

Personality, Authoritarianism, Social Dominance, and Ambivalent Sexism: A Mediational Model

Andrew N. Christopher

Albion College

Kevin L. Zabel*

University of Tennessee

Drew E. Miller

Albion College

*Kevin Zabel; Department of Psychology; Austin Peay Building; University of Tennessee; Knoxville, TN 37996. kzabel@utk.edu (e-mail).

ABSTRACT - We examined how facets of the Big Five personality factors of agreeableness and openness predicted hostile and benevolent sexism toward women and how two forms of conservative ideology, social dominance orientation (SDO) and right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), mediated these relationships. Participants ($N = 296$) were recruited from an online survey service, and completed measures of agreeableness and openness facets, SDO and RWA, and hostile and benevolent sexism. Partially supporting hypotheses, two hierarchical regressions revealed that the agreeableness facet of trust and openness facet of values were each significant predictors of both hostile and benevolent sexism. Additional analyses utilizing percentile bootstrapping indicated that, as expected, SDO mediated the predictive strengths of trust and values in hostile sexism, whereas RWA mediated the predictive strength of values in benevolent sexism. Discussion encompasses the theoretical implications of linking personality, conservative ideology, and ambivalent sexism.

A formidable body of literature has investigated sexism toward women. Whereas initial research studies tended to operationalize sexism towards women as antipathy, recent research has focused on more subtle forms of sexism toward women. Similar to findings in the realm of racial prejudice, accumulating evidence suggests that contemporary forms of sexism exist in blatant and subjectively negative, as well as more subtle and subjectively positive forms. To exemplify these complementary expressions of sexism, Glick and Fiske (1996, 1997) proposed two forms of sexism in their theory of ambivalent sexism, describing hostile and benevolent sexism as distinctive, but equally detrimental forms of prejudice toward women.

Hostile sexism is a type of prejudice in which women are viewed in a blatantly negative manner. Such sexism stems from a desire for a hierarchy in which men are dominant to women and from a resentment of women who try to gain power relative to men. An example of hostile sexism is failing to hire a more qualified woman over a less qualified man. In contrast, *benevolent* sexism is a type of prejudice in which women are viewed in a subjectively positive, yet gender role reinforcing and stereotypically-

restrictive manner. For example, benevolently sexist people believe that women are pure and should be protected by men.

Previous research (Christopher & Wojda, 2008; Sibley, Wilson, & Duckitt, 2007) has investigated forms of conservative ideology, specifically social dominance orientation (SDO) and right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), and how they predict hostile and benevolent sexism toward women. Although conservative ideology has its roots in personality (Sibley & Duckitt, 2008), links between personality, conservative ideology, and ambivalent sexism have not yet been reliably established. In the current research, we examined the unexplored questions of how hostile and benevolent sexism were rooted in the more precise facets of two Big Five personality factors (i.e., agreeableness and openness), and how these relationships were funneled through two types of conservative ideology: SDO and RWA.

Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism

According to Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle (1994), SDO is a "...general attitudinal orientation toward intergroup relations, reflecting whether one generally prefers such relations to be equal versus hierarchical, that is, ordered along a superior-inferior dimension" (p. 742), whereas RWA consists of displaying high degrees of deference to established authority, aggression toward societal out-groups when authorities permit such aggression, and support for traditional values (Kreindler, 2005). Duckitt (2001; Duckitt & Sibley, 2010) proposed a dual-process motivational model of prejudice that involves SDO and RWA. Specifically, SDO and RWA have different underlying motivational goals. People high in SDO tend to derogate members of out-groups with which they are in actual or perceived competition. People high in RWA tend to view the world as a dangerous and threatening place in which security and societal order must be maintained. Indeed, there is an abundance of empirical support for this distinction.

For example, high SDO endorsement has been negatively associated with endorsement of social welfare programs, progressive racial policies, and women's rights, all of which favor increasing equality among social groups (Pratto et al., 1994). Regarding ambivalently sexist attitudes, Christopher and Mull (2006) found SDO was related to hostile sexism but not to benevolent sexism, a finding replicated in subsequent research (Christopher & Wojda, 2008; Sibley et al., 2007). The SDO-hostile sexism link is consistent with the SDO emphasis on an intergroup hierarchy because hostile sexism may result from supporting social hierarchies that maintain male dominance over women.

In comparison, individuals high in RWA wish to preserve societal order and express prejudice against groups such as homosexuals (Whitley, 1999) that violate traditional values endorsed by established authorities. Regarding ambivalently sexist attitudes, Christopher and Mull (2006) found RWA was related to benevolent but not hostile sexism, and this finding was replicated in subsequent research (Christopher & Wojda, 2008; Sibley et al., 2007). The RWA-benevolent sexism link is consistent with the RWA emphasis on adherence to traditional values because benevolent sexism may serve the function of preserving social traditions that, in turn, reinforce gender inequalities.

Personality Factors, Prejudice, and Sexism

Previous research has tended to focus on one particular aspect of ambivalent sexism (i.e., hostile) when studying the relationships between Big Five personality factors (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and sexism. For example, to assess sexist attitudes, Ekehammar and Akrami (2007) used the Swedish Modern Sexism Scale (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2000), a two-factor scale which consists of items such as "Women are generally not very talented," and "The women's movement serves no purpose and should be abolished." These items appear to tap subjectively negative attitudes toward women that are more hostilely sexist than benevolently sexist in nature.

This criticism notwithstanding, prior research (Ekehammar, Akrami, Gylje, & Zakrisson, 2004) has found consistent negative links between the personality factors of agreeableness and openness regarding generalized prejudice and the Swedish Modern Sexism Scale (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007; Ekehammar et al., 2004). Supporting the nature of these links, individuals low in *agreeableness* tend to demonstrate a lack of concern for others and social harmony, as well as distrust toward others' intentions, whereas individuals low in *openness* tend to be resistant to change and to new experiences. In addition to these associations, Ekehammar et al. (2004) found that agreeableness was negatively correlated with SDO but not with RWA (see also Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007), whereas openness was negatively correlated with RWA but not with SDO, suggesting that SDO and RWA, in addition to predicting different forms of sexism (Christopher & Mull, 2006; Sibley et al., 2007), may be rooted in different Big Five factors.

Personality Facets, Conservative Ideology, and Sexism

Relationships between the smaller facets of agreeableness and openness with regard to sexism and generalized prejudice have also been demonstrated in previous research (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007). Each of the Big Five personality factors are composed of six smaller facets (Costa & McCrae, 1992), which represent the more specific dimensions of each factor. Because facets are more precise dimensions of their overarching factors, they often afford a more exact understanding as to which specific dimensions of Big Five personality factors may be driving the predictive ability of personality factors in a variety of constructs and outcomes (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007). The factor of agreeableness is composed of six more precise facets. *Trust* reflects one's disposition to believe others are honest and well-intentioned, *straightforwardness* refers to one's tendency to be frank and sincere, *altruism* reflects one's active concern for the welfare of others, *compliance* reflects one's tendency to avoid interpersonal conflict and inhibit aggression, *modesty* reflects one's tendency to be humble and self-effacing, and *tender-mindedness* reflects one's tendency to hold attitudes of sympathy and concern for others (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

The factor of openness is also composed of six facets. *Fantasy* concerns one's preference to create for themselves a more interesting inner-world; *aesthetics* entails one's deep appreciation for art and beauty; *feelings* reflects one's receptivity to inner feelings and a high regard for personal emotion; *action* refers to one's willingness to try different activities, go new places, or try unusual foods; *ideas* refers to one's active

pursuit of intellectual interests and willingness to try new, unconventional ideas; and *values* refers to one's willingness to reexamine social, political, and religious values.

Specific facets of agreeableness and openness have consistently predicted several forms of prejudice. For example, within a sample of Swedish students, values ($\beta = -.33$) and tender-mindedness ($\beta = -.38$) were the two facets most predictive of generalized prejudice (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007). In a second study, using scores on the Swedish Modern Sexism Scale as the criterion, again, only values ($\beta = -.28$) and tender-mindedness ($\beta = -.35$) predicted sexism.

In considering agreeableness facets, the relationship between tender-mindedness and sexism is buttressed by Duckitt, Wagner, du Plessis, and Birum's (2002) findings that tough-mindedness, conceptually the opposite of tender-mindedness, was positively correlated ($r = .28$) with a composite measure of outgroup prejudice toward several groups. It is important to note, however, that toughmindedness predicted prejudicial outgroup attitudes that were subjectively negative in nature within Duckitt et al.'s (2002) work. Similarly, tender-mindedness predicted sexist attitudes that appear to be collectively more hostilely sexist than benevolently sexist in Ekehammar and Akrami's (2007) work. Thus, in the current study, we expected that tender-mindedness would negatively predict hostilely sexist attitudes toward women. Moreover, given tender-mindedness's link to SDO endorsement (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006) and the well-established link between SDO and hostilely sexist attitudes toward women, we expected that SDO would mediate the relationship between tender-mindedness and hostilely sexist attitudes.

In considering the other agreeableness facets, empirical work suggests that the facet of trust may also be important in the prediction of hostile sexism. Trusting people have a disposition to believe that others are honest and well-intentioned, and not to be skeptical of others. Individuals skeptical of individuals' intentions are likely to be wary of other groups, have a need for social hierarchy, and more strongly endorse SDO. This negative relationship between trust and SDO has been supported in previous research (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006). When considering sexist attitudes, this endorsement of SDO would likely propagate in feelings that women are antagonistic toward men, as well as out to usurp their societally-bestowed power. Indeed, given the established SDO-hostile sexism link, we expected that trust would negatively predict hostilely-sexist attitudes toward women, and that SDO would mediate this relationship.

In examining the facets of openness, the relationship between values and sexism (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007) is buttressed by empirical work that found that values predicted both SDO and RWA (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006). Moreover, values was the only personality facet to underlie both SDO and RWA. The unique dual-underlying of SDO and RWA by values makes sense, in that values concerns the reexamination of social and religious values, both of which are largely based in principles of SDO and RWA, respectively. Given that values appears to underlie SDO and RWA, links between values and both prejudiced and sexist attitudes (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007), and established SDO-hostile and RWA-benevolent sexism links, we expected that values would underlie both hostilely- and benevolently-sexist attitudes toward women, and that SDO and RWA would mediate these relationships, respectively.

Overview and Hypotheses

The current study was unique in that it investigated the predictive ability of agreeableness and openness personality facets in the more contemporary forms of ambivalent sexism, and the mediational roles of SDO and RWA in personality-sexism relationships to better understand the ways by which personality may underlie subjectively different forms of sexism via types of conservative ideology. To our knowledge, no research has examined how the more precise Big Five personality facets underlie ambivalently sexist attitudes. We chose to examine only the agreeableness and openness personality facets because research (e.g., Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008) suggests these two factors are most strongly related to sexism and prejudice. We examined the extent to which SDO and RWA mediated personality facet-sexism relationships using bootstrapping procedures (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). We expected the agreeableness facets of tender-mindedness and trust, as well as the openness facet of values, would be predictive of hostile sexism, and that SDO would mediate these relationships, whereas values would be predictive of benevolent sexism, and that RWA would mediate this relationship.

Method

Participants

An online survey service (<http://www.StudyResponse.org>) obtained responses from 296 U. S. residents. Respondents received \$8 for their participation. Our sample consisted of 141 women and 155 men, with ages ranging from 22 to 74 years ($M = 39.81$ yrs, $SD = 11.01$ yrs).

Measures

Openness and Agreeableness. We used Costa and McCrae's (1992) NEO-PI-R measure of the Big Five Personality Factors and their facets. Forty-eight items measured agreeableness (8 items for each facet) and another 48 items measured openness (8 items for each facet). Participants rated the degree to which statements were characteristic of them using a 1 (*not at all descriptive of me*) to 7 (*extremely descriptive of me*) range. Agreeableness facet α s ranged from .65 to .81, with a mean α of .73. Openness facet α s ranged from .72 to .81, with a mean α of .77.

Social Dominance Orientation. Adherence to SDO ($\alpha = 0.93$) was measured with Pratto et al.'s (1994) 16-item scale. Participants indicated how negatively or positively they felt about statements such as "Some groups are simply inferior to others," using a 0 (*very strongly negative*) to 8 (*very strongly positive*) response range.

Right-wing Authoritarianism. RWA attitudes ($\alpha = 0.75$) were measured with a 15-item scale (Zakrisson, 2005). Participants used a 0 (*very strongly disagree*) to 8 (*very strongly agree*) response range to respond to a variety of opinions, such as "Our society would be better off if we showed tolerance and understanding for untraditional values and opinions" (reverse-coded).

Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. We used the 22-item Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) to measure hostile ($\alpha = 0.84$) and benevolent ($\alpha = 0.84$) sexism (11 items each). Participants used a 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) response range to respond to a variety of statements such as "Women seek to gain power by getting

control over men" (hostile sexism) and "Women should be cherished and protected by men" (benevolent sexism).

Demographic Information. We collected data about participant sex, age, educational level, socioeconomic status (SES), and political leaning. To assess educational level, we used an 8-point scale ranging from 1 (*some high school*) to 8 (*terminal degree*). To assess SES, we used a 1-item measure, "In your overall estimation, how financially well-off is your household?" Responses ranged from 1 (*much worse off than most families*) to 5 (*much better off than most families*). To assess political leaning ($\alpha = 0.88$), we used Pratto et al.'s (1994) three-item measure. Respondents provided their views on foreign policy, social, and economic issues using a 1 (*very liberal*) to 7 (*very conservative*) response range.

Results

Zero-Order Correlations

Descriptive statistics for and correlations among all study variables appear in Table 1. Adhering to analytic techniques used in similar research (Ekehammar et al., 2004), we used an alpha level of .01 in all analyses. Regarding correlations relevant to mediational hypotheses, the agreeableness facet of tender-mindedness was negatively correlated with hostile sexism and SDO. Similarly, the agreeableness facet of trust was negatively correlated with hostile sexism and SDO. Finally, the openness facet of values was negatively correlated with benevolent sexism and RWA, as well as hostile sexism and SDO.

Personality Facets as Predictors of Hostile and Benevolent Sexism

We conducted two hierarchical regressions, the first with hostile and the second with benevolent sexism as the criterion variable, to derive personality facet predictors of hostile and benevolent sexism. In the first regression analysis, participant age, sex, political leaning, educational level, and SES were simultaneously entered in Step 1. In Step 2, as Glick and Fiske (1996, 1997) recommended, benevolent sexism was entered. In Step 3, the six agreeableness and six openness facets were entered in a stepwise fashion. Stepwise regression is an appropriate procedure to use when the goal is to select variables to use in subsequent models (Wang & Jain, 2003). The second regression mirrored that of the first regression, except that benevolent sexism was entered as the criterion variable and hostile sexism in Step 2.

The first regression revealed that, as expected, trust ($\Delta R^2 = .074$, $\beta = -.280$, $p < .001$) and values ($\Delta R^2 = .031$, $\beta = -.217$, $p < .001$) significantly predicted hostile sexism. Interestingly, tender-mindedness did not significantly predict hostile sexism ($\beta = .021$, $p = .72$) and thus was not included in subsequent analyses. Surprisingly, the second regression revealed that trust ($\Delta R^2 = .042$, $\beta = .218$, $p < .001$) significantly predicted benevolent sexism. As expected, values ($\Delta R^2 = .028$, $\beta = -.204$, $p < .001$) significantly predicted benevolent sexism. No other facets were significantly predictive of either hostile or benevolent sexism.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Between Study Variables

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Hostile Sexism	2.30	.92	---									
2. Benevolent Sexism	2.48	.84	.53	---								
3. SDO	2.60	1.58	.48	.24	---							
4. RWA	3.85	1.07	.43	.45	.34	---						
5. Altruism	5.20	.98	-.25	-.03	-.51	.03	---					
6. Compliance	4.20	.94	-.32	-.09	-.46	-.06	.47	---				
7. Modesty	4.58	.98	-.29	-.15	-.48	.01	.47	.47	---			
8. Straightforwardness	4.79	.98	-.34	-.14	-.53	-.06	.63	.53	.55	---		
9. Tender-Mindedness	4.78	.83	-.25	-.03	-.53	-.08	.61	.50	.40	.35	---	
10. Trust	4.40	1.00	-.29	.04	-.43	-.16	.50	.48	.23	.30	.56	---
11. Actions	3.98	.89	-.28	-.24	-.26	-.32	.15	.14	.03	.04	.24	.29
12. Aesthetics	4.35	1.16	-.16	.00	-.25	-.20	.24	.08	-.03	.02	.42	.29
13. Fantasy	4.50	.99	-.32	-.27	-.30	-.39	.22	.01	.06	.13	.19	.17
14. Feelings	5.02	.97	-.30	-.12	-.36	-.12	.53	.13	.19	.30	.49	.33
15. Ideas	4.94	1.03	-.19	-.08	-.26	-.25	.38	.06	.04	.19	.31	.25
16. Values	4.66	1.01	-.49	-.41	-.48	-.67	.27	.27	.17	.32	.24	.25
17. Participant Age	39.81	11.01	-.14	-.10	-.15	.07	.24	.13	.23	.25	.09	.11
18. Participant Sex ^a	---	---	.31	.27	.16	.04	-.20	-.08	-.18	-.20	-.16	.00
19. Participant Political Leaning ^b	3.79	1.49	.20	.14	.15	.45	.04	-.03	.15	.09	-.08	-.12
20. Participant Education	4.84	1.68	-.02	-.11	.01	-.26	-.14	-.06	-.24	-.16	.00	.09
21. Participant SES	3.25	.99	.11	.06	.26	-.14	-.28	-.14	-.33	-.36	-.10	.03

Note. Correlations stronger than or equal to .16 are significant at $p < .01$ ^a = Female = 0; Male = 1 ^b = Higher scores indicate a more conservative political leaning

Table 1 cont...

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
1. Hostile Sexism											
2. Benevolent Sexism											
3. SDO											
4. RWA											
5. Altruism											
6. Compliance											
7. Modesty											
8. Straightforwardness											
9. Tender-Mindedness											
10. Trust											
11. Actions	---										
12. Aesthetics	.47	---									
13. Fantasy	.44	.48	---								
14. Feelings	.37	.52	.45	---							
15. Ideas	.48	.56	.52	.45	---						
16. Values	.38	.23	.46	.36	.34	---					
17. Participant Age	-.11	-.09	.02	.15	-.05	.06	---				
18. Participant Sex ^a	-.13	-.12	-.11	-.36	-.04	-.19	.05	---			
19. Participant Political Leaning ^b	-.17	-.13	-.17	-.01	-.05	-.33	.14	-.06	---		
20. Participant Education	.12	.09	.00	-.05	.10	.11	-.12	.20	-.09	---	
21. Participant SES	.01	-.04	-.06	-.16	.04	-.11	-.20	.14	-.08	.29	---

Note. Correlations stronger than or equal to .16 are significant at $p < .01$ ^a = Female = 0; Male = 1 ^b = Higher scores indicate a more conservative political leaning

Mediational Roles of SDO and RWA

Having identified two significant facet predictors of both hostile and benevolent sexism (i.e., trust and values), we next used bootstrapping procedures (Preacher & Hayes, 2008) to determine the mediational roles of SDO and RWA in each relationship.

Bootstrapping allows simultaneous testing of two mediators in predictor-criterion relationships. We used an SPSS Macro (available for download at quantpsy.org) that Preacher and Hayes (2008) created to conduct all bootstrapping procedures.

We conducted four multiple regression analyses, using ordinary least squared regression and percentile bootstrapping, to investigate the strengths of trust and values in predicting hostile and benevolent sexism and the mediating roles of SDO and RWA in diminishing these predictive strengths. In each regression, the same demographic variables (i.e., participant age, sex, political leaning, SES, education level), two mediational variables (i.e., SDO, RWA), number of boot iterations (1000), and confidence intervals (99%) were entered. In the first two regressions, hostile sexism was the criterion, and trust and values were entered separately as predictors in each regression. In the second set of regressions, benevolent sexism was the criterion, and trust and values were entered separately as predictors in each regression.

Regarding hostile sexism, confidence intervals indicated that as expected, SDO mediated the predictive strengths of trust (-.1813 to -.0129) and values (-.1970 to -.0295), whereas RWA (-.0778 to .0195; -.2283 to .0023) did not. Regarding benevolent sexism, confidence intervals indicated that, as expected, RWA mediated the predictive strength of values (-.3141 to -.0882), whereas SDO did not (-.0785 to .0831). No mediational effect of RWA (-.0964 to .0213) or SDO (-.1241 to .0328) regarding the relationship between trust and benevolent sexism was revealed.

Discussion

Results support previous research (e.g., Christopher & Wojda, 2008; Sibley et al., 2007) indicating that hostile sexism is rooted in SDO and benevolent sexism is rooted in RWA. Furthermore, results are congruent with previous research (e.g., Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008) regarding the ability of the agreeableness and openness personality factors and facets to predict prejudicial attitudes. Findings support links between personality and sexism via SDO and RWA in previous research (e.g., Ekehammar et al., 2004), but do so from a facet-level personality perspective and specifically with regard to ambivalently sexist attitudes.

The predictive ability of values in hostile sexism is congruent with Ekehammar and Akrami's (2007) finding that values predicted modern sexism toward women (which we argue is more indicative of hostilely than benevolently sexist attitudes). Furthermore, the associations of values and SDO, as well as SDO and hostile sexism, are congruent with Akrami and Ekehammar (2006) and Sibley et al.'s (2007) findings, respectively. In addition to predicting hostilely sexist attitudes through SDO, results also indicated, as expected, that values predicted benevolent sexism, and that RWA mediated this relationship. The associations of values and RWA, as well as RWA and benevolent sexism, are congruent with Akrami and Ekehammar's (2006) and Sibley et al.'s (2007) findings, respectively. These findings meaningfully extend previous research by

simultaneously examining the extent to which agreeableness and openness facets predict ambivalently sexist attitudes toward women via conservative ideology.

As expected, we found trust was predictive of hostile sexism, and that this relationship was mediated by SDO. The trust-hostile sexism relationship is congruent with the reasoning that those cynical and skeptical toward others may think that women, as well as other historically-disadvantaged groups are out to usurp societally-bestowed positions. The mediational role of SDO in the trust-hostile sexism relationship is consistent with previous research (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006) and speaks to the group hierarchy orientation that is especially important in producing blatantly disparaging attitudes toward groups threatening the status quo. In this case, the blatantly disparaging attitudes were toward women, and took the form of hostilely sexist attitudes. Moreover, the fact that SDO and RWA each mediated the relationships between personality facets and hostile and benevolent sexism, respectively, supports previously established SDO-hostile sexism and RWA-benevolent sexism links.

Whereas prior research (e.g., Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007) found that tender-mindedness predicted prejudice and sexism, our data detected no such relationship. In addition to detecting no effect of tender-mindedness in hostile sexism, another surprising aspect of the current study was that trust positively predicted benevolent sexism. The positive association of trust with benevolent sexism is in line with the interdependent nature of the relationship between men and women, and suggests that individuals with a high disposition to trust others may tend to express prejudice toward women in benevolently sexist manners that, although apparently subjectively positive, act to reinforce stereotypical gender roles. However, individuals low in trust may be skeptical of others in general and motivated to see group distinctions, and thus tend to express prejudice in subjectively negative, hostile forms toward women. We used analytic techniques identical to those used in prior research to identify significant facet-level predictors of hostile and benevolent sexism. However, it is possible that the lack of detecting tender-mindedness as a predictor of hostile sexism, or the predictive ability of trust in benevolent sexism, is a function of measure and age differences between our sample and those utilized in previous research.

For instance, Ekehammar and Akrami (2007) used a measure devised for Swedish respondents that seemed to tap into hostile sexism better than benevolent sexism. Furthermore, it is quite possible that when examining specific forms of prejudice, measurement issues are particularly important. For example, Sibley and Duckitt (2008) found in their meta-analysis on personality and prejudice that agreeableness was more strongly related to general prejudice than to specific forms of prejudice. Thus, the specificity of prejudices appears to be an important consideration in which personality factors and facets may underlie prejudicial attitudes.

The current study extends Ekehammar and Akrami's (2007) findings of openness and agreeableness factors and facets predicting sexism and generalized prejudice, as well as RWA and SDO (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006), to an American sample. Our findings deviate most notably from Ekehammar and Akrami's (2007) in that tender-mindedness did not predict sexist attitudes, and trust predicted both hostilely and benevolently sexist attitudes toward women. Our findings suggest that as people age, tender-mindedness becomes a less prominent predictor of sexist attitudes. However, that personality

predicted sexism in our relatively older sample attests to its importance in predicting prejudice. Findings are congruent with past research (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2007) indicating that values is a strong and consistent predictor of prejudice. Thus, across two Western nationalities and age groups, values appears to be an important predictor of prejudice in general and both hostile and benevolent sexism in particular. However, the cross-sectional and correlational nature of this study necessarily limits causal conclusions.

Future research should extend our work by looking at moderators (e.g., gender, religiosity, age) of the well-established SDO-hostile sexism and RWA-benevolent sexism links, as well as the personality facet, conservative ideology, and ambivalent sexism links identified in the current study. Moreover, research should extend our work by examining personality and ideological predictors of ambivalence toward men (see Glick & Fiske, 1999; Glick & Whitehead, 2010), cognitions and behaviors resulting from ambivalent sexism toward men, and moderators of conservative ideology-ambivalent sexism toward men links. Research on ambivalence toward men is rare compared with that of ambivalence toward women. However, such work is needed to gain insights into the complex relationships between personality, ideology, and sexism.

Author Note

1. Portions of this research were presented at the 23rd Annual Convention of the Association for Psychological Science, May 2011, in Washington, D.C., as well as the 15th Biennial Convention of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences, July 2011, in London, United Kingdom.

References

- Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2006). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Their roots in the big five personality factors and facets. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 27, 117-126.
- Christopher, A. N., & Mull, M. S. (2006). Conservative ideology and ambivalent sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30, 223-230.
- Christopher, A. N., & Wojda, M. R. (2008). Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, sexism, and prejudice toward women in the workforce. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 65-73.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 33, pp. 41-113). New York: Academic Press.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2010). Personality, ideology, prejudice, and politics: A dual-process motivational model. *Journal of Personality*, 78, 1861-1893.
- Duckitt, J., Wagner, C., du Plessis, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 75-93.

- Ekehammar, B., & Akrami, N. (2007). Personality and prejudice: From big five personality factors to facets. *Journal of Personality*, 75, 1-27.
- Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2000). Development and validation of Swedish classical and modern sexism scales. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 41, 307-314.
- Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., Gylje, M., Zakrisson, I. (2004). What matters most to prejudice: Big Five Personality, social dominance, or right-wing authoritarianism? *European Journal of Personality*, 18, 463-482.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 119-135.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 519-536.
- Glick, P., & Whitehead, J. (2010). Hostility toward men and the perceived stability of male dominance. *Social Psychology*, 41, 177-185.
- Kreindler, S. A. (2005). A dual group processes model of individual differences in prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 90-107.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891.
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 248-279.
- Sibley, C. G., Wilson, M. S., & Duckitt, J. (2007). Antecedents of men's hostile and benevolent sexism: The dual roles of social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 160-172.
- Wang, G. C. S., & Jain, C. L. (2003). *Regression analysis: Modeling and forecasting*. Flushing, NY: Graceway Publishing Company.
- Whitley, B. E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 126-134.
- Zakrisson, I. (2005). Construction of a short version of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 863-872.