ view of intentionality was in fact a significant predictor of institutional sexism. This finding was not anticipated in the study, which assumed the null hypothesis, based on Blodorn et
al’s (2012) study. It was also hypothesized that intentionality would be a significant predictor of the perception of individual sexism. The results showed that intentionality did not predict the perception of individual sexism.

It was hypothesized that there would be a relationship between designated variables of historical subordination and the viewing of sexist acts as intentional. From the college graduate sample, results showed that there is a relationship between gender and viewing examples of institutional sexism as intentional. In fact, gender predicted the viewing of the institutional sexism scenarios as intentional. This finding is consistent with what was hypothesized. However, no other variables were shown to be associated with viewing sexist acts as intentional in either sample.

**Discussion of Findings**

**Perceived institutional sexism.** The present study has illuminated factors that can predict the perception of institutionalized sexism, the first being that having a mother from another country can influence the likelihood of perceiving institutionalized sexism. This finding seems to support the sociocultural theoretical perspective. However, while Latino and Asian/Pacific Islanders were linked to the perception of institutional sexism, these and other ethnic variables did not predict perceived institutional sexism. This suggests that there may be another variable that plays a role in determining perceived sexism likely attributional in nature.

To illustrate this possibility, previous research has reported indirect links between sociocultural factors and perceived discrimination. Phinney et al. (1998) found an indirect link between the birthplace of their participants and the perception of being discriminated against. Foreign-born participants had lower intergroup competence—an attributional variable which then predicted the perception of discrimination. The attributional variable had a direct effect,
though it was highly influenced by a sociocultural characteristic (being foreign-born). It is possible that there is a variable moderating between the sociocultural variables investigated in this study and the perception of institutionalized sexism.

Another variable that predicted the perception of institutional sexism was intentionality, which was an attributional variable. This could mean if people believe that there is a purpose or goal behind organizational policies that subordinate women, they are more likely to see those actions as institutionalized sexism. Previous research had shown that intentionality plays a strong role in determining perceived discrimination on the individual level (Blodorn et al., 2012). It is because of this, it originally posited that intentionality would not play a role in predicting institutional sexism. This result suggests that intent does play a key role in perceiving institutionalized sexism. It was found that gender predicts the perception of institutional sexism, if institutional sexism is viewed as intentional. This result was found in the college graduate sample only. No other sociocultural factor investigated predicted this in either sample.

**Perceived individual sexism.** There was a weak but significant correlation between ethnicity and the perception of individual sexism. Black participants had higher individual sexism scores than their non-black counterparts. However, none of the sociocultural variables investigated predicted perceived individual sexism. There was also a weak significant correlation between intentionality and individual sexism. Intentionality also did not predict the perception of individual sexism. This finding runs contrary to expectations based on previous research (Blodorn et al., 2012; Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998).

A possible explanation for this result employs the use of a theory first discussed by Inman and Baron (1996). They argued that a person’s perceptions of discrimination are heavily influenced by expectations regarding prototypical perpetrators. In the case of perceived
individual sexism, the prototypical perpetrator is male. Six of the eight items described examples of individual sexism by male perpetrators. For two of the items, the gender of the perpetrator was not clear. Because most of the perpetrators in the examples of individual sexism in the measure were mostly male and the victims in the examples were all female, it is possible that those prototypical expectancies influenced the perception of individual sexism, and not the view of whether the actions exemplified in the items were intentional.

To explain this idea further, intentionality depends on the information available to the perceiver about the potential discriminatory event. It also depends on the personal experiences and internal bias of the perceiver. In situations where sexist acts are more implicit e.g., “male teacher ignoring women in a physics class.”, one can label the event as an example of individual sexism, but there may not be enough information provided to determine whether the male teacher’s actions were purposeful. The description of the event does involve the stereotypical perpetrator for sexism – a male individual. It is possible that this expectation contributed to the perception of individual sexism.

**Reliability of Perceived Sexism Measure.** Another goal for this study was to examine the reliability of the measure of perceived sexism developed by Blodorn, et al. (2012). The internal consistencies for the sexism and intentionality composites for both participant groups were high and comparable to the alphas found in the Blodorn et al (2012) study. This finding is a vital initial factor in establishing validity. The next step in replicating the measure was to examine whether the results in the present study mirrored the findings in the original study. T-tests were conducted to investigate whether there were gender differences in perceiving sexism and the intentionality ratings. T-tests were also used to investigate differences in type of sexism and intentionality ratings for each type of sexism.
Based on the findings in the Blodorn et al (2012) study, the following outcomes were expected using the perceived sexism measure. First, individual sexism ratings should be higher than institutional sexism overall. In addition, intentionality ratings for individual sexism should be higher than intentionality ratings for institutional sexism. This is because previous research has supported the notion that members of high-status groups have more reasons to legitimize the current social system because it privileges them (Blodorn et al., 2012; O’Brien et al. 2009; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Next, there should be gender differences in the ratings for institutional sexism, with women reporting higher ratings of perceived institutional sexism than men. In addition, there should be gender differences in the intentionality ratings for institutional sexism, with women rating examples of institutional sexism as more intentional than men. This hypothesis has been supported by previous research where it was found that men perceive less sex-based discrimination than women (Blodorn et al., 2012; Inman & Baron, 1996; Phinney et al., 1998).

**Undergraduate sample findings.** There was a difference in the intentionality ratings for the perceived sexism variables. Examples of individual sexism were rated as more being intentional than the examples of institutional sexism. This finding is consistent with what was found in the Blodorn et al. (2012) study. However, there were no differences between men and women in their ratings of both types of sexism or both intentionality ratings in the undergraduate sample. In addition, there were no differences in how the group overall rated individual and institutional sexism. These findings are inconsistent with the Blodorn et al. (2012) study, where it was found that there were gender differences in the perception of both types of sexism and group differences overall in the perception individual and institutional sexism. It is possible that the difference in ethnic makeup of this sample contributed to the inconsistency. The majority of
the participants in the undergraduate sample belong to an ethnic group that is historically subordinated. It is possible that experiences connected to being part of historically subordinated group contributed to an enhanced ability to perceive different types of discrimination. In addition, the undergraduate sample also included foreign-born participants where the Blodorn et al (2012) did not.

**College graduate sample findings.** Among the entire sample, examples of individual sexism were rated as being more intentional than the examples of institutional sexism. There were no gender differences in the perception of individual sexism. There was a gender difference in the intentionality ratings for institutional sexism. Women perceived examples of institutional sexism as being more intentional than men. These three particular findings were consistent with what was found in the Blodorn et al. (2012) study. However, the college graduate sample rated institutional sexism higher than they rated individual sexism. It was expected that the ratings for would be higher for individual sexism than institutional sexism. In addition, there were no gender differences in the ratings of institutional sexism. These findings were inconsistent with the Blodorn et al. (2012) study, where it was found that individual sexism was rated higher overall than institutional sexism, and that women rated institutional sexism higher than men did. As discussed previously, a possible explanation for these inconsistencies may have to do with the composition of the sample. Blodorn et al. (2012) required that the all of the participants in their study be born in the United States. The present study made no such requirement.

The results from the college graduate sample also differed from the undergraduate sample where there men and women gave the intentionality rating to perceived institutional sexism and rated institutional sexism higher than individual sexism. One factor that could explain the differences is age. The college graduate sample is older than the undergraduate sample by almost
ten years, which may mean that the college graduate participants have more personal and professional experience upon which to base their ratings of institutional sexism.

**Related, but distinct constructs.** Blodorn et al. (2012) asserted that individual and institutional sexism are distinct, but related constructs. An association between the two variables should be established in order to demonstrate convergent validity. The college graduate sample shows that individual and institutional sexism are moderately associated with each other. However, in the psychology undergraduate sample, individual sexism and institutional sexism are not significantly associated with each other. This result could be due to the difference in ethnic make-up of the two samples. The undergraduate sample is 84% non-white, while the college graduate sample is 64% white. In contrast, approximately 79% of the participants from the initial investigation of the perceived sexism measure in the Blodorn et al. (2012) were white. Also, as previously mentioned above, this study included participants who were foreign-born, while the Blodorn et al. (2012) study did not.

**Limitations of This Study**

The present study has contributed to an understanding of how young adults perceive individual and institutional sexism. However, it is important to acknowledge that there were limitations to how perceived sexism was investigated in this study. The study was limited in the following ways: (1) No verification mechanism was placed in the survey to assess participant understanding of both sexism definitions. (2) Internal validity is limited. (3) Non-normal data were used in the regression analysis. These limitations are discussed in more detail below.

**No verification mechanism.** The participants were shown conceptual definitions of individual sexism and institutional sexism before proceeding with rating the survey items. This was done in order to make sure participants knew what individual and institutional sexism are
before rating items that exemplify these concepts. However, no verification mechanism was placed in the online survey to ensure that participants understood the difference between the two types of sexism before proceeding to the measure.

**Limited internal validity.** No variables were manipulated in this investigation, as it was an observational study. Although some predictors of perceived institutional sexism were identified, predictors do not explain what was observed. As a result, it cannot be stated that the sociocultural or attributional variables caused the perceptions of sexism.

**Non-Normal Data.** The descriptive analysis for the sexism and intentionality composites showed that there were a number of outliers that slightly skewed the distributions negatively. Some of the extreme scores came from participants who rated individual sexism items as institutional and vice versa. Regression analysis assumes normality of data. However, since the normality deviations were not extreme, and there was no relationship among the residuals of variables that were analyzed, it can be safe to assume that statistical assumptions were not violated.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Despite the limitations of this study, it does lay the groundwork for some future research. The following recommendations will be discussed in more detail below: (1) Exploring other sociocultural variables that may predict the perception of sexism. (2) Exploring other attributional variables that may predict the perception of sexism. (3) Revising the Individual and Institutional Perception of Sexism Measure by Blodorn et al (2012) measure. (4) Sampling different populations.

**Exploration of other sociocultural variables that may predict perceived sexism.** It was found that the participants who had foreign-born mother predicted perceived institutional
discrimination. Further research can include a more thorough investigation of which countries that these mothers came from and the historical contexts related to discrimination against women in those countries. As previously mentioned in the literature review for this study, social identities often serve as markers for the way people may perceive discrimination against them (Deaux, 2001). Most research concerning perceived discrimination has focused on single identities or group memberships such as race/ethnicity or gender, because these are the primary and most visible identities that serve as the basis for discrimination. Suggestions for further research include an exploration of other potential sociocultural predictors of perceived sexism. Categories related to social identity such as religiosity, vocation, and political affiliations could be predictors of perceived sexism (Deaux, 2001; Jackson & Smith, 1999).

**Exploration of other attributional variables that may predict perceived sexism.** This study compared two theoretical perspectives about the perception of sexism—the sociocultural perspective and the attributional perspective. This study mainly focused on sociocultural factors that could predict the perception of sexism, using only one attributional factor—intentionality. Intentionality was shown to predict perceptions of institutional sexism. Future research can include other attributional factors such as self-esteem, or depression, which in past research were shown to be associated with the perception of ethnic and/or gender discrimination on the individual level (Inman and Baron, 1996; Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997; Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998). Future investigations should provide a more complete understanding the perception of sexism and of a theoretical perspective that contrasts with the sociocultural perspective.

**Revising the Individual and Institutional Perception of Sexism Measure by Blodorn et al (2012).** The measure developed by Blodorn provided a useful opportunity to explore the
concepts of perceived individual and institutional sexism. However, in order to get a more complete understanding of perceived sexism, the measure would need some revisions. The first revision suggestion has to do with the typical victim and perpetrator in sexist scenarios. Six of the eight individual sexism items in the Blodorn et al. (2012) measure describe or strongly imply perpetrators that were men. Two of the items had perpetrators that were not defined by their gender. Ambiguity about the actor/perpetrator of individual sexism may have had an effect on whether the actions described in the items were intentional. The items can be revised to reflect clearly the male actor in the scenarios. Alternatively, items depicting women participating in sexist acts can also be used in order to investigate whether intentionality plays a role in perceiving sexism or if it is the prototypical expectancies of the observers—e.g., men engaging in sexist actions.

All of the items in the measure illustrate scenarios from a third person perspective. Items that place the respondents in a potential scenario involving sexism from a first person perspective may produce more information regarding the perception of sexism. The measure also used bi-polar scales with individual and institutional sexism on opposite ends. In reality, the concepts of individual and institutional sexism are related and not polar opposites of each other. The measure can be revised to use mono-polar scales for each item using both individual and institutional sexism examples.

Another way to gauge the perception of sexism would be to use pictures or video simulations. Having a visual representation of an example of sexism could provide more complete information about how sexism is perceived and interpreted. Lastly, the number of items in the measure should be increased. There are only 14 items covering two constructs—perceived individual and institutional sexism. Increasing the number of items will increase its reliability.
Sampling different populations. This study sampled an ethnically diverse population to assess their perceptions of sexism. Since the examination of individual and institutional sexism as two distinct constructs is still relatively new, more research that samples different populations from different geographical locations and backgrounds would be necessary to develop a better understanding of the validity of these constructs.

Conclusion

This study addressed the scarcity in research on individual and institutional sexism, shedding light in particular on what predicts perceived sexism on an institutionalized level. Another one of the strengths of this study is that it helped addressed the scarcity of research sampling ethnic minorities with respect to perceived sexism. There is limited research available that investigates perceived individual and institutional sexism, and even fewer, if any studies that sample an ethnically diverse population.

This study also made a unique contribution to the body of knowledge about both the sociocultural and attributional theoretical perspectives in understanding perceived sexism. There was weak support found for the sociocultural theoretical perspective in this study. None of the sociocultural factors tested predicted individual sexism. The only sociocultural factor that predicted the perception of institutional sexism was participants who had mothers who were foreign-born. Participants who had mothers that were born outside of the United States predicted the perception of institutional sexism. As for the attributional perspective, the perception of institutional sexism was predicted by how intentional or purposeful the participants thought the actions described in the scenarios were. Even though the evidence that supports the sociocultural perspective is limited, it does not mean that sociocultural factors are not important to helping to understand the perception of sexism. Both theoretical perspectives are important. It is possible
that sociocultural and attributional factors work together in perceiving sexism. Sociocultural factors could play an indirect role and attributional factors may play a more direct role. As discussed before, Phinney et al. (1998) have provided a similar explanation.

The Blodorn et al. (2012) study represents a major first step in fully understanding perceived sexism. It is also among the first to recognize perceived institutional sexism as a construct that is distinct from individual sexism. However, it is unclear whether this measure is valid when sampling populations that are more ethnically diverse. It is possible that the measure will need revising in order more accurately capture perceptions of sexism. In any case, more research is required of the construct and the measure before the results from the measure can be generalized to broader populations.

**Importance of study and its implications.** As outlined previously in the literature review, the perception of discrimination perpetrated by individuals has been associated with negative mental health, physical health, and educational outcomes. It continues to be important to gain an understanding of the individual differences in the perception of individualized discrimination. In fact, the majority of research that covered perception of discrimination focused on the discriminatory behavior of individuals.

However, it is only recently that the perception of institutionalized forms of discrimination have explored by researchers. It seems straightforward to focus on individuals when examining any type of perceived discrimination. Yet, it is equally important to note that institutionalized discrimination too can have harmful effects, especially on those who are historically subordinated. It has been suggested in this and other studies that institutional discrimination is viewed as being less intentional than individual discrimination. Because institutionalized discrimination is seen as less intentional, people may be less inclined to address
it (Blodorn et al, 2012; O’Brien et al, 2009). This is the main reason why this and other research on institutionalized forms discrimination is important. Once factors that consistently predict the perception of discrimination are identified, new approaches and other policies to combat these perceptions or challenge the issues at hand can be developed and used to help others at risk.
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Tables

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Psychology Undergraduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender $^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group $^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Ethnicities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Mixed/Multicultural/Multiracial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace $^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Lived in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Years (but not entire life)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Entire Life</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Origin $^d$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Parent Born in U.S.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents Born in U.S.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents Born outside of U.S.</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ There are three missing values for gender.

$^b$ The ‘Two or More Ethnicities’ category includes respondents who identified with more than one race. The Biracial category includes respondents who only used “Biracial/Mixed/Multicultural/Multiracial” Category to identify themselves.

$^c$ There are three missing values for Birthplace.

$^d$ There are eleven missing values for Parents’ origin.
Table 2. Means, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis of Individual Sexism, Institutional Sexism, and Intentionality on Individual and Institutional levels for Psychology Undergraduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Sexism</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.184)</td>
<td>(.365)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Sexism</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.933</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.183)</td>
<td>(.364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Individual)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.184)</td>
<td>(.366)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Institutional)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.183)</td>
<td>(.364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Standard errors are below the statistic in parenthesis.

Values closer to 7 indicate perception of the respective type of sexism.

Intentionality refers to the degree which the respondent believes the example described in the survey to be deliberate or purposeful.

Values closer to 1 indicate a rating of unintentional. Values close to 7 indicate a rating of intentional. The intentionality composite was split into two separate variables. One composite averaged the ratings of examples of individual sexism. One composite averaged the ratings of examples of institutional sexism.
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of College Graduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Ethnicities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Lived in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 Years (but not entire life)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Entire Life</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents Born in U.S.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents Born outside of U.S.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a There is one missing value for gender.
b The ‘Two or More Ethnicities’ category includes respondents who identified with more than one race, but did not choose ‘Biracial/Mixed/Multicultural/Multiracial’.
Table 4. Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis of Individual Sexism, Institutional Sexism, and Intentionality on Individual and Institutional levels for College Graduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Sexism</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.393)</td>
<td>(.768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Sexism</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.987</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.398)</td>
<td>(.778)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Individual)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.388)</td>
<td>(.759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Institutional)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.405)</td>
<td>(.788)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N: 33

Note. Standard errors are below the statistic in parenthesis.

a Values closer to 7 indicate perception of the respective type of sexism.

b Intentionality refers to the degree which the respondent believes the example described in the survey to be deliberate or purposeful. Values closer to 1 indicate a rating of unintentional. Values close to 7 indicate a rating of intentional. The intentionality composite was split into two separate variables. One composite averaged the ratings of examples of individual sexism. One composite averaged the ratings of examples of institutional sexism.
Table 5. Intercorrelations of Ethnic Groups, Individual Sexism, Institutional Sexism, and Intentionality on the Individual and Institutional Levels for Psychology Undergraduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual Sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional Sexism</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intentionality (Individual)</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intentionality (Institutional)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. White</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Black</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asian</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Latino</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Two or More Ethnicities</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Biracial</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Kendall’s Tau-b Correlations. ** = p < .01, * = p<.05.
Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations for Intentionality on the Institutional Level for Women and Men for Psychology Undergraduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Sexism</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>-0.780</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Sexism</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>-0.778</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Individual)</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>-0.838</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Institutional)</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>-0.450</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. No significant results. Standard deviations appear in the parentheses below means.
Table 7. Paired t-test Comparisons of Type of Sexism and Intentionality Ratings for Psychology Undergraduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Dif.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Individual Sexism-Institutional Sexism</td>
<td>−.074</td>
<td>-.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Intentionality (Individual)-Intentionality (Institutional)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>18.6 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p<.001
Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations for Intentionality on the Institutional Level for Women and Men College Graduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Sexism</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Sexism</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Individual)</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Institutional)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.78*</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * = p<.01 Standard deviations appear in the parentheses below means.
Table 9. Paired t-test Comparisons of Type of Sexism and Intentionality Ratings for College Graduate Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Difference</th>
<th>Paired Diff.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Sexism-Institutional Sexism</td>
<td>–1.51</td>
<td>–11.5*</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality (Individual)-Intentionality (Institutional)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>5.38*</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N= 33 for both pairs. * = p<.001
Figures

Figure 1. Histogram of Frequencies of Individual Sexism Averages for Psychology Undergraduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
Figure 2. Histogram of Frequencies of Individual Sexism Averages for Psychology Undergraduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
Figure 3. Histogram of Frequencies of Intentionality for Individual Sexism Examples for Psychology Undergraduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
Figure 4. Histogram of Frequencies of Intentionality for Institutional Sexism Examples for Psychology Undergraduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
Figure 5. Histogram of Frequencies of Individual Sexism Averages for College Graduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
Figure 6. Histogram of Frequencies of Individual Sexism Averages for College Graduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
Figure 7. Histogram of Frequencies of Intentionality for Individual Sexism Examples for College Graduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
Figure 8. Histogram of Frequencies of Intentionality for Institutional Sexism Examples for College Graduate Sample.

A normal distribution is superimposed on the graph for comparison.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Sample</th>
<th>Both Samples</th>
<th>College Graduate Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No gender differences in rating how intentional examples of individual sexism were.</td>
<td>Individual Sexism is more intentional than institutional sexism.</td>
<td>Women rated examples of institutional sexism as being more intentional than men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Sexism and Institutional Sexism were not significantly associated with one another.</td>
<td>No gender differences in the perception of individual sexism.</td>
<td>Institutional Sexism was rated higher than Individual Sexism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black participants were associated with the perception of individual sexism.</td>
<td>No gender differences in the perception of institutional sexism.</td>
<td>Individual Sexism and Institutional were significantly associated with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander participants were associated with the perception of institutional sexism.</td>
<td>No gender differences in rating how intentional examples of individual sexism were.</td>
<td>Gender predicted the viewing of institutional examples of sexism as intentional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born mothers of participants predicted the perception of institutional sexism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality predicted the perception of institutional sexism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Summation of Findings for Undergraduate and College Graduate Samples
Appendix A-Recruitment Materials

1. Flyer for Psychology Undergraduate Students

City College of New York
Perceptions of Real-World Situations
**Volunteers Needed For Research Study**

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study is to see your reactions to a number of statements describing social situations. You will be asked to complete a survey and demographic questionnaire online. The approximate time commitment is 30-45 minutes. The online survey can be taken at home.

ELIGIBILITY: All CCNY students enrolled in PSY 102 and are registered in the CCNY Subject Pool are welcome to participate in the study.

RISKS: The risks involved are no greater than what would be experienced in ordinary life.

BENEFITS: You will receive credit for participation and you will have the opportunity to learn about how research is conducted.

PARTICIPATION: Your participation in this study would be completely voluntary.
2. SONA (Subject Pool) Description (255 characters or less, was displayed to participants when viewing the list of subject pool studies)

**Title to the Students:** “Perceptions of Real-World Situations”
The purpose of this study is to see your reactions to a few statements describing social situations. You’ll be asked to complete a survey and demographic questionnaire online, which can be taken at home. The approximate time commitment is 30-45 minutes.

3. Facebook Post (Used to recruit non-student participants.)

**TEXT**

**Title:** “Volunteers Needed for Research Study. Your Feedback is Important”
“The purpose of this study is to see your reactions to a number of social situations. You will be asked to complete a survey and demographic questionnaire online. The approximate time to complete the survey is 30-45 minutes. The online survey can be taken at home or wherever you have a computer with internet access. All of the data you provide in this survey will remain anonymous. To learn more about the study before proceeding please visit https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RGXJ3FL Thanks for your help.”

**How it appeared to Participants (Below).**

"Perceptions of Real-World Situations.** Volunteers Needed for Research Study.
The purpose of this study is to see your reactions to a number of social situations. You will be asked to complete a survey and demographic questionnaire online. The approximate time to complete the survey is 30-45 minutes. The online survey can be taken at home or wherever you have a computer with internet access. All of the data you provide in this survey will remain anonymous. To learn more about the study before proceeding please visit https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RGXJ3FL Thanks for your help."
Appendix B-Perceived Sexism Survey and Demographic Questionnaire


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent to Participate in Research Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please read the following statement in its entirety.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

Principal Investigator: Jennifer Grant
Graduate Student, Psychology Program
City College of New York
160 Convent Avenue, New York, NY 10031

Faculty Advisor: Deborah L. Vietze, Ph.D.
Professor, Psychology Department
City College of New York
160 Convent Avenue, New York, NY 10031

Introduction/Purpose: The purpose of this study is to see your reactions to a number of social situations.

Procedures: Approximately 100 people are expected to participate in this study. Each person will participate in one survey and a series of demographic questions about you. The time commitment of each participant is expected to be approximately 30-45 minutes.

Possible Discomforts and Risks: Your participation in this study may involve some risks. This study asks participants to evaluate examples of sexism. The risks involved are no greater than what would be incurred in ordinary life.

If you are bothered or troubled, as a result of this study, contact the Counseling Center of CCNY at (212) 650-8222 or via email at counseling@ccny.cuny.edu.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits. However, participating in the study may increase general knowledge of understanding situations when sexism can occur.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may decide not to participate without prejudice, penalty, or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to leave the study, please contact the principal investigator Jennifer Grant to inform her of your decision.

Financial Considerations: Participation in this study will involve no cost to you.

Confidentiality: The data obtained from you will be collected electronically. The collected data will be accessible to Jennifer Grant, Dr. Deborah Vietze, and IRB members reviewing the research. The data will be securely stored in a file box in Dr. Deborah Vietze’s laboratory at City College. All data collected from this study will remain anonymous.

Contact Questions/Persons: If you have any questions about the research now or in the future, you should contact the Principal Investigator, Jennifer Grant, at jgrant.ccnystudy@gmail.com, or Dr. Deborah Vietze at...
Perceptions

dvietze@ccny.cuny.edu.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact Tricia Mayhew-Noel at 212-850-7902, tmayhewnol@ccny.cuny.edu.

Statement of Consent:

"I have read the above description of this research and I understand it. I have been informed of the risks and benefits involved, and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. Furthermore, I have been assured that any future questions that I may have will also be answered by the principal investigator of the research study. By giving consent I have not waived any of my legal rights to which I would otherwise be entitled.

By clicking 'next', I volunteer and agree to participate in this study."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please take a moment to review the definitions below.

Individual Sexism: Prejudicial attitudes or discriminatory behavior towards women.

Institutional Sexism: Organizational practices and policies that disadvantage women.
Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don’t believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on “Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism” in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click “Not Sure.”

1. A man refuses to board an airplane with a woman pilot.

On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A man refuses to board an airplane with a woman pilot.

On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don’t believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on “Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism” in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click “Not Sure.”

### 3. A man refuses to let a woman valet park his expensive car.

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. A man refuses to let a woman valet park his expensive car.

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
<td>📑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don’t believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on “Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism” in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click “Not Sure.”

5. John announces that he would not vote for a woman for president because he does not think that women are strong leaders.

On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. John announces that he would not vote for a woman for president because he does not think that women are strong leaders.

On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perceptions

Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don’t believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on “Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism” in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click “Not Sure.”

#### 7. A highly qualified woman applies for a job promotion and her boss gives the promotion to a less qualified man.

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 8. A highly qualified woman applies for a job promotion and her boss gives the promotion to a less qualified man.

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="circle.png" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don't believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on "Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism" in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click "Not Sure."

9. An experienced woman carpenter shows up to volunteer for a rebuilding project. Instead of being assigned to carpentry work, she is asked to work at the food and water station.

On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. An experienced woman carpenter shows up to volunteer for a rebuilding project. Instead of being assigned to carpentry work, she is asked to work at the food and water station.

On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Perceptions**

Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don't believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on "Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism" in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click "Not Sure."

11. A physics teacher routinely calls on his men students, ignoring the woman students willing to answer questions.

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. A physics teacher routinely calls on his men students, ignoring the woman students willing to answer questions.

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perceptions

Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don't believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on "Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism" in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click "Not Sure."

#### 13. A male bartender ignores a woman customer because he believes that women are bad tippers.

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 14. A male bartender ignores a woman customer because he believes that women are bad tippers.

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perceptions

Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don't believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on "Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism" in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click "Not Sure."

#### 17. The disproportionate number of women among CEO's in Fortune 500 companies.

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 18. The disproportionate number of women among CEO's in Fortune 500 companies.

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don’t believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on “Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism” in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click “Not Sure.”

**19. Police protective wear was made to fit men, resulting in uncomfortable and less safe protective wear for women.**

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20. Police protective wear was made to fit men, resulting in uncomfortable and less safe protective wear for women.**

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Perceptions

Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don't believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on "Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism" in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click "Not Sure."

### 21. Road Construction signs that may say things like “Men working ahead” instead of “People working ahead.”

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22. Road Construction signs that may say things like “Men working ahead” instead of “People working ahead.”

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Circle" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions

Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise, if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don't believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on "Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism" in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click "Not Sure."

23. Women professional athletes make less money than male professional athletes.

On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?

On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?

Extremely Unintentional  Most Likely Unintentional  Somewhat Unintentional  Not Sure  Somewhat Intentional  Most Likely Intentional  Extremely Intentional
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Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don’t believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on “Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism” in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click “Not Sure.”

### 25. A university's college of engineering ends its affirmative action program, resulting in a large drop in enrollment among women.

**On the scale below, what type of role do you think SEXISM played in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Individual Sexism</th>
<th>Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Somewhat Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Most Likely Institutional Sexism</th>
<th>Definitely Institutional Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 26. A university's college of engineering ends its affirmative action program, resulting in a large drop in enrollment among women.

**On the scale below, how INTENTIONAL were the actions described in the above example?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unintentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Unintentional</th>
<th>Somewhat Unintentional</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Somewhat Intentional</th>
<th>Most Likely Intentional</th>
<th>Extremely Intentional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are statements that describe a particular social situation. For each statement, you will first be asked to indicate on the scale below the role that sexism may have played in the statement described.

For example, if you believe that the statement describes an instance of an INDIVIDUAL sexism you would click on a point closer to the LEFT of the scale. Likewise if you believe that the statement describes an example of INSTITUTIONAL sexism, you may click closer to the RIGHT of the scale.

If you don’t believe sexism played a role in the social situation at all, you can click on “Neither Individual nor Institutional Sexism” in the middle of the scale.

The second question will ask how intentional the actions displayed in the social situation. You can click closer to the LEFT to indicate that you believe the actions were NOT INTENTIONAL, or closer to the RIGHT if you believe the actions displayed in the situation were INTENTIONAL. If you are unsure of how intentional the actions displayed were, you may click “Not Sure.”

27. Restrictions on the positions that women are allowed to serve in the armed forces.

28. Restrictions on the positions that women are allowed to serve in the armed forces.
### Perceptions

**Questions About You**

Please answer the questions below.

**29. What is your age?**

- 

**30. What is your gender?**

- Female
- Male
- I prefer not to answer.

**31. Please describe your race or ethnicity.**

- Caucasian (White/or European ancestry)
- Black American
- African, West Indian
- East Asian
- South East Asian
- South Asian
- Pacific Islander
- Hispanic/Latino/Chicano/Puerto Rican/Dominican
- Bi-racial/Mixed/Multicultural/Multi-racial
- Other (please specify)

**32. Was your mother born in the United States?**

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to answer.

**33. Was your father born in the United States?**

- Yes
- No
- I prefer not to answer.
### Perceptions

#### 34. What global region were you born in?
- [ ] North America
- [ ] South America
- [ ] Caribbean
- [ ] East Asia
- [ ] South Asia
- [ ] Europe
- [ ] Africa
- [ ] Pacific Islands
- [ ] Other (please specify)

#### 35. How long have you resided in the United States?
- [ ] Less than 1 year
- [ ] 1-5 years
- [ ] 6-10 years
- [ ] 10-15 years
- [ ] More than 15 years (but not my whole life)
- [ ] My entire life
Thank You!

Thank you for completing this survey!