
Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Sexism

Suzanne C. Klonis

University of Wisconsin–Madison

E. Ashby Plant

Florida State University

Patricia G. Devine

University of Wisconsin–Madison

Based on Plant and Devine's (1998) measures of Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice toward Blacks, new scales were developed to assess Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Sexism (IMS-S and EMS-S, respectively). The scales possess good psychometric properties. Providing evidence of convergent and discriminant validity, the IMS-S was strongly related to measures of sexism yet unrelated to measures of social evaluation. The EMS-S was modestly related to both sexism and social evaluative concerns. Providing evidence of predictive validity, participants who were either internally or externally motivated to respond without sexism rated sexist jokes more negatively in a situation discouraging sexism compared to participants low in both sources of motivation. However, only high IMS-S participants rated the jokes negatively whether the situation encouraged or discouraged sexism and whether their response was public or private. Implications for understanding the similarities and differences between sexism and racism are discussed.

Keywords: *sexism; motivation; self-regulation; scale development*

Throughout the last half-century, shifts in the political and social climate have affected the expression of prejudice, such that overt expressions of prejudice are no longer acceptable (Blanchard, Lilly, & Vaughan, 1991; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995). Particularly in the past two decades, a strong social norm discouraging the explicit expression of bias has created intense pressure to be nonprejudiced. During this same period, traditional measures of prejudiced attitudes have indicated a decline in both racial prejudice (Kleugel & Smith, 1986; Schumann, Steeh, & Bobo, 1985) and gender prejudice (Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1991; Hammerlie & Mont-

gomery, 1991) among the American public. However, implicit, theoretically less controllable, measures of bias indicate that both racial and gender bias are still prevalent (e.g., Banaji & Hardin, 1996; Blair & Banaji, 1996; Carpenter, 2000; Devine, 1989; Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995; Kawakami & Dovidio, 2001; Rudman & Kilianski, 2000).

The discrepancy between self-reported attitudes and more indirect or implicit measures suggests to some theorists that self-report measures are not trustworthy assessments of people's true attitudes. Specifically, they doubt whether changes in self-reported attitudes are sincere and instead believe these changes are simply a response to politically correct pressure that discourages overt expressions of prejudice (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; McConahay, 1986; Sears & Kinder, 1985). Much of the theorizing on people's responses to politically correct social norms assumes that when people do not feel constrained by social norms to respond without prejudice, they will express their true prejudiced attitudes. This view discounts the potential influence of internal reasons as a motivator to act in nonprejudiced ways.

Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Toward Blacks

Rather than discounting either internal or external reasons to respond without prejudice, Plant and Devine

Authors' Note: Please address correspondence to Suzanne C. Klonis, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Psychology Department, 1202 West Johnson Street, Madison, WI 53706; e-mail: scklonis@wisc.edu.

PSPB, Vol. 31 No. 9, September 2005 1237-1249
DOI: 10.1177/0146167205275304

© 2005 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.

(1998) argued that both are likely important sources of motivation for responding without prejudice, although people may vary in the extent to which either motivational force is important to them. They developed scales to assess both internal and external sources of motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people. Internal motivation reflects White people's concern with acting consistently with personally important nonprejudiced standards, whereas external motivation reflects White people's concern with acting nonprejudiced to avoid negative reactions from others.¹

Plant and Devine (1998) provided extensive evidence concerning the reliability and validity of the Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scales (IMS and EMS, respectively). For example, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis showed that items from the two scales loaded onto two separate factors. Furthermore, they found that the IMS and EMS are largely independent such that people can be motivated to respond without prejudice primarily for internal reasons, primarily for external reasons, for both internal and external reasons, or for neither reason. Plant and Devine also demonstrated the scales' convergent and discriminant validity. For example, there was a strong correlation between the IMS and traditional measures of prejudice such that low-prejudice people tend to be higher in internal motivation to respond without prejudice than high-prejudice people. In addition, they found a moderate correlation between external motivation and racial prejudice; high-prejudice individuals tend to report somewhat higher levels of external motivation than low-prejudice individuals. Furthermore, the EMS showed small positive correlations with measures of social anxiety (e.g., Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale; Leary, 1983a), indicating that although the EMS is related to social anxiety, it taps into a specific concern about appearing prejudiced rather than a general concern with others' evaluations. Importantly, neither the IMS nor the EMS was related to measures of social desirability (e.g., Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

In addition, and perhaps most important for the utility of the scales, the source of people's motivation to respond without prejudice predicts their behavior in theoretically meaningful ways. For example, Plant and Devine (1998) examined White people's endorsement of racial stereotypes as a function of the social context in which they reported their endorsement. Whereas some participants reported their endorsement in a private, anonymous setting, others reported their endorsement of the stereotype in public, responding directly to the experimenter. The findings indicated that only those individuals who respond without prejudice solely to avoid negative reactions from others and not because of nonprejudiced personal beliefs (i.e., low IMS/high

EMS) showed a discrepancy between their privately and publicly reported stereotype endorsements. Reporting their beliefs about racial stereotypes publicly to an experimenter made normative nonprejudiced standards highly salient and resulted in these participants' reluctance to endorse racial stereotypes, stereotypes that they endorsed under private reporting conditions. In contrast, in the absence of an external audience, these people endorsed racial stereotypes consistent with their personal beliefs. All others reported stereotype endorsement levels consistent with their levels of internal motivation in both private and public contexts (i.e., high IMS led to low stereotype endorsement in both public and private, whereas low IMS led to high stereotype endorsement).

Since their development, the internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice scales have been useful in predicting a range of responses and clarifying a variety of issues. For instance, the scales have been useful in predicting White people's expectations and emotional reactions to interracial interactions (Plant, 2004; Plant & Devine, 2004) as well as their responses to being encouraged to comply with nonprejudiced social pressure (Plant & Devine, 2001). The scales also have helped to identify who is likely to show effective bias regulation across implicit and explicit measures (Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Devine, 2003; Devine, Plant, Amodio, Harmon-Jones, & Vance, 2002). Given the utility of the IMS and EMS for understanding a range of issues involved in non-Black people's responses toward Black people, it may be helpful to examine the degree to which these constructs are meaningful for other forms of bias, such as sexism.

Similarities and Differences Between Racism and Sexism

As with race, legislative and normative changes have made sexism unacceptable in social as well as legal contexts (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995; Tougas et al., 1995). Given the increase in external pressure to respond without sexism, people, particularly men, may be concerned with not appearing sexist for fear of the social disapproval that sexist responses or behavior might elicit. At the same time, it is also possible that people would be concerned with responding in nonsexist ways because of their personally important nonsexist beliefs. Therefore, it is important to investigate whether the constructs of external and internal motivation to avoid prejudice apply to sexism. Questions remain, however, concerning the extent to which these constructs would be comparable when women rather than Blacks are the target group. Two contrasting perspectives can be articulated.

On one hand, sexism and racism may be similar enough so that analogous motivational forces would

come into play for responses regarding both types of bias. Indeed, sexism and racism share significant similarities. Hacker (1951) argued that both women and Black people are effectively banned from certain spheres, especially economic and political ones, and that both women's and Blacks' job opportunities are lower status and lower paying than those available to White men (see also Eberhardt & Fiske, 1994). In addition, both sexism and racism have changed from an overt "traditional" prejudice to a covert "modern" form (Swim et al., 1995; Tougas et al., 1995). Furthermore, similar changes have taken place in the social and legal realm influencing the appropriateness of sexism and racism, including norms and laws prohibiting discrimination (Tougas et al., 1995). Such normative pressure proscribing sexism may result in some people experiencing motivation to respond without sexism to avoid the social sanctions that sexism might elicit (i.e., external motivation) consistent with concomitant external motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people.

On the other hand, however, an alternative possibility is that the social norms discouraging expressions of sexism are not as compelling or consistent as the norms discouraging racism (see Eberhardt & Fiske, 1994). Fiske and Stevens (1993) argue that demeaning images of women are more common than demeaning images of Blacks. Evidence also suggests that racist behavior carries with it a greater threat of punishment and is perceived as more egregious than sexist behavior (e.g., Cowan & Hodge, 1996). Rodin, Price, Bryson, and Sanchez (1990) found that the same discriminatory acts were perceived as more prejudiced if perpetrated against a Black person by a White person than against a woman by a man. In addition, people are more worried about offending others with racist behavior than sexist behavior and they feel guiltier if they think they have committed a racist act than a sexist act (Czopp & Monteith, 2003). As a result, people appear to be less concerned about their own sexist responses and may be unlikely to actively discourage others' sexist behavior. If social sanctions are less severe and less frequent for violations of the nonsexist social norm as compared to the norm against racism, people may not feel as obligated to comply with the nonsexist norm. As a result, external motivation to respond without sexism may not be a potent motivational force that consistently predicts meaningful behavior.

Another important difference between racism and sexism is the fact that people generally have quite positive attitudes and stereotypes of women, which may influence the strength of internal motivation to avoid sexism. The existence of close interpersonal contact and interdependency between heterosexual men and women leads some theorists to argue that gender-based preju-

dice differs from other kinds of prejudice in that it is characterized by a mix of positive and negative emotions rather than antipathy (Glick & Fiske, 1996). In fact, women are evaluated more positively than men on both explicit (Eagly et al., 1991) and implicit measures of sexism (Carpenter, 2000). Internal motivation supposes that being nonsexist is central to one's self-concept. People with positive representations of women may doubt they could be sexist, and so it is unlikely that being nonsexist would be an important personal standard for these individuals. If people do not generally worry about making sexist responses, then internal motivation may not be particularly strong.

The primary goals of the current research are to explore whether distinct internal and external motivations to respond without sexism exist in the same way they do for racism and to examine the implications of these motivations for overt expressions of sexism. To this end, following Plant and Devine (1998), our research was conducted in three phases. Phase 1 focused on item generation and scale construction. The second phase focused on establishing the scales' convergent and discriminant validity by examining their relationships with other self-report measures. In the third and final phase, we conducted a study to establish the scales' predictive validity. We designed a study in which individuals differing in their levels of internal and external motivation should respond in theoretically meaningful and predictable ways. Specifically, we examined participants' public and private approval of sexist jokes when a confederate either established a norm within the situation to respond positively or negatively to the jokes as a function of their level of internal and external motivation to respond without sexism.

PHASE 1: SCALE DEVELOPMENT

To develop the Internal Motivation to Respond Without Sexism Scale (IMS-S) and the External Motivation to Respond Without Sexism Scale (EMS-S), we followed the same procedure as Plant and Devine (1998); that is, we made sure that the items clearly implicated only one source of motivation to respond without sexism. We adapted all 10 items from Plant and Devine's (1998) IMS and EMS scales but used the phrase "sexism against women" instead of "prejudice against Black people." In addition to the adapted items, new items were generated to reflect issues more pertinent to sexism, including five internal items (e.g., "Because of my personal beliefs, I think women should be able to go into male-dominated careers without resistance from society") and five external items (e.g., "I try to treat women and men as equals because I'm afraid other people would be upset with me if I didn't") (see the appendix).

For both scales, participants were asked to indicate their agreement with each item on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*), where high scores indicate higher levels of motivation. Two samples completed the scales so we could perform exploratory factor analysis with the first sample and confirmatory factor analysis with the second. Because our focus was on men's motivation to respond without sexism toward women, we administered the scales only to men. Although it is true that women can be sexist, we are most interested in gender prejudice perpetrated by the dominant, higher powered outgroup (i.e., men) and, therefore, in men's motivations to respond without sexism. In addition, limiting our sample to men will allow us to compare our results to those of Plant and Devine (1998), which focused on White people's motivations for responding without prejudice toward Black people. Descriptions of the two samples are followed by analyses.

Method

Sample 1 consisted of 107 male introductory psychology students (79% White) who filled out the 10-item IMS-S and 10-item EMS-S scales anonymously in group sessions (averaging 20 men per session) and who received extra credit points for their participation.² Sample 2 included 452 male introductory psychology students (88% White) who completed the scales as part of a mass-testing session at the beginning of the following semester and who received extra credit for participation.

Scale Development Results

Exploratory factor analysis with Sample 1. An exploratory factor analysis was performed on the responses to the IMS-S and EMS-S items from Sample 1 to see if the items loaded onto separate factors. To the degree that internal and external motivations to respond without sexism reflect distinct constructs, the items should load on two interpretable factors. Responses to all 20 items were submitted to a principal components analysis with an oblimin rotation using SPSS 11.0 for Windows. Examination of the scree plot revealed two strong factors. The first factor accounted for 25% of the total variance (eigenvalue of 5.01) and consisted of items tapping external motivation to respond without sexism. The second factor accounted for 21% of the variance (eigenvalue of 4.26) and consisted of items that assessed internal motivation to respond without sexism.

Only those items that met two criteria were retained for inclusion on the scales: a factor loading of more than .50 onto one of the factors and a unique loading onto only one of the factors. Using these criteria, one internal motivation item was dropped. In addition, based on reliability analyses, five newly developed items (two IMS-S items, three EMS-S items) were dropped because they

decreased the scales' internal consistency. Whereas Plant and Devine's (1998) IMS and EMS scales assessed motivations underlying the general tendency to respond without prejudice, the new items asked about responses to gender-specific issues (e.g., supporting equal rights for women). This difference might explain why the new items did not cohere well with modified items from Plant and Devine's scales.

Confirmatory factor analysis with Sample 2. To test the goodness of fit of the theoretical model against the actual data, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted with the revised versions of the scales (i.e., seven-item IMS and seven-item EMS) using AMOS (Arbuckle, 1997). The initial model was based on the exploratory factor analysis, with two factors, internal and external motivation, and errors set to be uncorrelated. Goodness of fit was evaluated using the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Comparative Fit Index (CFI). These measures are standardized and range from 0 to 1, with 1 indicating a perfect fit; GFI values greater than .85 and CFI values greater than .90 are considered a good fit to the model.

In the initial model, both factors consisted of the seven items. The goodness of fit for the two-factor model was moderately good for Sample 2 (see Table 1). However, the χ^2 value for the seven-item scales was rather high, suggesting that the model could be refined by eliminating items with large positive and/or negative residual values. Respecification continued until the model that provided the best fit to the data was identified. The final model consisted of five IMS items and five EMS items. The final items for both of the scales were those adapted from Plant and Devine's (1998) scales. Comparison of the two-factor model to a one-factor solution revealed that the two-factor model fit the data significantly better than did the one-factor model. The adequacy of the two-factor model also was cross-validated by comparing the goodness of fit on Sample 1. For Sample 1, as in Sample 2, the two-factor solution fit the data significantly better than did the one-factor solution.

Reliability and correlations between IMS and EMS. In developing and refining the scales, half of the original items were removed, resulting in rather short scales, raising concerns about reliability. However, the final five-item IMS-S and EMS-S maintained reasonable reliabilities (alpha levels from .78 to .84) across both samples (see Table 2). Also of interest, the correlations between the final IMS-S and EMS-S were small and negative in each sample ($r = -.05$ to $-.01$), suggesting that the scales are independent. Thus, rather than reflecting a single, general motivation to avoid sexism, the IMS-S and EMS-S items appear to reflect distinct sources of motivation to respond without sexism. These findings indicate that people can be motivated to respond without sexism

TABLE 1: Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Fit Index	Sample 2		Sample 1	
	Initial 7-Item	Final 5-Item	Initial 10-Item	Final 5-Item
One-factor solution				
GFI	0.56	0.62	0.55	0.65
CFI	0.45	0.43	0.42	0.49
Chi-square	1,503.91	973.22	429.17	218.63
Two-factor solution				
GFI	0.91	0.93	0.80	0.89
CFI	0.90	0.92	0.84	0.91
Chi-square	340.13	158.64	174.15	66.99
Decrease in chi-square (vs. one-factor)	1163.78**	814.58**	255.02**	151.64**
N	452	452	194	194

NOTE: GFI = Goodness of Fit Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index.
 ** $p < .01$.

primarily for internal reasons, primarily for external reasons, for both internal and external reasons, or for neither set of reasons.

PHASE 2: CONVERGENT AND DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY

The IMS-S and EMS-S appear to measure independent sources of motivation to respond without sexism. Our next step was to establish the convergent and discriminant validity of the scales by exploring their relationships with other self-report measures that are theoretically related or unrelated to the IMS-S and EMS-S. For instance, people who report that responding without sexism is personally important (i.e., high IMS-S) also should report that they have nonsexist attitudes. Therefore, higher levels of sexism on traditional sexism scales should be negatively correlated with the IMS-S. Because the EMS-S measures individuals' desire to appear nonsexist because of possible negative reactions from others, it was less clear how EMS-S would relate to measures of sexism. However, Plant and Devine (1998) found that the EMS for Blacks was moderately related to measures of prejudice such that high external motivation was associated with high levels of prejudice. Therefore, we anticipated weak to moderate correlations between the EMS-S and sexism measures.

We also assessed the extent of the relationships of the IMS-S and EMS-S with self-report measures of social evaluation and self-presentation. We did not expect particularly strong correlations between the social evaluation measures and the IMS-S. However, because the EMS-S measures whether people are concerned with appearing sexist to others, we expected the EMS-S to be related to measures that assess general apprehension about being evaluated by others. However, to the degree that the EMS-S reflects a specific concern with appearing sexist rather than a general concern with how one appears to others, these correlations should not be large. Finally, to the extent that the motivation measures were valid

TABLE 2: IMS-S and EMS-S Reliabilities (Cronbach's α) Across Three Samples

Motivation Scale	Sample 1 (N = 107)	Sample 2 (N = 452)
IMS-S	.78	.84
EMS-S	.80	.80

NOTE: IMS-S = Internal Motivation to Respond Without Sexism Scale, EMS-S = External Motivation to Respond Without Sexism Scale. The Cronbach's alphas are based on the final five-item scales.

assessments, neither of the scales should be related to measures of self-presentation.

Participants and Procedure

Data from the 107 men in Sample 1 were used to establish convergent and discriminant validity of the IMS-S and EMS-S using the final five-item scales. Participants completed a packet of questionnaires (see below) in one of several administration sessions, each lasting approximately 45 min. Questionnaires were in three random orders.³

Results

Analyses of the correlations between the IMS-S and EMS-S and other scales reveal that the IMS-S and EMS-S differ in their relationships to other constructs in sensible ways that help to establish the validity of the scales. Values for all correlations between the final five-item IMS-S, EMS-S, and other measures are shown in Table 3.

Relation of IMS-S and EMS-S to Measures of Sexism

In addition to the IMS-S and EMS-S, participants completed scales assessing traditional, modern, and ambivalent forms of sexism. To measure sexism in its traditional, interpersonal form, we administered the Egalitarianism/Traditionalism Scale (E/T; Larsen &

Long, 1988). Also included were two modern sexism scales, the Modern Sexism Scale (MSS; Swim et al., 1995) and Neosexism Scale (NSS; Tougas et al., 1995), which measure politically oriented sexism (e.g., denial of discrimination) in a way that is believed to be more immune to socially desirable responses than traditional sexism measures. Finally, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) was included. This inventory consists of two subscales, Benevolent and Hostile Sexism, which measure protective paternalistic feelings and antagonistic attitudes toward women, respectively. The NSS and ASI are scored such that higher scores indicate higher levels of sexism. The MSS and E/T are scored such that lower scores indicate higher levels of sexism.

Consistent with predictions, the IMS-S was associated with lower levels of sexism on the MSS, E/T, NSS, and the ASI's Hostile Sexism subscale. The EMS-S was not significantly correlated with either the E/T or the Benevolent Sexism Scale, suggesting that external motivation is unrelated to traditional paternalistic forms of sexism. However, the EMS-S was moderately related to higher levels of sexism on the MSS, NSS, and Hostile Sexism Scales.

Relation of IMS-S and EMS-S to Measures of Social Evaluation and Self-Presentation

To differentiate the IMS-S and EMS-S from general measures of concern over being evaluated by others, participants completed three scales assessing their concerns about social evaluation: the Interaction Anxiety Scale (Leary, 1983b), the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (Leary, 1983a; Watson & Friend, 1969), and the Public Self-Consciousness Scale (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975). Higher scores on all three scales indicate stronger social evaluative concerns. As expected, the IMS-S was not significantly associated with any of the social evaluation scales. The EMS-S, on the other hand, was moderately correlated with Fear of Negative Evaluation, Interaction Anxiety, and Public Self-Consciousness. However, the size of these relationships indicates that the EMS-S is not merely a measure of general concern with social evaluation.

To examine the IMS-S and EMS-S's relationships with strategic self-presentation and social desirability, participants completed the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder, 1974) and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The Self-Monitoring Scale measures the tendency and ability to observe one's own reactions in response to social cues and to adapt them strategically. High scores on this scale indicate stronger self-monitoring tendencies. Because the IMS-S and EMS-S both measure something beyond a general tendency to self-monitor, we did not expect either of the motivation scales to be related to the self-monitoring scale. Consis-

tent with these expectations, self-monitoring was unrelated to both the EMS-S and IMS-S.

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) measures the extent to which individuals respond to self-report measures in such a way as to present an unrealistically positive impression of themselves (i.e., their tendency to lie on these scales to make themselves look good). High scores on the Marlowe-Crowne indicate high social desirability. As predicted, EMS-S was unrelated to the Marlowe-Crowne. The IMS-S had a modest negative correlation with the Marlowe-Crowne such that participants who were strongly internally motivated to respond without sexism were less likely to present themselves in an unrealistically positive manner. Although not specifically predicted, this relationship supports the idea that internally motivated people do not report nonsexist personal beliefs to appear socially desirable.

Relation Between the Motivations to Respond Without Sexism and Racism

We also thought it important to examine the IMS-S and EMS-S's relation to Plant and Devine's (1998) Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Toward Blacks Scales (IMS-B and EMS-B, respectively, for ease of comparison). A sample of 414 men (88% White) completed both sets of motivation scales in group sessions. We expected that the two versions of the IMS would be moderately correlated with each other and the two versions of the EMS would be moderately related. However, we did not expect the relationship to be so large as to indicate that the scales are redundant. As expected, the internal motivation scales had weak negative correlations with the external motivation scales. However, the two internal motivation scales were highly correlated with each other, as were the two external motivation scales, indicating a degree of overlap between these two motivational sources. Thus, high IMS-B men also tend to be highly internally motivated to respond without sexism. In addition, high EMS-B men also tend to be highly externally motivated to respond without sexism.

To explore whether IMS-B and EMS-B and IMS-S and EMS-S were independent constructs, we submitted the items from all four scales to an exploratory factor analysis with an oblimin rotation. Examination of the scree plots revealed four factors. The items from each of the four scales independently loaded onto separate factors. The first factor accounted for 27% of the variance and the five items from the EMS-S all loaded onto this factor. The second factor accounted for 21% of the variance and included the five items from the IMS-S. The third factor accounted for 7% of the variance and included the items from the IMS-B. Finally, the fourth factor

TABLE 3: Correlations Between IMS-S and EMS-S and Related Scales

	α	IMS-S r	EMS-S r
Sexism scales			
Neosexism	.82	-.51**	.31**
Modern sexism	.82	.34**	-.28**
Egalitarianism/traditionalism	.87	.34**	-.13
Hostile sexism	.85	-.41**	.39**
Benevolent sexism	.76	.08	.07
EMS-S		-.05	
Social evaluation scales			
Fear of negative evaluation	.91	-.07	.39**
Interaction anxiety	.89	-.04	.26**
Public self-consciousness	.79	-.04	.23*
Self-presentation scales			
Self-monitoring scale	.75	.10	.07
Social desirability	.73	-.27**	.02
IE-Blacks			
IMS-B	.78	.56**	-.13*
EMS-B	.80	-.09	.64**

NOTE: IMS-S = Internal Motivation to Respond Without Sexism Scale, EMS-S = External Motivation to Respond Without Sexism Scale, IMS-B = Internal Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Toward Blacks Scale, EMS-B = External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Toward Blacks Scale. Modern Sexism and Egalitarianism/Traditionalism Scales are scored such that lower scores indicate higher levels of sexism.

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

accounted for 6% of the variance and included the items from the EMS-B. These findings indicate that the motivation to respond without sexism and prejudice are distinguishable constructs.

In setting up the alternative possibilities concerning the existence of external and internal motivations to respond without sexism, we speculated that these two sources of motivation might be weaker for sexism than they are for racism. To explore this possibility, we examined the average extremity of responses on the scales. Comparison of the mean values of the EMS-S and EMS-B revealed that the average scores on the EMS-B ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.93$) were higher than the average scores on the EMS-S ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 1.77$), $t(413) = 5.23$, $p < .001$. In addition, the mean of the IMS-S ($M = 6.67$, $SD = 1.63$) was lower than the mean of the IMS-B ($M = 7.15$, $SD = 1.57$), $t(413) = 6.53$, $p < .001$. Therefore, both internal and external motivation appear to be somewhat weaker for sexism than they are for racism.

Summary

Examination of the relationships between the IMS-S and EMS-S and a range of other measures indicates that the IMS-S and EMS-S have good convergent and discriminant validity. In general, the pattern of correlations for the IMS-S and EMS-S was consistent with corresponding findings for the IMS-B and EMS-B (Plant &

Devine, 1998). In addition, comparison of the IMS-S and EMS-S with the IMS-B and EMS-B revealed that although the scales are related, they are not redundant measures. A key question remains, however, concerning the extent to which IMS-S and EMS-S play a role in regulating sexist behavior. We address this issue in the final study.

PHASE 3: PREDICTIVE VALIDITY

Having developed two conceptually meaningful, independent, and reliable measures with good convergent and discriminant validity, it was important to demonstrate the significance of the IMS-S and EMS-S for the regulation of sexist behavior, which would help to establish the predictive validity of the scales. To this end, we conducted a study to examine the extent to which people's source of motivation to respond without sexism influences their responses in a situation that either encouraged sexist responses (i.e., confederate's behavior was sexist) or discouraged sexist responses (i.e., confederate's behavior was nonsexist). The current study thereby examined the regulatory significance of the measures across two important and oft-observed social contexts. Situations that discourage the expression of sexism establish a norm within the situation that is wholly consistent with internally motivated people's personal nonsexist standards but inconsistent with the personal standards of those low in internal motivation. For those low in internal motivation, the decision to respond consistently with the situational pressure should be determined by the degree of external motivation; that is, those externally motivated to respond without sexism should publicly respond without sexism in a social situation that discourages the expression of sexism.

In contrast, situations that encourage sexist responses establish a norm that is inconsistent with internally motivated people's nonsexist beliefs but consistent with beliefs of those low in internal motivation. Therefore, the internally motivated must decide between responding consistently with their personally important nonsexist beliefs and conforming to the sexist confederate. To the extent that they are personally dedicated to responding without sexism, internally motivated people should resist pressure to conform with the confederate and respond consistently with their personal standards. Thus, by exploring responses both in situations that discourage and encourage sexism, the current study provided a strong test of the validity of both the IMS-S and EMS-S. In addition, by exploring both types of situations, the current work provides a replication and extension of Plant and Devine's (1998) validation work, which examined the implications of people's motivation to respond without prejudice for their responses in a situation that discouraged the expression of race prejudice.

In the current study, male participants who differed in their motivations to respond without sexism interacted with a male confederate who expressed either approval or disapproval of sexist jokes. Of interest was participants' approval of the jokes in the presence of the confederate as a function of their motivation to respond without sexism and the stance of the confederate. In addition, we explored participants' private approval of the jokes after they were released from any normative pressure exerted by the confederate.

We anticipated that the source of participants' motivation to respond without sexism would influence their responses across the confederate-sexism-level conditions. Participants who are high in internal motivation to respond without sexism were expected to report disapproval of the jokes across the reporting conditions. Because their motivation to respond without sexism reflects a personal dedication to responding consistently with their nonsexist personal beliefs, they should disapprove of the jokes regardless of whether the confederate approves of the jokes and whether their responses are made publicly or privately. In contrast, participants who are only externally motivated to respond without prejudice (i.e., low IMS-S/high EMS-S) should only express disapproval of the sexist jokes when in the presence of a nonsexist audience consistent with Plant and Devine's (1998) findings using the IMS-B and EMS-B. When in the presence of a sexist audience or when in private, they should report approval of the sexist jokes, consistent with their personal beliefs. Finally, those who are low in both IMS-S and EMS-S should consistently respond with moderate approval of the jokes, consistent with their sexist personal beliefs.

Method

Pretesting. Pretesting was conducted to select jokes that would be used in Phase 3. Participants were 47 White men who volunteered to participate in exchange for introductory psychology course credit. They rated a series of 87 jokes gathered from the Internet, 17 of which targeted women. Participants rated how funny they found each joke on a gut level, on a scale from 1 (*not funny at all*) to 7 (*very funny*). Eight sexist jokes were selected that were rated, on average, as moderately funny ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.22$). By selecting moderately amusing jokes, the confederate could convincingly respond more favorably than average or less favorably than average.

Participants and design. Participants were 100 White, male, introductory psychology students who participated for course extra credit. The participants had completed the IMS-S and EMS-S during a mass testing session at the beginning of the semester. Participants in each of the four IMS-S/EMS-S groups were randomly assigned

to the Sexist or Nonsexist confederate condition. In the Sexist condition, the confederate responded positively to the sexist jokes. In the Nonsexist condition, the confederate responded negatively to the sexist jokes. Eight participants (four in each condition) were excluded because they did not believe the cover story.

Procedure. Participants were told that they would be helping to select a comedian for an upcoming campus benefit by evaluating a comedian's list of 16 jokes with another student (actually the confederate). The experimenter explained that they would be reading the jokes aloud to create a situation that would resemble a comedian's joke-telling routine. The experimenter handed the participant a blank joke-rating questionnaire, then gave the confederate a similar sheet, on which scripted responses appeared (hidden from the participant's view). A rigged drawing determined that the confederate would take the role of the joke teller. The confederate always told the jokes and gave his responses to the jokes first to create the situational norm of responding with approval or disapproval of the jokes. Jokes were rated on a scale from 0 (*completely disapprove; would definitely not recommend it*) to 5 (*completely approve; definitely would recommend it*). The manner in which the confederate told the four sexist jokes and the ratings he gave these jokes were scripted to convey either approval or disapproval, depending on the experimental condition. In the Nonsexist condition, the confederate told the jokes in a disgusted tone of voice and gave them unfavorable ratings (an average of 1.25). In the Sexist condition, the confederate laughed as he told the jokes and gave them favorable ratings (an average of 4.75). The dependent measure, joke ratings, was created by averaging the participants' ratings of the four sexist jokes, such that higher scores indicated more approval of the jokes ($\alpha = .90$).

After rating the jokes together, the participant and confederate were told they would be evaluating another comedian's jokes separately and the confederate left the room. The participants privately rated another set of jokes, four of which were sexist (private ratings, $\alpha = .81$). They were told that their responses were completely confidential; the jokes they rated highest would go in to a large pool of approved jokes. Participants completed a manipulation check, which (among other items) asked, "How sexist do you perceive your partner to be?" (1 = *not at all* to 9 = *very*). At the completion of the study, the experimenter probed participants for suspicion, told them the true purpose of the study, and said that because some of the jokes could be considered offensive to certain groups, the retelling of these jokes was not condoned. Both the confederate and the experimenter were blind to participants' IMS-S and EMS-S scores.

Results

Examination of the responses to the manipulation check question revealed that, consistent with the intentions of the manipulation, the participants in the sexist condition rated the confederate as more sexist ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 1.93$) than participants in the nonsexist condition ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 1.09$), $t(91) = 6.10$, $p < .001$.

Participants' ratings of the sexist jokes in private and public each were examined using separate hierarchical regression analyses with IMS-S, EMS-S, and the confederate stance (sexist vs. nonsexist) as predictors. All possible two-way and three-way interactions also were included in the second and third steps of the regression analysis, respectively. The main effects were assessed in the first step and the interactions were examined in the step that they were entered.

The analysis of the joke ratings in the presence of the confederate revealed a main effect of stance such that, overall, participants responded with more positive evaluations of the jokes when the confederate was sexist (i.e., rated the jokes positively) than when he was nonsexist (i.e., rated the jokes negatively), $F(1, 89) = 252.21$, $p < .001$ ($\beta = -.84$). In addition, there was a main effect of IMS-S, such that participants who were internally motivated to respond without sexism gave the jokes more negative ratings overall, $F(1, 89) = 9.50$, $p < .004$ ($\beta = -.16$). However, these main effects were qualified by a three-way IMS-S \times EMS-S \times Stance interaction, $F(1, 85) = 4.54$, $p < .04$ ($\beta = .17$). To explore the nature of this interaction, separate regressions were conducted for the sexist and nonsexist conditions with IMS-S, EMS-S, and their interaction as predictors.

The analysis of the sexist condition only revealed a main effect of IMS-S such that the high IMS-S participants rated the sexist jokes more negatively in the presence of the sexist confederate than did the low IMS-S participants, $F(1, 44) = 4.30$, $p < .05$ ($\beta = -.30$). The analysis of the nonsexist condition revealed a similar main effect of IMS-S, $F(1, 43) = 5.36$, $p < .03$ ($\beta = -.33$). However, this main effect was qualified by an IMS-S \times EMS-S interaction, $F(1, 42) = 6.70$, $p < .02$ ($\beta = .36$). Simple slopes analyses indicated that among the participants who were low in external motivation to respond without sexism, there was a strong effect of IMS-S, such that highly internally motivated participants rated the jokes far more negatively, $F(1, 43) = 12.71$, $p < .002$ ($\beta = -.65$). In contrast, among the participants who were high in external motivation to respond without sexism, internal motivation was unrelated to joke ratings, $F < 1$. Thus, when the confederate was nonsexist, the participants who were either internally or externally motivated to respond without sexism were less likely to approve of the sexist jokes compared to the participants who were neither internally nor externally motivated.

Analysis of the joke ratings in private revealed a main effect of stance such that, overall, participants responded with more positive evaluations of the jokes when the confederate was sexist (i.e., rated the jokes positively) than when he was nonsexist (i.e., rated the jokes negatively), $F(1, 89) = 8.53$, $p < .005$ ($\beta = -.28$). This suggests that the social pressure exerted by the confederate continued to have some influence over the participants even when they responded in private. In addition, there was a main effect of IMS-S, such that participants who were internally motivated to respond without sexism gave the jokes more negative ratings overall, $F(1, 89) = 10.38$, $p < .003$ ($\beta = -.31$).

As in Phase 2, we compared the relative strength of internal and external motivations to respond without racism and sexism, both collected in the mass-testing session. Similar to the Phase 2 results, the average level of EMS-S ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 2.18$) was significantly lower than the average level of the EMS-B ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 2.30$), $t(92) = 2.27$, $p < .03$. As in Phase 2, the mean of the IMS-S ($M = 6.53$, $SD = 2.29$) was lower than the mean of the IMS-B ($M = 7.09$, $SD = 2.14$), $t(92) = 2.89$, $p < .006$. These findings indicate that both internal and external motivation to respond without sexism tend to be weaker on average than the concomitant motivations to respond without prejudice.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The current work examined whether distinct internal and external sources of motivation to respond without sexism exist and influence behavior in meaningful ways. We proposed two alternative possibilities regarding these differential motivations to respond without sexism at the outset of this article. One possibility was that there would exist distinct internal (due to nonsexist personal standards) and external (due to norms against the expression of sexism) motivational sources to respond without sexism that influence men's expressions of sexism, much the same way as these sources exist as motivations to respond without prejudice toward Black people. Alternatively, it was possible that one or the other source of motivation would not be a sufficiently strong motivational force to influence gender-relevant behavior. Specifically, external motivation could be a less potent source of motivation for sexism than racism because the norms against sexism are weaker than those against racism (Cowan & Hodge, 1996; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Rodin et al., 1990). Internal motivation also could be weaker for sexism than racism. People who possess strong positive feelings toward women may not appreciate their own potential for responding in sexist ways and may see little need to be personally motivated to be nonsexist.

The findings from the current studies primarily supported the first possibility, indicating the existence of distinct internal and external motivations to respond without sexism that are similar in nature to the motivations to respond without prejudice toward Black people. In Phases 1 and 2, separate scales (the IMS-S and EMS-S) were developed to tap into these constructs, and across the studies, analyses indicated that the scales measure two independent sources of motivation to respond without sexism. For example, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis on the IMS-S and EMS-S items established that the two-factor solution (internal and external items as separate factors) provides a better fit to the theoretical model than a one-factor solution. In addition, correlations revealed that the IMS-S and EMS-S were unrelated to each other. As such, people can be motivated to respond without sexism primarily for internal reasons, primarily for external reasons, for both types of reasons, or for neither reason. The current work also established that the EMS-S and IMS-S are both internally consistent and possess good convergent and discriminant validity, as evidenced by their sensible relationships with other measures of sexism, self-presentation, self-evaluation, and Plant and Devine's (1998) IMS-B and EMS-B.

The scales' predictive validity also was demonstrated in Phase 3, such that participants' responses in situations that encouraged or discouraged sexist responses were consistent with their source of motivation to respond without sexism, as measured with the IMS-S and EMS-S. Participants who reported high levels of internal motivation to respond without sexism responded negatively to sexist jokes even when in the presence of a confederate who expressed approval of the jokes—a response that is consistent with these individuals' personal standards of nonsexist responding. These findings provide strong support for the validity of the IMS-S. Participants who were low in internal motivation to respond without prejudice reported more approval of the sexist jokes than the high IMS-S participants across the public and private contexts, with one exception. Low IMS-S/high EMS-S participants disapproved of the sexist jokes only when in the presence of a confederate who disapproved of the jokes, consistent with their concern with social disapproval. In addition to providing strong support for the predictive validity of the IMS-S and EMS-S, the findings from this study provide important insight into how people navigate situations where sexist responses are encouraged or discouraged and how their motivation to respond without bias influences their responses in such situations.

In many ways, the scale development and validation phase results for the IMS-S and EMS-S replicated the pattern of results obtained for Plant and Devine's (1998) IMS-B and EMS-B. Because the results and the item

wording for both sets of scales are quite similar, it might seem more parsimonious to develop general scales assessing internal and external motivations to respond without any kind of bias. However, internal and external motivations to respond without sexism and racism are not redundant measures. Although the IMS-B and IMS-S scales were significantly correlated, as were the EMS-B and EMS-S, exploratory factor analyses revealed that the items from the different scales loaded onto separate factors. Furthermore, there are important differences between sexism and racism, which argue for measuring the internal and external motivation for responding without sexism and racism separately.

As noted previously, because women tend to be evaluated more positively than men on both explicit (Eagly et al., 1991) and implicit measures of sexism (Carpenter, 2000), people with stereotypic and biased beliefs about women may not view themselves as sexist. In addition, people feel less guilty if they respond with sexist compared to racist behavior (Czopp & Monteith, 2003). Therefore, being nonsexist may not be as personally important as being nonracist. Consistent with this idea, the mean values of IMS-S were lower than the mean levels of IMS-B. In addition, the average levels of EMS-S tended to be lower than the average levels of EMS-B, perhaps reflecting the fact that norms proscribing racism tend to be more stringent than norms proscribing sexism (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1994).

Because of the similarities and differences between these constructs, future work should examine whether the IMS-S and EMS-S have similar implications for behavior as Plant and Devine's IMS-B and EMS-B. It remains to be seen, for example, whether responses to nonsexist social pressure are similar to responses to nonracist social pressure. Plant and Devine (2001) demonstrated that people's responses to pro-Black pressure varied as a function of their source of motivation to respond without prejudice toward Black people. Specifically, participants who were primarily externally motivated (i.e., low IMS/high EMS) complied with nonprejudiced pressure, consistent with their external motivation, but when the pressure was released, they responded with heightened prejudice. Plant and Devine argued that these participants' reactance against pro-Black social pressure was rooted in feelings of anger resulting from a perception of threats to their personal freedom. In future work, it will be important to explore whether nonsexist social pressure results in a similar backlash among people primarily externally motivated to respond without sexism. Women may face the same threat of backlash against their moves for equality as do Black people. For example, workplace diversity training that outlines strict guidelines regarding sexual harassment might arouse ire in men who resent having rules

imposed on their interactions with female coworkers. Modern sexism scales have been useful for predicting who has positive or negative attitudes toward women. However, it is unclear whether they can predict who will respond with backlash against pressure to respond without sexism. The Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale (LSH; Pryor, 1987) can predict sexual harassment, such that high-LSH men are more likely to sexually harass women than are low-LSH men, especially in contexts in which harassment is permitted. However, it remains to be seen whether the LSH can predict backlash in contexts in which harassment is not condoned. In other words, do high-LSH men experience anger and resentment at constraints against their sexist behavior toward women? Such reactions may be better predicted by the use of the IMS-S and EMS-S together with the LSH. By considering jointly people's internal and external motivation to respond without sexism, it may be possible to identify who among those people with negative attitudes toward women will show affective and behavioral backlash when faced with unwanted pressure to be nonsexist.

Past work using the IMS-B and EMS-B also has proven useful for predicting which individuals are most effective at regulating race bias (Amodio et al., 2003; Devine et al., 2002). Specifically, individuals who are primarily internally motivated to respond without prejudice toward Blacks are more capable of responding consistently with their nonprejudiced standards compared to individuals who are both internally and externally motivated to respond without prejudice. Devine et al. (2002) found that high IMS/low EMS individuals were less likely to respond with bias on difficult-to-control implicit measures compared to individuals in the other IMS/EMS groups. These individuals also perceive less of a need to regulate race bias in interracial interactions compared to high IMS/high EMS individuals (Plant & Devine, 2001, 2004). They are theoretically similar to people who, according to self-determination theory (Ryan & Connell, 1989), possess identified reasons for responding without prejudice (Devine et al., 2002). Such individuals have internalized and integrated their important goals and values into their self-concept and are thus more effective at responding consistently with these goals than people whose goals are determined by both internal as well as external reasons (i.e., introjected; Williams, Grow, Freedman, Ryan, & Deci, 1996; Williams, Rodin, Ryan, Grolnick, & Deci, 1998). In sum, this body of research has shown that high IMS/low EMS individuals are more effective at regulating race bias than are high IMS/high EMS individuals across measures that differ in ease of controllability.

The IMS-S and EMS-S could have similar implications for men's ability to regulate gender bias. For example,

on measures of implicit stereotyping, high IMS/low EMS men may show less evidence of implicit gender stereotyping compared to other IMS/EMS groups. Because their nonsexist goals are highly internalized, they should respond without bias on easy-to-control as well as difficult-to-control measures.⁴ Automatically activated stereotypes can influence men's behavior toward women in real-life interactions. For instance, men who accept the stereotype of women as physically weak may refuse to play with women on coed sports teams. Men who accept traditional gender roles may be less willing to share housework equally with their spouse. Men who implicitly accept the descriptive stereotype of women as lacking in agentic traits (e.g., competence, dominance, leadership) may consistently fail to promote female employees and discriminate against women in cases where the job description requires agentic traits.

Ironically, recent trends toward valuing stereotypically feminine communal traits may have created potential opportunities for job discrimination among women who possess agentic traits (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Rudman and Glick argue that the communal stereotype of women is prescriptive; that is, it establishes a social norm for women to "play nice" and to get along with other people. Agentic women are seen as violating the communal stereotype simply because agency and communality are seen as diametrically opposed. Thus, agentic women may be seen as competent but not as likeable as a similarly agentic male counterpart. As a result, agentic women may experience discrimination when qualifications for employment or promotion include stereotypically "feminine" traits, such as interpersonal skills. Indeed, Rudman and Glick found that agentic women were seen as less socially skilled than similar men and thus were viewed as less likely to be hired for a job that required communal traits. As the trend toward communal job qualifications becomes more prevalent, the potential backlash that faces agentic women may become an increasingly important issue for gender researchers. The IMS-S and EMS-S could help predict which men would be likely to discriminate against women in this way because of their adherence to implicit gender stereotypes.

Conclusion

The current work demonstrates that individuals may be motivated to respond without sexism because of personally important nonsexist standards, because of normative pressures to be nonsexist (particularly on a university campus), or because of both reasons. We developed new measures to assess these distinct motivations to respond without sexism and established the scales' convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity. In the same way that the IMS and EMS have helped

researchers understand the nature of race bias regulation, we hope that the IMS-S and EMS-S will help sexism researchers gain a deeper understanding of how these motivations independently and jointly operate to influence the expression and regulation of gender bias.

APPENDIX IMS-S and EMS-S Scale Items

Internal Motivation Items

- According to my personal values, using stereotypes about women is OK. (reverse-coded)
- I am personally motivated by my beliefs to be nonsexist toward women.
- Being nonsexist toward women is important to my self-concept.
- Because of my personal values, I believe that using stereotypes about women is wrong.
- I attempt to act in nonsexist ways toward women because it is personally important to me.
- I support equal rights for women because it is personally important to me.^a
- Because of my personal beliefs, I think women should be able to go into male-dominated careers without resistance from society.^a
- According to my personal beliefs, women should have as much sexual freedom as men have.^b
- It is personally important to me to let people know that I think women are just as good as men in high-level careers.^b
- According to my personal standards, women are entitled to have as much access to leadership roles as men.^b

External Motivation Items

- Because of today's PC (politically correct) standards I try to appear nonsexist toward women.
- I try to hide any negative thoughts about women in order to avoid negative reactions from others.
- If I acted sexist toward women, I would be concerned that others would be angry with me.
- I attempt to appear nonsexist toward women in order to avoid disapproval from others.
- I try to act in nonsexist ways because of pressure from others.
- I support women's rights because I feel like I have to, in today's PC climate.^a
- I try to treat women and men as equals, because I'm afraid other people would be upset with me if I didn't.^a
- I publicly support women going into male-dominated careers, because I'm afraid of disapproval from others.^b
- Because of social pressure, I try not to let on that I think women are better-suited for their traditional roles.^b
- I don't tell Blonde jokes around people who I think might call me a sexist.^b

NOTE: Items without a superscripted a or b are included on the final scales.

a. Items were part of the 14-item scales, used in both data collection efforts.

b. Items were part of the 20-item scales, used in the first data collection effort.

NOTES

1. The Internal and External Motivation to Respond Without Prejudice Scales (IMS and EMS, respectively) also have been used to examine the responses of non-White participants who were also non-Black (e.g., Asians). However, most of the scale construction work was conducted on all White samples. As a result, we use White in our descriptions here.

2. In the scale development phase, we tested both the terms "nonsexist" ($N = 107$) and "unbiased" ($N = 87$) as a less emotionally charged alternative. Although the convergent and discriminant validities for the "unbiased" and the "nonsexist" versions were highly similar in form and strength, the pattern of correlations was more sensible for the "sexism" wording. Sample 1 consists only of those 107 participants who completed the "nonsexist" form of the questionnaire. The scale used in Sample 2 exclusively uses the term "nonsexist."

3. There were no order effects; therefore, the order variable was not included in the reported analyses.

4. IMS-S and EMS-S may moderate implicit stereotyping but likely would not moderate implicit evaluations, which are typically more positive toward women than toward men.

REFERENCES

- Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Devine, P. G. (2003). Individual differences in the activation and control of affective race bias as assessed by startle eyeblink response and self-report. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 738-753.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (1997). *AMOS User's Guide 3.6*. Chicago: Smallwaters.
- Banaji, M. R., & Hardin, C. (1996). Automatic stereotyping. *Psychological Science, 7*, 136-141.
- Blair, I. V., & Banaji, M. R. (1996). Automatic and controlled processes in stereotype priming. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 1142-1163.
- Blanchard, F. A., Lilly, T., & Vaughan, L. A. (1991). Reducing the expression of racial prejudice. *Psychological Science, 2*, 101-105.
- Carpenter, S. J. (2000). *Implicit gender attitudes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Cowan, G., & Hodge, C. (1996). Judgments of hate speech: The effects of target group, publicness, and behavioral responses of the target. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 355-374.
- Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of Black and White discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin, 87*, 546-563.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 532-544.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5-18.
- Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., Amodio, D. M., Harmon-Jones, E., & Vance, S. L. (2002). The regulation of explicit and implicit race bias: The role of motivations to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 835-848.
- Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than men? An analysis of attitudes, beliefs, and emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 203-216.
- Eberhardt, J. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1994). Affirmative action in theory and practice: Issues of power, ambiguity, and gender versus race. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15*, 201-220.
- Fazio, R. H., Jackson, J. R., Dunton, B. C., & Williams, C. J. (1995). Variability in automatic activation as an unobtrusive measure of racial attitudes: A bona fide pipeline? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 1013-1027.
- Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43*, 522-527.
- Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M.

- Constanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society: Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 173-196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-89). New York: Academic Press.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512.
- Hacker, H. M. (1951). Women as a minority group. *Social Forces, 30*, 60-69.
- Haemmerlie, F. M., & Montgomery, R. L. (1991). Goldberg revisited: Pro-female evaluation bias and changed attitudes toward women by engineering students. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6*, 179-194.
- Kawakami, K., & Dovidio, J. F. (2001). The reliability of implicit stereotyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 212-225.
- Kleugel, J. R., & Smith, E. R. (1986). *Beliefs about inequality: Americans' views about what ought to be*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Larsen, K. S., & Long, E. (1988). Attitudes toward sex-roles: Traditional or egalitarian? *Sex Roles, 19*, 1-12.
- Leary, M. R. (1983a). A brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 371-375.
- Leary, M. R. (1983b). Social anxiousness: The construct and its measurement. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 47*, 66-75.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-126). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Plant, E. A. (2004). Responses to interracial interactions over time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1458-1471.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 811-832.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2001). Responses to other-imposed pro-Black pressure: Acceptance or backlash? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 486-501.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (2004). *Regulatory concerns for interracial interactions: Approaching egalitarianism versus avoiding overt bias*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles, 17*, 269-290.
- Rodin, M. J., Price, J. M., Bryson, J. B., & Sanchez, F. J. (1990). Asymmetry in prejudice attribution. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 26*, 481-504.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 743-762.
- Rudman, L. A., & Kilianski, S. E. (2000). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward female authority. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 1315-1328.
- Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 749-761.
- Schumann, H., Steeh, C., & Bobo, L. (1985). *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sears, D. O., & Kinder, D. R. (1985). Whites' opposition to busing: On conceptualizing and operationalizing group conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 1141-1147.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 199-214.
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 842-849.
- Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33*, 448-457.
- Williams, G. C., Grow, V. M., Freedman, Z., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (1996). Motivational predictors of weight loss and weight-loss maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 115-126.
- Williams, G. C., Rodin, G. C., Ryan, R. M., Grolnick, W. S., & Deci, E. L. (1998). Autonomous regulation and long-term medication adherence in adult outpatients. *Health Psychology, 17*, 269-276.

Received August 25, 2004

Revision accepted January 1, 2005