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Latine cultural values may present elements of hostile and benevolent sexism that overlap with patriarchal gender expectations that maintain gender norms. Despite extensive research linking hostile and benevolent sexism with negative outcomes, few studies have focused on Latine samples. Understanding how Latines perceive sexist behavior is an important step towards addressing the negative effects of sexism in Latine communities. This study examined the relationship between Latine cultural values and perceptions of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior. Participants were presented with fourteen scenarios reflecting hostile and benevolent sexist behavior and were asked to rate these scenarios on a variety of traits, including perceptions of sexism and characteristics of caring. The findings suggest that Latine men and women may be more likely to perceive benevolent sexist behaviors as less sexist and more caring than hostile sexist behaviors. Latine women may also be more likely than Latine men to identify sexist behaviors as sexist, regardless of sexism type. Additionally, Latine cultural values were found to be associated with how hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors are perceived. These findings lend support to previous conceptualizations of Ambivalent Sexism Theory and Chicana feminist theories which suggests that hostile and benevolent sexism function within Latine cultural values to uphold gender divisions. This study contributes to this conceptualization by addressing the role of Latine cultural values in how sexist interactions are perceived by Latine men and women and highlights the strengths within these values that can be used to address issues of sexism within Latine communities.
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Latine Cultural Values and Ambivalent Sexism: Perceptions of Sexism Through a Latine Lens

In a patriarchal society such as the United States, women have historically experienced sexism (Klonoff & Ladrine, 1995) and instances of gender discrimination and harassment continue to be widespread (SteelFisher et al., 2019). While recent events such as the #MeToo movement have increased the public’s awareness of sexism that is experienced by women more broadly (Pew Research Center, 2018), the experiences of BIPOC women, including Latine women remain overlooked (Onwaychi-Willig, 2018). Despite belonging to the largest minority group in the United States, research on sexism has often excluded the experience of Latine women (Morardi & DeBlaere, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). A recent study conducted by SteelFisher and colleagues (2019) examining the reported experiences of gender discrimination and harassment of women in the U.S. found that Latine women were more likely to experience gender-related discrimination than non-Latine White women in several domains including education, health care, housing, political participation, and court systems. It has also been well documented that experiences of sexism and gender discrimination are associated with negative mental health outcomes (Becker & Swim, 2011; Chan et al., 2008; Klonoff et al., 2000; Kreiger et al., 2006; Moradi & Subich, 2004) with Latine women being particularly at risk for poorer mental health and are less likely to receive mental health support (Shattell et al., 2008). Being able to detect these instances of discrimination may be necessary for women to effectively respond to and cope with sexist experiences (Kirkman & Oswald, 2020) and given the continued growth of the Latine population in
the U.S., there is a critical need for research to examine the ways in which Latine women perceive and experience sexism.

**Cultural Factors**

Recent work has shown that understanding the multi-faceted levels of oppression experienced by Latine individuals in the U.S. is essential to understanding the constructs that make Latine women vulnerable to discrimination (Szlyk et al., 2019). Utilizing an intersectional theoretical framework, Chicana feminist theories posit that in addition to experiencing patriarchal gender oppression within the U.S. more broadly, Latine women may also experience gender oppression within their own communities through Latine cultural values (Bermúdez et al., 2015; Garcia, 1989). That is, cultural values such as Marianismo, Machismo, Caballerismo, and Familismo can present elements of sexism and emphasize conformity to traditional gender roles that maintain an imbalance of power through rigid gender divisions. For example, the feminine cultural value of Marianismo emphasizes the centrality of family and being submissive, chaste, and dependent (Castillo et al., 2010) as well as emphasizing the importance of maintaining family and romantic relationships above one’s own needs. Similarly, Machismo and Caballerismo reflect two traditional masculine gender roles within Latine culture. The Latine cultural value of Machismo emphasizes virility, independence, physical strength, and sexual prowess (Marín et al., 1997), and Caballerismo refers to a traditional chivalric code of masculinity that emphasizes respect, expectations to provide for the family, and emotional connectedness (Arciniega et al., 2008). According to Bermúdez and colleagues (2015), Familismo is a Latine cultural value that is tied closely to Machismo and Marianismo and it is considered to be the basis of family structure across many Latine
communities (Garcia-Preto, 1996; Hernandez, 1996; Falicov, 1998). Bermúdez and colleagues (2015) define Familismo as the belief that family is central in one’s life and highlights the importance of family cohesion, loyalty, love, and commitment. Familismo is tied closely to Machismo and Marianismo in that it outlines the differing and hierarchical familial roles and responsibilities for Latine men and women. Familismo captures the Machismo sentiment in that men are expected to assume the dominant role in the family, serving as protectors and providers. Familismo also embodies aspects of Marianismo in that woman are expected to be submissive to men and attend to household responsibilities (Bermúdez et al., 2015).

Like patriarchal notions of gender in the U.S., Latine cultural values are reinforced by culture and socialization where individuals who do not meet or deviate from these expectations are punished and those who do meet these expectations are rewarded (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004). For example, in their study examining the gender-based socialization practices of Latine families, Raffaelli and Ontai found that Latine girls experienced stricter rules than their male peers. One participant highlighted the experience of her father becoming angry with her for being unable to prepare food as well as her sisters, as it reflected her inability to meet the expectations of Latine women. Other men and women in their study described experiences of being directed to act ladylike, manly, or macho, all of which are phrases that may work to reinforce conformity to gender-based expectations.

**Perceptions of Ambivalent Sexism**

Theoretically, this Latine gender dynamic has similar parallels to Ambivalent Sexism Theory which outlines that sexist attitude are comprised of hostile sexism that
punishes gender role deviance, and benevolent sexism that rewards gender role adherence (Glick & Fisk, 1996). According to Glick and Fiske (1996), hostile sexism is characterized by overt, negative, and prejudicial beliefs that are directed towards women, especially those who deviate from traditional gender roles. Examples include the belief that women seek power by gaining control over men, and the belief that women tease men sexually in order to gain power or control. Benevolent sexism on the other hand is a more subtle form of sexism that rewards women for staying in gender traditional roles and reflects heterosexual intimacy, protective paternalism, and complimentary gender differences (Glick & Fiske, 1996). More specifically, heterosexual intimacy romanticizes women as both objects of affection and as romantic partners and reflects the desire for intimacy and sexual reproduction with women. Protective paternalism refers to the attitudes and behaviors that justify the patriarchy and conceptualizes women as not fully competent adults who are in need of protection. Consequently, protective paternalism reflects beliefs that women are to be loved and protected which legitimizes the need for a superordinate male figure as a protector and provider. Benevolent sexism also includes the belief of complimentary gender differences which hold that men and women have traits the complement each other, justifying the traditional division of social roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996). While hostile and benevolent sexism may seem to be at odds, they are positively correlated and serve to maintain the gender status quo, with hostile sexism functioning as the mechanism that punishes gender role deviance while benevolent sexism serves to rewards gender role adherence for both men and women (Glick & Fiske, 1999).
Previous research examining hostile and benevolent sexism in the U.S. has found that people understand acts of hostile sexism to be problematic, however most people are unaware of how benevolent sexism contributes to gender discrimination (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2000). Benevolent sexism is an effective tool in maintaining gender inequality as it undermines women’s resistance towards discrimination and provides women with a reason to maintain the current gender status quo (Jackman, 1994; Jost & Kay, 2005). In a study examining the reactions of women exposed to acts of benevolent sexism within a sample of women from southern Spain, exposure to benevolent sexism was found to be positively associated with women’s acceptance of paternalistic discrimination (Moya et al., 2007). Specifically, the more women endorsed benevolent sexism the more they were likely to be accepting of affectionate attitudes, condescension, and praise that works to keep women in low-status positions (Vescio et al., 2005). In a similar study conducted with a sample of women from a Dutch university, exposure to benevolent sexism was positively associated with increased acceptance to traditional gender expectations (Barreto et al, 2010).

**Identification of Sexism**

Despite the frequent occurrence of sexism, people often are not able to identify behaviors and attitudes consistent with gender discrimination as sexism (Kirkman & Oswald, 2020). It is important to examine how hostile and benevolent sexism are perceived and identified to better address the negative effects that are associated with experiencing sexism. Early research examining perceptions of overt sexism directed at women found that sexist behaviors were more likely to be perceived as sexist by both men and women if the perpetrator of the sexist behavior was male (Baron et al., 1991).
Baron and colleagues also found that participants who identified as female rated the behaviors as more sexist overall than the participants who identified as male. These results indicated that sexist behaviors were more likely to be recognized when the person engaging in sexist behavior was male.

Additionally, early work conducted by Kiliansky and Rudman (1998) that sought to examine people’s understanding of ambivalent sexism, presented female participants with dating profiles of men who expressed hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. Participants were asked to report the likelihood that the profiles were of the same man and the results of the study indicated that the participants found it unlikely that the hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes expressed in the profiles belonged to the same person. This suggested that people likely perceived hostile and benevolent sexism as opposing attitudes. Furthermore, work by Barreto and Ellemers (2005) examining the perceptions of alleged endorsement of hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes found that individuals who endorsed benevolent sexist attitudes were evaluated more positively than those who endorsed hostile sexist attitudes. Barreto and Ellemers explain that people fail to recognize benevolent sexism as a form of gender discrimination because benevolent sexist attitudes are often perceived as likable and do not align with stereotypical understandings of sexism. Consistent with these findings, research conducted by Oswald and colleagues (2018) examining the sexist experiences of women found that although women reported more frequent experiences of benevolent sexism, participants perceived their experiences with hostile sexism as more distressing and more sexist.

Not only are benevolently sexist behaviors not easily identifiable as sexist, in certain situations they can even be perceived as prosocial or caring. For example,
previous research has conceptualized benevolent sexism as expressing reverence and care towards women in addition to promising women that they will be protected and provided for by men (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996). To further illustrate this, research by Overall and colleagues (2011) found that men who more strongly endorsed benevolent sexism exhibited more positive and caring behaviors towards women. Their findings suggest that even when these men behaved negatively or were restrictive of their partner’s behavior, their actions were attributed to more caring, loving, and benign motives.

Drawing from Ambivalent Sexism Theory and Chicana feminist theories, Bermúdez and colleagues (2015) explain that Latinx cultural values may present elements of hostile and benevolent sexism that overlap with U.S. patriarchal gender expectations that work to maintain gender norms. For example, they argue that Machismo emphasizes that men should be in control and Marianismo emphasizes that women should be subordinate to men. Despite the extensive research on Ambivalent Sexism Theory across multiple countries that have linked benevolent and hostile sexism with a variety of negative outcomes for women, few studies have focused on Latinx samples (Bermúdez et al., 2015). Understanding how Latinx communities perceive sexist behavior is an important step towards addressing the negative effect of sexism. Although previous research examining ambivalent sexism within the context of Latinx communities suggests overlap between the function of ambivalent sexism and Latinx cultural values (Bermúdez, 2015), no research to date has examined how Latinx communities perceive sexist behavior through the lens of Latinx cultural values.
The purpose of the present study is to examine the relationship between Latine cultural values and perceptions of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior in a sample of Latine individuals. Participants who identify as Latine or Hispanic were presented with fourteen scenarios that consist of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior, and they were asked to rate them on a variety of traits including perceptions of sexism and characteristics of caring.

**Hypotheses**

The first goal of the study is to examine the extent that Latine men and women identify hostile and benevolent behaviors as sexist.

Given the research to date, we hypothesize that hostile sexist interactions will be identified as sexist more frequently and to a stronger degree than benevolent sexist interactions. Gender is also expected to moderate this finding. Specifically, we hypothesize that Latine women will be more likely to identify the benevolent sexist interactions as sexist than Latine men, while both Latine men and women will identify the hostile sexist interactions as sexist at similar levels.

We further hypothesize that benevolent sexist interactions will be identified as caring more frequently and to a stronger degree than hostile sexist interaction, however, gender will moderate this such that Latine men will be more likely to identify the benevolent sexist interaction as caring than Latine women, while both Latine men and women will identify the hostile sexist interaction as caring at similar levels.

The second goal of this study is to understand how Latine cultural values are associated with identification of perceptions of hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors.
We hypothesize that endorsement of Marianismo, Caballerismo, and Familismo will be positively associated with identification of hostile sexist interactions as sexist, but negatively associated with identification of benevolent sexist interactions as sexist. We also hypothesize that endorsement of Machismo will be negatively associated with identification of both hostile sexist interactions and benevolent sexist interactions as sexist. Conversely, we hypothesize that endorsement of Marianismo, Caballerismo, and Familismo will be positively associated with identification of benevolent sexism as caring, but negatively associated with identifying hostile sexist interactions as caring. Lastly, we hypothesize that endorsement of Machismo will be positively associated with identification of caring in both hostile and benevolent sexist interactions.
Method

Participants

An a priori power analysis estimated that a total of 86 participants ($\alpha = 0.05$) were needed to detect a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$) and obtain acceptable statistical power of 80\% for forward stepwise regression. Participants for the study were recruited online through Prolific and included 57 women and 55 men, all of whom resided in the United States. Three participants identified as non-binary and one participant indicated that they identified as “other.” Due to the limited sample size, these participants were not included in the analyses. The mean age was 32.05 ($SD = 10.63$) years. The majority, 59.6\% ($n = 68$) identified as Mexican, 15.8\% ($n = 18$) identified with multiple ethnicities, 7.9\% ($n = 9$) identified broadly as Latine or Hispanic, and the rest indicated another ethnicity including Brazilian, Colombian, Cuban, Dominican, El Salvadorian, Guatemalan, Peruvuan, Puerto Rican, and Spanish (each < 5.0\%, see Table 1). With respect to sexual identity 75.0\% ($n = 87$) identified as heterosexual, 3.4\% ($n = 4$) identified as gay, 17.2\% ($n = 20$) identified as bisexual, 2.6\% ($n = 3$) identified as queer, 0.9\% ($n = 1$) indicated “other,” and 0.9\% ($n = 1$) indicated “prefer not to answer.” Regarding marital status, 48.3\% ($n = 56$) of participants identified as single, 31.0\% ($n = 36$) identified as married, 18.1\% ($n = 21$) identified as being in an other committed relationship, and 2.6\% ($n = 3$) identified as divorced. With respect to generational status, the majority of participants, 49.1\% ($n = 57$) identified as second generation, 15.5\% ($n = 18$) identified as first generation, and 35.4\% ($n = 41$) identified as belonging to later generations. For full demographic descriptions, see Table 1.
Table 1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvadorian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latine/Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age
Mean = 32.05
Range = 18-73
SD = 10.63

Gender
Women          | 57      | 49.14|
Men            | 55      | 47.41|
Nonbinary      | 3       | 2.59 |
Other          | 1       | 0.86 |

Education
High School Graduate | 21  | 18.1 |
GED or Equivalent     | 1   | 0.9  |
Some College           | 22  | 19.0 |
Associate Degree       | 14  | 12.1 |
Bachelor's degree      | 50  | 43.1 |
Master’s degree        | 4   | 3.4  |
Doctorate               | 4   | 3.4  |

Family Annual Income
0 - $10,000        | 3   | 2.6  |
$10,000 - $20,000  | 11  | 9.5  |
$20,000 - $30,000  | 8   | 6.9  |
$30,000 - $40,000  | 19  | 16.4 |
$40,000 - $50,000  | 11  | 9.5  |
$50,000 - $60,000  | 9   | 7.8  |
$60,000 - $70,000  | 12  | 10.3 |
$70,000 - $80,000  | 8   | 6.9  |
$80,000 - $90,000  | 5   | 4.3  |
$90,000 - $100,000 | 10  | 8.6  |
$100,000 - $110,000| 6   | 5.2  |
$110,000 - $120,000| 0   | 0.0  |
$120,000 - $130,000| 2   | 1.7  |
$130,000 - $140,000| 1   | 0.9  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$140,000 - $150,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 &lt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital Status**
- Married: 36 (31.0)
- Widowed: 0 (0.0)
- Divorced: 3 (2.6)
- Single: 56 (48.3)
- Other Committed Relationship: 21 (18.1)

**Sexual Identity**
- Heterosexual: 87 (75.0)
- Gay: 4 (3.4)
- Bisexual: 20 (17.2)
- Queer: 3 (2.6)
- Other: 1 (0.9)
- Prefer not to answer: 1 (0.9)

**Community Type**
- In a large city (>250,000): 43 (37.1)
- In a suburb near a large city: 31 (26.7)
- In a medium sized city (50,000-250,000): 21 (18.1)
- In a small city or town (<50,000): 18 (15.5)
- In a rural area, but not on a farm: 3 (2.6)
- On a farm: 0 (0.0)

**Citizenship Status**
- Yes: 115 (99.1)
- No: 1 (0.9)

**Generational Status**
- First Generation: 18 (15.5)
- Second Generation: 57 (49.1)
- Later Generations: 41 (35.4)

**Religious Affiliation**
- Catholic: 42 (36.2)
- Evangelical Christian: 9 (7.8)
- Jehovah’s Witness: 2 (1.7)
- Protestant: 7 (6.0)
- Not identified with a particular religion: 34 (29.3)
- Atheist: 17 (14.7)
- Other: 5 (4.3)

---

**Materials**

_Familism Scale_ (Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003)
The Familism Scale is an 18-item measure that assesses participants' attitudes of familism that was specifically designed for Latine populations (Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003). Responses are on a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 10 = strongly agree. An average score is calculated from the entire measure to reflect a total familism score. Sample items include “children should live with their parents until they get married” and “a person should be a good person for the sake of their family.” Research conducted by Gallegos & Segrin (2021) indicated this scale is internally consistent with a Cronbach’s alpha score of .87. In the current study, the alpha coefficient was .94.

*Marianismo Beliefs Scale (Castillo et al., 2010)*

The Marianismo Beliefs Scale (MBS) is a 24-item measure that assess the extent that respondents believe that Latine women should participate in traditional gender role expectations. This measure consists of five subscales which include: Family (five items, e.g., “A Latina must be a source of strength for her family”), Virtuous and Chaste (5 items, e.g., “A Latina should remain a virgin until marriage”), Subordinate to Others (five items, e.g., “A Latina should do anything a male in the family asks her to do”), Silencing Self to Maintain Harmony (six items, e.g., “A Latina should feel guilty about telling people what she needs”), and Spiritual (three items, e.g., “A Latina should be the spiritual leader of the family”). Using a 4-point Likert scale, items range from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree. This scale was scored by calculating the mean score of the total scale. Higher scores indicate greater adherence to Marianismo beliefs. Research conducted by Terazza-Carillo & Sabina (2019) indicated this scale is internally consistent with a Cronbach’s alpha score of .88. In the current study, the alpha coefficient was .94.
Traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale (Arciniega et al., 2008)

The Traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale (TMCS) is a 20-item measured that consists of the Traditional Machismo subscale (10 items, e.g., “It is necessary to fight when challenged”) and Caballerismo subscale (10 items, e.g., “Men display good manners in public”). Participants responded to each item using a 7-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (very strongly disagree) to 7 (very strongly agree). Although the construct of Machismo is originally of Mexican culture, the authors found the scale to apply similarly to other Latine communities (Arciniega et al., 2008). The sum of the items are calculated, where high scores indicate higher endorsement of Caballerismo or Machismo. Research conducted by Terazza-Carillo & Sabina (2019) indicated this scale is internally consistent with a Cronbach’s alpha score of .82. In the current study the alpha coefficient for the Machismo subscale was .86 and the alpha coefficient for the Caballerismo subscale was .74.

Perceptions of interactions

Participants were randomly presented with vignettes describing a sexist interaction between a man and a woman. The participants were asked to provide an open-ended response that describes the man in the scenario in two to three words. Participants were again randomly presented with the same vignettes and then presented with a list of traits such as funny, aggressive, sexist, warm, fair, intelligent, boring, caring, and rude. For this study, only the Likert scale ratings of the sexist and caring traits were analyzed.

Procedure

Recruitment was conducted virtually through Prolific. Participants were asked to complete an online survey which took an average of 46 minutes ($SD = 22$) to complete,
and they were compensated an average of $7.43 per hour for their participation. Before beginning, participants were asked to read and agree to a consent form. Upon consenting, participants were informed that the purpose of the study was to examine how interpersonal interactions are perceived. Participants were asked to indicate if they identify as Latine or Hispanic and if they are 18 years of age or older to determine if they met the study’s inclusion criteria. Participants were additionally asked to verify that they are able to communicate in English.

Fourteen vignettes that consist of an interaction between a man and woman were utilized. The vignettes were previously developed, tested, published by Kirkman and Oswald (2020) and are based on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) and a study incorporating diaries cataloguing experiences with sexism (Becker and Swim, 2011). For the purposes of this study, the names of the individuals in each scenario have been adapted to reflect the Latine or Hispanic identity of the participants sampled. Behavior in the vignettes was always initiated by the man and directed toward the woman. Four vignettes described an interaction that is benevolently sexist in nature, four vignettes described a hostile sexist interaction, and six vignettes depicted interactions that are not sexist (neutral). Of those non-sexist interactions, two were written to be rude or negative in tone, two reflected a more friendly and positive interaction, and two were neutral in tone. The scenarios were randomly presented.

After reading each scenario, participants were asked to identify two to three traits that describe the male perpetrator of the sexist behavior. Responses were coded as identifying sexism if descriptions include terms such as stereotypical, chauvinistic, traditional, and misogynistic (Baron et al., 1991). Responses were coded as identifying
caring if descriptions included positive descriptions of the man in the scenario, such as kind, loving, friendly, nice, or well-meaning. All other responses were coded as non-sexist or non-caring. Each vignette could have a score of 0 (not identified as sexist/caring) or 1 (identified as sexist/caring) and a total identification score was computed that ranged from 0 to 4, given the four hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes. The vignettes were then randomly presented a second time. This time, participants were presented with a list of traits such as funny, aggressive, sexist, warm, fair, intelligent, boring, rude, and caring. The participants were asked to rate the male perpetrator on a scale of 1 (does not describe) to 7 (very strongly describes) for each of these traits. For this study the analyses focused on the participants’ responses for the “sexist” and “caring” traits and the other descriptors were treated as filler items and were not analyzed. Participants were then presented with the Familism Scale (Lugo Steidel & Contreras, 2003), the Marianismo Beliefs Scale (Castillo et al., 2010), and the Traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale (Arciniega et al., 2008) to complete in a randomized order. Participants were compensated for their time upon completion of the survey.
Results

Table 2 presents the correlations between the variables of interest, the means, and standard deviations.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Machismo</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Caballerismo</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marianismo</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Familismo</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Qualitative HSV Sexist</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Qualitative HSV Caring</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Qualitative BSV Sexist</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Qualitative BSV Caring</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Likert Ratings HSV Sexist</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Likert Ratings HSV Caring</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Likert Ratings BSV Sexist</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first goal of the study was to compare the mean differences of men and women in their qualitative trait identification and Likert scale ratings of sexist and caring for both hostile and benevolent sexist scenarios. To test the hypotheses, four two (gender) by two (hostile and benevolent vignette rating) mixed ANOVAs were conducted. A mixed ANOVA was computed for each of the main dependent variables of interest: the qualitative ratings of sexist and caring and the Likert ratings of sexist and caring.

For the qualitative traits identifying sexism in the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes there was a main effect of sexism type, $F(1,110) = 67.45$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .38$ such that hostile vignettes ($M = 2.77$) were rated higher in sexism than the benevolent sexist vignettes ($M = 1.73$). The main effect for participant gender was significant, $F(1,110) = 5.23$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$, such that overall women ($M = 2.49$) rated the vignettes as more sexist than did men ($M = 2.01$), overall. The interaction between sexism type and gender was not significant ($p = .19$). See Figure 1.

Note. HSV denotes Hostile Sexist Vignettes, BSV denotes Benevolent Sexist Vignettes. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Ratings</th>
<th>BSV Caring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>-.67*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Note. HSV denotes Hostile Sexist Vignettes, BSV denotes Benevolent Sexist Vignettes. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. |
Figure 1

*Estimated Marginal Means of Qualitative Identification of Sexism in Hostile and Benevolent Sexist Vignettes by Gender*

![Bar chart showing estimated marginal means for Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism by gender.](image)

*Note. N = 111. Scores ranged from 0 to 4. Error Bars: 95% Confidence Intervals*

For the qualitative traits identifying caring in hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes there was a significant main effect of sexism type, $F(1,110) = 246.74, p < .001, \eta^2 = .69$, such that the benevolent sexist vignettes (M = 2.11) were rated higher in caring than the hostile sexist vignettes (M = 0.04). The main effect of gender was not significant, $F(1,110) = 243.33, p = .51, \eta^2 = .004$. The interaction between sexism type and gender was not significant ($p = .49$). See Figure 2.
For the Likert rating of sexism in the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes there was a main effect of sexism type, $F(1,110) = 174.58, p < .001, \eta^2 = .61$, such that the hostile vignettes ($M = 6.39$) were rated higher in sexism than the benevolent sexist vignettes ($M = 4.33$). The main effect for participant gender was significant, $F(1,110) = 8.03, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$, such that overall women ($M = 5.66$) rated the vignettes as more sexist than did men. The Interaction between sexism type and gender was not significant ($p = .76$). See Figure 3.
For the Likert ratings of caring in the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes there was effect of sexism type, $F(1,110) = 291.79$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .69$, such that the benevolent sexist vignettes ($M = 3.82$) were rated higher in caring than the hostile sexist vignettes ($M = 1.53$). The main effect for participant gender was significant $F(1,110) = 13.95$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .11$, such that overall men ($M = 3.01$) rated the vignettes as more caring than did women ($M = 2.34$). The interaction between sexism type and gender was not significant ($p = .22$). See Figure 4.
Figure 4

Estimated Marginal Means of Likert Scale Ratings of Caring in Hostile and Benevolent Sexist Vignettes by Gender

The second goal of the study was to assess the ability of Latine cultural values to predict identification of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior as sexist and caring. To test these hypotheses, eight forward stepwise regressions were conducted to assess the ability of Latine cultural values in predicting identification of hostile and benevolent sexist behavior as sexist and caring. The Latine cultural values of Marianismo, Machismo, Caballerismo, and Familismo were entered for each stepwise regression in addition to age and gender as the predicting variables. The degree to which the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes were identified as sexist and caring in the qualitative and
quantitative/Likert responses were used as the eight outcome variables. After entering the predicting variables, the strongest individual predictors continued to be added in order of predictive strength until no additional predictors met the inclusion criteria, \( p < .05 \). As predictors were added, previously included variables were excluded if \( p > .10 \). Given the issue of multicollinearity across our variables of interest (see Table 2), this forward selection approach allowed us to see whether Machismo, Caballerismo, Marianismo, and Familismo would be selected as predictors, and if so, how strongly would they be associated with identification of sexism and caring across the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes.

For the qualitative trait identification of sexism, we obtained a significant model at Step 1, \( F(1, 109) = 5.85, p < .05, R^2 = .05 \). In Step 1, Machismo, \( \beta = -.23, p < .05 \), was added to the model, and was negatively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting hostile sexist interactions. At Step 2, the model was significant \( F(1, 108) = 4.69, p < .05, R^2 = .09 \), and Machismo, \( \beta = -.23, p < .05 \), was again negatively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting hostile sexist interactions. However, Age, \( \beta = .19, p < .05 \), was positively associated with identification of sexism. Marianismo, Caballerismo, Familismo, and gender were excluded from the models. See Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( B )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machismo</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The forward stepwise regression predicting qualitative identification of caring in depictions of hostile sexism was not significant. After entry of all variables, no variables were added into the model as no variables met the inclusion criteria.

The model for qualitative trait identification of sexism in depictions of benevolent sexism was significant. A significant model was obtained in Step 1, $F(1, 109) = 21.08, p < .001, R^2 = .16$. In Step 1, Machismo, $\beta = -.40, p < .001$, was added to the model and was negatively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting benevolent sexist interactions. At Step 2, the model was significant $F(1, 108) = 5.17, p < .05, R^2 = .20$, and Machismo ($\beta = -.31, p < .001$) and Caballerismo ($\beta = -.22, p < .05$) were negatively associated with identification of sexism. At Step 3, the model was significant $F(1, 107) = 4.38, p < .05, R^2 = .23$, and Machismo, $\beta = -.32, p < .001$, and Caballerismo, $\beta = -.21, p < .05$, were negatively associated with identification of sexism. Age, $\beta = .17, p < .05$, was positively associated with identification of sexism.

Marianismo, Familismo, and gender were excluded from the models. See Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machismo</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caballerismo</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ for change in $R^2$</td>
<td>21.08***</td>
<td>5.17*</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 116$. We examined the ability of Latine cultural values in predicting identification of hostile sexism. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$
Note. \( N = 116 \). We examined the ability of Latine cultural values in predicting identification of sexism. \(*p < .05. \quad **p < .01. \quad ***p < .001\)

For qualitative identification of caring in depictions of benevolent sexism, a significant model was obtained at Step 1, \( F(1, 109) = 9.10, p < .01, R^2 = .08 \). In Step 1, Marianismo, \( \beta = .27, p < .01 \), was added to the model and was positively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting benevolent sexist interactions. No other steps or variables significantly contributed to the model. See Table 5.

**Table 5**

*Stepwise Regression Results for Variables Predicting Qualitative Identification of Characteristics of Caring for Benevolent Sexist Vignettes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianismo</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F ) for change in ( R^2 )</td>
<td>9.10**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 116 \). We examined the ability of Latine cultural values in predicting identification of characteristics of caring. \(*p < .05. \quad **p < .01. \quad ***p < .001\)

For Likert scale identification of sexism in depictions of hostile sexism, we obtained a significant model at Step 1, \( F(1, 109) = 24.51, p < .001, R^2 = .18 \). In Step 1, Machismo, \( \beta = -.43, p < .001 \), was added to the model, and was negatively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting hostile sexist interactions. At Step 2, the model was significant \( F(1, 108) = 6.92, p < .01, R^2 = .23 \), and Machismo and Caballerismo were added. Machismo, \( \beta = -.53, p < .001 \), was again negatively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting hostile sexist interactions, but Caballerismo, \( \beta = .24, p < .05 \), was positively associated. Marianismo, Familismo, age, and gender were excluded from the models. See Table 6.
Table 6

Stepwise Regression Results for Variables Predicting Likert Scale Ratings of Sexism for Hostile Sexist Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machismo</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.53***</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caballerismo</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F ) for change in ( R^2 )</td>
<td>24.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.92**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 116 \). We examined the ability of Latine cultural values in predicting identification of sexism. *\( p < .05 \). **\( p < .01 \). ***\( p < .001 \)

For Likert scale identification of caring in depictions of hostile sexism, we obtained a significant model at Step 1, \( F(1, 109) = 22.29, p < .001, R^2 = .16 \). In Step 1, Machismo, \( \beta = -.41, p < .001 \), was added to the model and was positively associated with identification of caring in the vignettes depicting hostile sexist interactions. At Step 2, the model was significant \( F(1, 108) = 6.15, p < .05, R^2 = .20 \), and Machismo and Caballerismo were added. Machismo, \( \beta = .51, p < .001 \), was positively associated, and Caballerismo, \( \beta = -.23, p < .05 \), was negatively associated with identification of caring. At Step 3, the model was significant \( F(1, 107) = 4.07, p < .05, R^2 = .22 \), and Machismo, Caballerismo, and gender were added. Machismo, \( \beta = .44, p < .001 \), was positively associated with identification of caring. Caballerismo, \( \beta = -.24, p < .05 \), and gender, \( \beta = -.18, p < .05 \), were negatively associated with identification of caring. Marianismo, Familismo, and age were excluded from the models. See Table 7.

Table 7

Stepwise Regression Results for Variables Predicting Likert Scale Ratings of Characteristics of Caring for Hostile Sexist Vignettes
Table 8

Stepwise Regression Results for Variables Predicting Likert Scale Ratings of Sexism for Benevolent Sexist Vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machismo</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caballerismo</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F ) for change in ( R^2 )</td>
<td>22.29***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.07*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 116. \) We examined the ability of Latine cultural values in predicting identification of characteristics of caring. *\( p < .05. \) **\( p < .01. \) ***\( p < .001. \)

For Likert scale identification of sexism in depictions of benevolent sexism, a significant model was obtained at Step 1, \( F(1, 109) = 9.29, p < .01, R^2 = .08. \) In Step 1, Machismo, \( \beta = -.28, p < .01, \) was added to the model, and was negatively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting benevolent sexist interactions. At Step 2, the model was significant \( F(1, 108) = 7.63, p < .01, R^2 = .12, \) and Machismo and age were added. Machismo, \( \beta = -.28, p > .05, \) was not significant. Age, \( \beta = .25, p < .01, \) was positively associated with identification of sexism in the vignettes depicting benevolent sexist interactions. Marianismo, Familismo, Caballerismo, and gender were excluded from the models. See Table 8.
For Likert scale identification of caring in depictions of benevolent sexism, a significant model was obtained at Step 1, \( F(1, 109) = 8.67, p < .01, R^2 = .07 \). In Step 1, Machismo, \( \beta = .27, p < .01 \), was added to the model, and was positively associated with identification of caring in the vignettes depicting benevolent sexist interactions. At Step 2, the model was significant \( F(1, 108) = 3.93, p < .01, R^2 = .11 \), and Machismo and gender were added. Machismo, \( \beta = .20, p < .05 \), was again positively associated with identification of caring in the vignettes depicting benevolent sexist interactions significant. Gender, \( \beta = -.19, p < .05 \), was negatively associated with identification of caring in the vignettes depicting benevolent sexist interactions. Marianismo, Familismo, Caballerismo, and age were excluded from the models. See Table 9.

**Table 9**

*Stepwise Regression Results for Variables Predicting Likert Scale Ratings of Characteristics of Caring for Benevolent Sexist Vignettes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machismo</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F ) for change in ( R^2 )</td>
<td>8.67**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \( N = 116 \). We examined the ability of Latine cultural values in predicting identification of characteristics of caring. *\( p < .05 \). **\( p < .01 \). ***\( p < .001 \).*
Discussion

The first goal of the present study was to understand the extent that Latine men and women identify hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors as sexist and caring. Consistent with our hypothesis, the results for both qualitative traits and Likert scale ratings of the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes suggest that the hostile sexist vignettes were rated higher in sexism than the benevolent sexist vignettes and were thus perceived as more sexist regardless of the perceiver’s gender. This is consistent with the theoretical conceptualization of ambivalent sexism which characterizes hostile sexist behaviors as overt and benevolent sexist as subtle and therefore less likely to be identified as sexist (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Furthermore, the women in our sample rated the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes as more sexist than the men in our sample, for both the Likert scale ratings and the qualitative trait identification. Consistent with our hypothesis, this suggests that the women sampled would be more likely to identify the hostile sexist vignettes as sexist than the men sampled, as Baron and colleagues (1991) also found that women were more likely to recognize overt sexist behaviors as sexist than men. However, our findings suggest that the women in our sample were able to identify benevolent sexism as sexist more often than the men. This was unexpected as previous literature suggests that both men and women often do not recognize benevolent sexism as sexist (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2000). These findings could be due to our sample consisting largely of individuals who have obtained a college degree (62%, see Table 1). Although research examining the relationship between education and identification of sexism is limited, previous research has found education to be negatively correlated to hostile sexism in
men and benevolent sexism in women (Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014). Similarly, Glick and colleagues (2002) found that higher levels of education attainment were the strongest predictor of lower sexist attitudes, above and beyond factors demographic factors such as age. These findings indicate that education may play an important role in the ability individuals to identify benevolent sexism as sexist, but further research is needed. Regarding identification of caring, the benevolent sexist vignettes were rated higher in caring than the hostile sexist vignettes, for both qualitative traits and Likert scale ratings. This was consistent with our hypothesis given that benevolent sexism has been found to be perceived positively by both men and women and is often attributed to more caring, loving, and benign motives (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Glick & Fiske, 1996; Overall et al., 2011). Interestingly, our findings suggest that there was a difference in how men and women identified the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes as caring by response style. Specifically, when provided with a Likert scale to rate the vignettes, the men in our sample rated the hostile and benevolent vignettes as more caring than did women. However, when asked to describe the hostile and benevolent sexist behavior qualitatively, the men and women of our sample identified the vignettes as caring at similar levels. These findings may be explained in part by the Likert scale ratings as they also function as a measure of intensity in addition to identification. Therefore, the men and women of our sample may have been equally likely to identify benevolent sexist behaviors as caring, but the men identified these behaviors as being more “intensely” caring than women.

The second goal of the present study was to examine how Latine cultural values are associated with identification of hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors as sexist and
caring. Drawing on Chicana feminist theory we hypothesized that endorsement of Marianismo, Caballerismo, and Familismo would be positively associated with identification of hostile interactions as sexist, but negatively associated with identification of benevolent sexist interactions as sexist. Conversely, Marianismo, Caballerismo, and Familismo were hypothesized to be negatively associated with identification of hostile interactions as caring, but positively associated with identification of benevolent sexist interactions as caring. Lastly, Machismo was hypothesized to be negatively associated with identification of both hostile and benevolent interactions as sexist but positively associated with identification of these interactions as caring.

The results highlighted that Latine cultural values are indeed associated with identification of sexism and caring in hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes, in addition to age and gender. Specifically, Machismo stood out as the variable most notably associated with identification of sexism in both the hostile and benevolent sexist vignettes for both the qualitative traits and Likert scale ratings, such that higher Machismo beliefs were associated with a less likelihood of identifying these interactions as sexist. This was not surprising given that Machismo has been considered to be the masculine force driving the standard of behaviors that are both prized and expected of Latine men (Andrade, 1992; Arciniega et al., 2008; Panitz et al., 1983).

In contrast, Caballerismo was found to be negatively associated with qualitative trait identification of sexism in the benevolent sexist vignettes, but positively associated with Likert scale ratings of identification of sexism in the hostile sexist vignettes. These findings suggest that individuals who endorsed higher Caballerismo beliefs were less
likely to identify the benevolent sexist interactions as sexist and more likely to identify the hostile sexist interactions as sexist. Additionally, Caballerismo was negatively associated with quantitative trait identification of caring in the hostile sexist scenarios, suggesting that individuals who endorsed higher Caballerismo beliefs were less likely to identify the hostile sexist interactions as caring. These findings were consistent with our hypotheses as research has conceptualized Caballerismo as the positive aspects of Machismo that evokes chivalry and respect (Arciniega et al., 2008). These findings further work to highlight the complexity of the values associated with Caballerismo as Caballerismo was also not associated with identification of benevolent sexism as caring as we had expected. Although previous research has tied Caballerismo to benevolent sexist attitudes and behaviors (Bermúdez et al., 2015; Christler et al., 2013), there may be aspects of Caballerismo that go beyond maintaining gender norms, are more egalitarian in nature, and emphasize emotional connectivity. This can be seen in items from the Caballerismo Scale (Arciniega et al., 2008) such as “Men must be exhibit fairness in all situations” and “Men should be affectionate with their children.” It is therefore likely that identification of benevolent sexism as caring is better explained by other Latinx cultural values such as Machismo or Marianismo.

Indeed, our findings demonstrated that Marianismo was positively associated with qualitative trait identification of the benevolent sexist scenarios as caring, while Machismo was positively associated with Likert scale ratings of the benevolent sexist scenarios as caring. These findings were consistent with our hypotheses and suggest that participants that endorsed higher Marianismo and Machismo beliefs, were more likely to identify the benevolent sexist interactions as caring. These findings may be explained by
the overlap between benevolent sexist behaviors and the gendered expectations of Latine men and women that are can be perceived as positive in nature and emphasized by Machismo and Marianismo. Previous work by Bermúdez and colleagues (2015) has highlighted that benevolent sexism captures these attitudes consistent with Marianismo and Machismo that may be perceived as positive, such as women being morally superior to men, women should be cherished and protected, and men should be the primary providers for families.

In addition to Marianismo, gender was negatively associated with qualitative trait identification of the benevolent sexist scenarios as caring, such that men were more likely to identify the benevolent sexist scenarios as caring. This was surprising as we had originally hypothesized that other cultural values, such as Familismo and Caballerismo, would be stronger in predicting identification of benevolent sexism as caring given previous research findings which suggest that people, regardless of gender, are generally unaware of how benevolent sexism contributes to gender discrimination (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick et al., 2000). Additionally, work by Oswald and colleagues (2018) found that despite experiencing more frequent occurrences of benevolent sexism, women were more likely to perceive their experiences with hostile sexism as more sexist than their experiences of benevolent sexism.

Unexpectedly, age was positively associated with qualitative trait identification of sexism for the hostile sexist vignettes, such that older participants were more likely to identify the scenarios as sexist. This was surprising given that research that has examined the relationship between sexism and age has found sexist attitudes to increase with age (Lameiras et al. 2004; Moya, Expósito, Rodríguez- Bailón, Glick & Páez, 2002). These
findings are, however, consistent with research that has specifically examined perceptions of sexist behaviors. For example, work by Ohse and Stockdale (2008) examining age in perceptions of workplace sexual harassment found that college aged participants were less likely to identify sexual harassment than older-aged participants. Although examining the differences in age and perceptions of sexism was beyond the scope of this study, our study’s findings may be explained in part by other factors that were unaccounted for, such as experience, maturation, or generational effects, that can influence one’s perspective with age. In further contrast to our hypotheses, Familismo did not predict identification of any of the hostile or benevolent sexist vignettes as either sexist or caring. This may be due to the issue of multicollinearity between Familismo and the other measured Latine cultural values. As previously noted, Familismo is tied closely to Machismo and Marianismo in that it outlines the differing and hierarchical structure of the roles and responsibilities of men and women in Latine families. Additionally, Familismo seems to be particularly tied to the aspects of self-sacrifice that are associated with Marianismo as well as the gendered hierarchical familial structure that Machismo works to uphold. Specifically, Marianismo has been conceptualized as including a self-silencing “pillar” that emphasizes the importance of maintaining family and romantic relationships above one’s own needs (Castillo et al., 2010). This is notably similar to items from the Familism scale (Lugo et al., 2003) such as “a person should always support members of the extended family, for example, aunts, uncles, and in-laws, if they are in need even if it is a big sacrifice” and “a person should always be expected to defend his/her family’s honor no matter what the cost.” These items highlight the self-
sacrificing aspects of Familismo in addition to the emphasis on the hierarchical family dynamics.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

In interpreting these findings there are several important limitations to consider. First, our study’s conceptualization of Latine cultural values as they relate to ambivalent sexism theory and gender role expectations function primarily within the gender binary. Due to the small number of Latine participants that identified as non-binary or other ($n = 4$), we were unable to meaningfully examine how these individuals may perceive hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors. Research suggests that hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes are predictive of transprejudice (Nagoshi et al., 2008) and given the elements of hostile and benevolent sexism associated with Latine cultural values, understanding how Latine transgender and gender non-conforming individuals perceive hostile and benevolent sexist behavior may be of particular importance. This is an increasingly consequential area of research given that 2021 was named the deadliest year on record for transgender and gender-nonconforming individuals (Powel, 2021).

Additionally, our sample consisted of Latine adults the majority of which live in cities or suburbs, identified as heterosexual, identified as second generation or later, had an associated degree or higher, and were United States citizens and therefore do not fully represent all Latine groups. Our sample was also not representative of all Latine ethnicities and consisted primarily of individuals who identified as Mexican. Due to the small number of other Latine ethnicities represented in our sample, we were limited in our ability to examine within-group differences. Although there are similarities that are shared across various Latine communities, Latines are not monolithic and may not
perceive hostile and sexist behaviors in the same way. Future researchers may benefit from obtaining a larger sample of Latine participants that is representative of the diverse ethnicities and perspectives that exist within the broader Latine community.

Furthermore, researchers may expand on the methodology of the study through the use of videos instead of written vignettes to showcase hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors and further examine Latine perceptions of sexist behaviors via a video medium. Future research may also examine how Latine cultural values are associated with how Latine individuals respond to instances of hostile and benevolent sexism, both as a bystander and as a victim using real-life scenarios. By expanding on the methodology of this study, future research would help to provide a more complete level of understanding of how Latine cultural values contribute to the ways in which Latine communities experience and respond to instances of sexism.

Finally, because this study is correlational in nature, we are unable to establish causality between the Latinx cultural values examined and perceptions of hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors as either sexist or caring. The findings of this study must also be interpreted with caution due to the small effect sizes related to the main effect of participant gender. In contrast, the effect sizes of the main effect related to sexism type were larger and suggests that the difference in hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors were more important for the identification of these behaviors as sexist or caring.

Conclusion

Overall, the findings of this study suggest that Latine men and women may be more likely to perceive benevolent sexist behaviors as less sexist and more caring than hostile sexist behaviors. Latine women may also be more likely than Latine men to
identify sexist behaviors as sexist, regardless of sexism type. Additionally, Latine cultural values were found to be associated with how hostile and benevolent sexist behaviors are perceived. These findings provide insight into the ways that Latine men and women perceive sexist behavior that have important implications for both researchers and clinicians and can be used to inform trainings and interventions that specifically target Latine communities. Specifically, these findings lend support to Bermúdez and colleagues’ (2015) conceptualization of Ambivalent Sexism Theory and Chicana feminist theories which suggest that hostile and benevolent sexism function within Latine cultural values, namely Machismo and some aspects of Marianismo, to maintain hierarchical gender norms that place men in control and women subordinate to men. This study contributes to this conceptualization by highlighting the role of Latine cultural values in understanding how sexist interactions are perceived by Latine men and women. Our findings further highlight the complexities of Marianismo and Caballerismo beliefs and suggest that these values may provide an egalitarian and perhaps feminist lens for which to identify problematic and sexist behavior. This nuanced understanding of the role of Latine cultural values in identifying sexist behavior can inform researchers seeking to study or address issues of sexism in Latine communities. These findings provide important pathways for clinicians working with Latine clients to use the positive aspects of Caballerismo and Marianismo to empower their clients to identify and address sexist behavior and make positive changes for themselves, their families, and the broader Latine community.
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Appendix A

Hostile Sexist Vignette 1

José and Leticia, coworkers at a hardware store, looked at the schedule for the day. It looked busier than usual. “What can I work on?” Leticia asked, looking over at the list. “Well,” Jose said, “I need to move some pallets with the reach machine, so I’m not sure what you could do.”

“Oh, I’ve actually finished the training on that machine! I can take care of some of that.” Leticia said, excited to get a chance to try something new. José shrugged, with a little laugh. “I don’t think it’s a good idea for you to do that.” Leticia stared, trying to figure out why. José shrugged again, saying, “Women just usually aren’t very good at driving that machinery.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe José portrayed in the vignette you just read.
Appendix B

Hostile Sexist Vignette 2

“Hey, baby! Nice ass.” Antonio called out as Victoria passed him. Victoria rolled her eyes, ignoring him. She had just finished with a long day and was looking forward to some relaxation at home. “Hey, I’m talking to you.” Antonio said, raising his voice and walking toward her. Victoria glared at him. “Look, I’m just not in the mood. Please leave me alone.”

“Wow, it was just a compliment. No need to be so frigid. You need to loosen up a bit.” As he said this he reached out and grabbed Victoria’s butt. She jerked and walked away quickly. “Bitch!” He yelled after her.

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Antonio portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Appendix C

*Hostile Sexist Vignette 3*

Maria and Luis went out for drinks after work. They both agreed that the past week had been a tough one. “This week took forever,” Luis said. “I’m so glad it’s Friday.”

“Me too. I feel like our boss was super hard on me too. I mean, I can take criticism but he was pretty out of line. I’m considering talking to HR.”

Luis laughed. “Seriously? Are you sure you’re not blowing this out of proportion? Women tend to do that. They have a bad week at work, just like everyone else, but then it turns into some crazy crusade. Women just need to calm down and not be so easily offended.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Luis portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
Appendix D

Hostile Sexist Vignette 4

Esmeralda started giving Carlos an overview of her research when he interrupted her. “Sure, sure.” Carlos said. “But I was just looking at your stats. I mean, it’s not surprising, but you made a mistake here.”

“I checked my stats several times. There shouldn’t be any mistakes.” Esmeralda said. “And what’s not surprising?”

“No, you definitely made an error. Just trust me, I know stats much better than any woman would. You clearly should have talked to some of the men in your department before you brought this to the conference. It’s pretty embarrassing.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Carlos portrayed in the vignette you just read.
Appendix E

Benevolent Sexist Vignette 1

Marta had been looking forward to a game of football with a group of coworkers because she enjoyed playing with her family when she was younger. When she got to the field, she saw that almost everyone was already there, and the guys were talking together to the side. Manuel walked over to her saying, “Hey, Marta. I was just talking to the guys about you. I want to make sure they go a little easier on you and make sure not to tackle you. I want to make sure you don’t get hurt or feel weird.”

“Oh,” Marta said, “Thanks, but I actually used to play football a decent amount. I’m not too worried.”

“That’s fine, but I just want to look out for you and make sure you feel safe.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Manuel portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
Appendix F

Benevolent Sexist Vignette 2

The debate had been going on about twenty minutes. Alejandro and Maria had been able to have an interesting discussion of the U.S. justice system and they were just finishing their final statements. After they finished, they both walked back while the judges deliberated. “Nice work!” Alejandro said.

“Thanks,” Maria said, smiling, “you know your stuff!”

“I try. Still, you had something I just didn’t.”

“What’s that?” Maria asked.

“Well,” Alejandro said, thinking, “I just generally find women are able to bring in morals and values better. There’s a sense of good intention and purity there that men just don’t have. I think that might give you an edge.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Alejandro portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix G

Benevolent Sexist Vignette 3

Marcela and Diego were hanging out with a small group of friends. They had been chatting about a design class they were taking. “I’d really like to do freelance design work. It just seems like it would be a good fit for me.” Marcela said.

“Yeah, that seems like it would fit you really well,” Diego said, smiling. “That way you can have the flexibility you need to have kids.”

“Well, I’m not sure I want kids,” Marcela shrugged. “But I do like the flexibility.”

“You don’t want kids? But you’re so warm and sweet! You would be such a good mom.”

“Thanks, but it’s just not really something I want.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Diego portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix H

Benevolent Sexist Vignette 4

Tomás and Carmen were chatting in the elevator on their way to work. “You had a date this weekend, didn’t you?” Tomás asked.

“I did,” Carmen said, “it’s going pretty well. We did dinner and a movie, so it made it easy to split the bill.”

“Seriously? I would never split the bill on a date. A guy needs to show he can provide for his woman. When I go on dates, I plan them and pay for them. When a guy takes control with the plans then it shows the girl she’s special! It’s an important part of being chivalrous and a gentleman. I would have never let you pay.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Tomás portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
Appendix I

Neutral Vignette 1

Juan checked the time. He and Mia had a presentation scheduled and they were putting on the finishing touches before it started. “What do you think?” He asked.

“I think it looks good! I don’t see any other typos. What about you?” Juan shook his head. They agreed that it looked ready. “Let me just save it and we can head over!” Mia said. They had been working on the presentation for a couple of weeks and it finally felt ready. It was an important project they had been assigned to, so Juan and Mia really wanted to do well to impress their boss.

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Juan portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
Appendix J

Neutral Vignette 2

Jesús and Isabella recently took a film class together. They ran into each other at the grocery store and were chatting about a movie they had both seen recently. “I thought it was really funny. What about you?” Jesús said. Isabella nodded, “Yeah, definitely. It’s been a while since I’ve gone out to see a movie. I wasn’t sure it would be any good, but I ended up liking it a lot.”

“Same here. They had a really good cast, which definitely helped. Anyways, I need to get going, but it was good seeing you!”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Jesús portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Appendix K

Neutral Vignette 3

Lupita just barely ran to the tennis ball in time and quickly hit it back over the net. “Nice save!” Saúl said, reaching out his racket to return the ball. They were both avid tennis players and enjoyed getting a game in after work. “Thanks!” Lupita called out. They generally didn’t keep score; instead, they just played until they got tired or needed to get going. They paused to get some water. “Oh, there’s a match this weekend. I’m getting a few friends together to watch at my place.” Saúl said. “You and your boyfriend should come.”

“Sounds fun.” Lupita said, nodding.

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Saúl portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
Appendix L

Neutral Vignette 4

Jorge was walking down the street talking to a friend. Without looking where he was going, he ran into Estrella. Her coffee spilled all over both of them. “Hey! What the hell?” Jorge said. “Watch where you’re going.”

“Me? Why don’t you watch where you’re going, you ran into me. I didn’t move at all.”

“I doubt that. Now I need to get my shirt change and I’m already running late. Thanks a lot.” Jorge said, glaring. He stormed off in a huff, muttering about how careless people could be these days.

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Jorge portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Appendix M

Neutral Vignette 5

Partway through the flight, Edgar turned to the woman sitting next to him. He cleared his throat loudly. When that didn’t work, he leaned into her line of sight, saying “Excuse me!” Gabriella took off her headphones. “Can I help you?”

“Actually, I was wondering if you could turn your music down. I’m trying to get some work done and it’s pretty disruptive.”

“No.” Gabriella said, glaring. “I should be able to listen to my music however loud I want.”

“Generally, sure.” Edgar replied. “But it’s tough to focus hearing your music blaring out of your headphones.” Deliberately, Gabriella put her headphones back in and turned away.

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Edgar portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix N

Neutral Vignette 6

Miguel walked over to Sofia’s desk. “Hey, Sofia. Do you have a second?” “Give me just a second,” she said, finishing up an email. “Alright, go ahead!”

“You know the expense report our manager needed last Thursday?” Sofia nodded. “Well, whoever was supposed to take care of it didn’t. You don’t still have it by any chance, do you?”

“You know, I think I do.” Sofia got up and walked over to the filing cabinet. She flipped through the files until she found what she was looking for. “Ah, here it is. Could you just make sure to get a copy back to me when you’re done?”

“Sure thing. Thanks.”

Please list 2-3 traits that describe Miguel portrayed in the vignette you just read.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix O

Vignette Trait Rating Scale

Please read the same vignettes again. This time, please rate the specified individual on the traits provided.

Please rate [Name] on the following traits where '1' indicates 'Does Not Describe' and '7' indicates 'Very Strongly Describes.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1 Does Not Describe</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 Very Strongly Describes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funny</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexist</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>