

Prescription of Protective Paternalism for Men in Romantic and Work Contexts

Marie Sarlet, Muriel Dumont, Nathalie Delacollette and Benoit Dardenne

Psychology of Women Quarterly 2012 36: 444 originally published online 17 August 2012

DOI: 10.1177/0361684312454842

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://pwq.sagepub.com/content/36/4/444>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



<http://www.sagepub.com> Society for the Psychology of Women

Additional services and information for *Psychology of Women Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://pwq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://pwq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Nov 26, 2012

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Aug 17, 2012

[What is This?](#)

Prescription of Protective Paternalism for Men in Romantic and Work Contexts

Marie Sarlet^{1,2}, Muriel Dumont¹, Nathalie Delacollette¹, and Benoit Dardenne¹

Abstract

Behavioral prescription specifies how people ought to act. Five studies investigated prescription for men of protective paternalism, a particular form of benevolent sexism, depending on contextual and individual factors. In Studies 1 and 2, female participants prescribed for men more protective paternalistic behavior toward women in a romantic than in a work context. In Study 3, male participants prescribed the same level of protective paternalistic behavior as female participants did. Conversely, more gender egalitarianism was prescribed for men in a work than in a romantic context (Studies 1–3). In Study 4, the same protective paternalistic behavior was labeled as intimacy in a romantic context but was identified to the same extent as intimacy and as sexism in a work context. In Study 5, female participants' benevolent sexist beliefs predicted their prescription of protective paternalistic behavior for men in both contexts. These studies demonstrated that prescription of protective paternalism for men is a complex phenomenon because it depends on contextual as well as individual variables. These findings need to be added to the list of factors explaining how this particular form of sexism is maintained within gender relationships and how it contributes to women's subordination.

Keywords

sexism, ambivalent sexism, sex role attitudes, social norms, egalitarianism, romance, employee attitudes, patriarchy, social environments

... an act gains its meaning and significance from its relation to the particular conditions of time, place, and circumstance. . . (Asch, 1952, p. 442)

When a woman is confronted by protective restrictions, such as being prohibited to participate in a practicum counseling dangerous men or driving on a long trip alone, how would she react? The answer may well depend partly on who is making the restriction. If the restrictor is a male coworker, the woman could see it as a proof of discrimination and sexism. However, if he is a romantic partner, the woman could see it much more positively—for instance, as a proof that her partner is caring about her safety. Indeed, this is exactly what Moya, Glick, Expósito, de Lemus, and Hart (2007; see also Lee, Fiske, Glick, & Chen, 2010) have shown. That is, most women reacted positively to a protective restriction imposed by a husband but not by a male coworker; a romantic and intimate context makes a protective restriction appear more positive and less discriminatory than a work context. Protective restrictions such as prohibiting a woman from a potentially dangerous situation can be characterized by the term paternalistic. *Protective Paternalism* refers to the belief that men should protect, take care of, cherish, and

provide for the women on whom they depend (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Moya et al.'s (2007) study echoes some earlier research. For instance, Antill (1983) showed that wives' happiness was positively related to husbands' qualities like being cheerful, affectionate, sensitive to the needs of others, compassionate, eager to soothe hurt feelings, and gentle. Moreover, couples in which both partners were high on these qualities were among the happiest. With some variations, several studies have replicated such findings (Bradbury, Campbell, & Fincham, 1995; Gilbert, Deutsch, & Strahan, 1978; Green & Kenrick, 1994). From our point of view, men's protective paternalism may be interpreted by women

¹ Department of Psychology: Cognition and Behavior, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium

² The Belgian National Funds for Scientific Research (FRS-FNRS), Brussels, Belgium

Corresponding Author:

Benoit Dardenne, Department of Psychology: Cognition and Behavior, University of Liège, Boulevard du Rectorat, 5 (B32), B-4000, Liège, Belgium.
Email: b.dardenne@ulg.ac.be

as motivated by affection and compassion, that is, by a genuine desire for intimacy. Overall, these results seem to indicate acceptance of men's protective and paternalistic behaviors by women in a romantic context. However, we do not know what women really want: *Accepting* protective paternalism as in Moya et al.'s (2007) study is not the same as *prescribing* protective paternalism.

Prescription of Protective Behaviors

To prescribe is to specify how group members *should* be and *ought* to act (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Gill, 2004; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Heilman, 2001). Gender prescriptions are often referred to as injunctive norms or socially enforced expectations about how men and women ought to act in a given situation (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). There are strong social pressures to conform to prescriptive norms and stereotypes that make it difficult not to behave accordingly (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Gill, 2004). Indeed, whereas people who do not conform to a descriptive stereotype (describing how people generally behave) elicit surprise, those failing to conform to a prescriptive stereotype elicit rejection.

Women are generally prescribed to be warm (Prentice & Carranza, 2002) and affiliative (Hess, Adams, & Kleck, 2005). In our article, we investigate whether men are prescribed to be paternalistically protective toward women in a romantic context—maintaining and even reinforcing women's traditional gender role including the prescription for warmth (Glick & Fiske, 2001). In contrast, we predict that gender egalitarianism will prevail in a work context. Indeed, nowadays, many legislative measures are established to promote equality between men and women in employment and work. Gender egalitarianism is an important value in a work context even if not transformed into tangible facts (see, for instance, International Labour Organization, 2012). Anderson and Johnson (2003) demonstrated that participants were more egalitarian in a work context than in a social one, and they proposed that egalitarianism at work increased because of a convergence between women's and men's employment roles. In the same way, Koenig and Richeson (2010) demonstrated that participants endorsed more "gender-neutral" ideology (the belief that gender categories should be ignored) in a work context than in a social context. Based on these arguments, we expected women to prescribe more gender egalitarianism for men in a work context than in a romantic one.

Ambivalent Sexism: Hostility and Benevolence

Protective restrictions imposed on women's behavior by men, their relative acceptance by women, and even their prescription as suggested here could be understood from the framework of Ambivalent Sexism Theory. Glick and Fiske (1996, 1997) have developed a model of sexism as an ambivalent attitude in which hostile and benevolent beliefs tend to coexist. *Hostile Sexism* (HS) covers a wide range of

negative feelings and beliefs toward women, such as the belief that women try to sexually seduce men in order to gain advantages over them. *Benevolent Sexism* (BS) involves subjectively positive images of women, such as considering women as nurturing, sensible, caring, and having a sense of aesthetic and moral superiority. BS idealizes women but only if they conform to the traditional roles men assign them and do not challenge men's authority (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997).

BS encompasses three different components (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997). The first one, *Complementary Gender Differentiation*, involves the belief that although men and women harmonize, women are the better gender—but only in ways that suit conventional gender roles. The second component is *Heterosexual Intimacy* or the belief that there are powerful feelings of personal need and intense affection between men and women and that a man can achieve true happiness in life only when involved in a romantic relationship with a woman. The third one is *Protective Paternalism*—the main interest in the current studies. Protective Paternalism refers to the belief that men should protect, cherish, and provide for the women on whom they depend. According to Glick and Fiske (1997, pp. 121–122), Protective Paternalism is:

the benevolent aspect of paternalistic ideology, which states that because of their greater authority, power, and physical strength, men should serve as protectors and providers for women. This protectiveness is particularly strong toward women on whom men are dyadically dependent or over whom they feel a sense of "ownership" (e.g., wives, mothers, daughters).

In the current studies, we propose that this particular form of BS is maintained and supported through men's and women's prescriptive norms and that these norms vary across romantic and work contexts.

Across different samples of men and women, HS and BS are typically positively correlated, thus creating ambivalence in the sense of holding at the same time seemingly contradictory attitudes toward women. For instance, Dardenne, Delacollette, Grégoire, and Lecocq (2006) found a correlation between HS and BS of .46 for men and of .28 for women in French-speaking samples. This positive association was found across various additional studies (e.g., Glick et al., 2000; Glick, Lameiras, & Castro, 2002; Phelan, Sanchez, & Broccoli, 2010).

The idea that HS and BS go hand in hand might seem counterintuitive. However, for men (and any dominant group), hostility tainted with benevolence is certainly a more "fruitful" strategy than hostility alone (Benokraitis, 1997; Haines & Jost, 2000; Jackman, 1994; Rudman & Heppen, 2003). Dominants' pure hostility is directed toward subordinates who do not conform to their role or who call into question social inequalities (e.g., Hebl, King, Glick, Singletary, &

Kazama, 2007). For women, the BS-HS association could be explained by the finding that their endorsement of BS protects them against HS (Glick et al., 2004). For instance, Fischer (2006; also see Phelan et al., 2010) demonstrated that women threatened by men's hostility were more likely to endorse BS, suggesting that BS could be seen as a tool for coping with the perceived threat of men's violence (also see Expósito, Herrera, Moya, & Glick, 2010).

Despite being associated, HS and BS are very different concepts that lead to different consequences for women. For instance, BS predicts positive stereotypes of women whereas HS predicts negative stereotypes (e.g., Dardenne et al., 2006; Glick et al., 2000, 2004). BS, for both women and men, has a positive indirect effect on life satisfaction by increasing diffuse system justification whereas HS is not related to diffuse system justification or life satisfaction for both women and men (Connelly & Heesacker, 2012). HS, but not BS, is positively correlated with tolerance toward sexist humor (Ford, Wentzel, & Lorion, 2001) as well as with denying positive secondary emotions to women (Viki & Abrams, 2003). Moreover, BS predicts negative judgments and stigmatization of rape victims more than HS (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003; Yamawaki, 2007), at least in the case of a "date rape" when the woman first initiates kissing (violating ideals of sexual virtue and thus being blamed for that misconduct). These results show that BS should be considered as a specific form of prejudice which is linked to particular processes that we propose to examine in this article.

Studies have shown that BS alone is sufficient to maintain social inequalities between women and men. For example, women primed with the BS subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) showed increased support for social inequalities and evaluated the social system as fairer (Jost & Kay, 2005). Moreover, exposure to BS and, in particular to its protective paternalistic subcomponent, leads women to behaviorally confirm the stereotypical belief that they are incompetent. Specifically, Dardenne, Dumont, and Bollier (2007) demonstrated that being confronted by a protective paternalistic recruiter during a job interview decreased women's cognitive performance compared to a hostile sexist or nonsexist recruiter, even when protective paternalism was not identified by these women as sexist. Clearly, BS, and more specifically protective paternalism, has damaging consequences for women.

Moreover, previous studies showed that women's personal endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs is also a tool for maintaining women's subordination. For example, BS endorsement at the level of a nation is positively related to gender discrimination (Glick et al., 2000). At an individual level, the more strongly a woman endorses BS beliefs, the more readily she accepts a protective restriction imposed by a romantic partner (Moya et al., 2007). Thus in the present studies, we took into account the impact of a woman's personal level of BS beliefs on her prescription of protective paternalistic behavior for men. Specifically, we focused on

women's level of Protective Paternalism as defined above and also on Heterosexual Intimacy level, that is, the belief that a female romantic partner is necessary for a man to be truly happy and "complete" in his life (Glick & Fiske, 1996). According to Ambivalent Sexism Theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997), Heterosexual Intimacy is sexist because it is focused on men's advantages. Thus, it reinforces the patriarchal social system in which women, as wives and mothers, have to help men in order to be accomplished in their own life. We suggested however that the relationship between endorsement of BS beliefs and prescription of protective paternalistic behavior for men may vary across contexts. Specifically, because Heterosexual Intimacy deals with romance ideals, it would predict the prescription of protective paternalistic behavior only in a romantic context, not in a work one. On the other hand, endorsement of Protective Paternalism would predict prescription of these behaviors across contexts.

The Present Studies

In the current studies, we are interested in how protective paternalism, as a particular form of BS, is maintained and supported through gender-role norm prescriptions. Specifically, we suggest that protective paternalism is maintained in part because it is prescribed for men in a romantic context, is not regarded as sexism in a work context, and is reinforced by women's personal BS beliefs.

In Studies 1 and 2, we activated explicitly (Study 1) or implicitly (Study 2) either a romantic or a work context in a between-subjects design. Prescriptions of protective paternalism as well as gender egalitarianism for men, targeted at the personal (Study 1) and group (Study 2) level, were then assessed. This distinction was made because the literature distinguishes these two levels of perceived discrimination, showing that individuals perceive more discrimination directed toward their group than toward themselves (Taylor, Wright, Moghaddam, & Lalonde, 1990). We wanted to see whether, at both the personal and the group levels, women prescribed more protective paternalism for men in a romantic context than in a work context. Moreover, we expected gender egalitarianism to be more prescribed for men in a work context than in a romantic context.

In Study 3, we wanted to replicate the results from the first two studies in a within-subjects design that included female as well as male participants. Because of the strong social pressure to conform to prescriptive stereotypes (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Gill, 2004), as well as the benefits that being paternalist could bring to men (e.g., Bohner, Ahlborn, & Steiner, 2010), we predicted that men's prescription of protective paternalism (for themselves) would mimic the prescription made by women.

In Studies 4 and 5, we investigated a mechanism which could explain why protective paternalism is more prescribed for men in a romantic context than in a work one. In Study 4,

we tested whether the same men's protective paternalistic behavior could be understood as the result of men's desire to be intimate with women in a romantic context, but as more ambiguous in a work context, that is, evaluated to the same extent as intimacy and as sexism. One step further, Study 5 investigated the hypothesis that women's endorsement of Protective Paternalism as measured by the ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1996) would predict their prescription of protective paternalistic behavior for men in both contexts: the more women endorse Protective Paternalism, the more they would prescribe it for men. We were also interested in women's endorsement of Heterosexual Intimacy. We suggested that, in a romantic context, the more women endorse this sexist belief, the more they would expect men to behave in a protective paternalistic way toward them. We did not expect this effect in a work context in which endorsing heterosexual intimacy beliefs would not be related to how women expect coworkers to behave toward them.

Study 1

Method

Participants

Participants were 40 Caucasian, traditional aged female undergraduate students recruited in various locations on the campus of a Belgian university (for instance, in the library, in the study room, or in the cafeteria). They were all native French speakers and heterosexual. They were all volunteers and received no incentive to participate in the research. Participants were randomly assigned to a romantic context ($n = 20$) or a work one ($n = 20$). All participants were informed that the study concerned relationships between men and women.

Procedure and Materials

We presented participants without any time limit with a written description of either a romantic or a work context, asked them to read it carefully, and then imagine the context described. A romantic context was simply described as a "private, romantic, and seductive relationship" whereas a work one was described as an "occupational and work relationship." Then they were asked to rate various statements concerning relationships between men and women (prescription measure). We targeted prescription at the personal level (i.e., a man toward the female participant). Specifically, we asked participants to evaluate four propositions related to the way a man should ideally behave toward them as a woman. Each proposition was rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*Do not agree at all*) to 7 (*Agree totally*). In a random order, two propositions referred to the prescription of protective paternalism ("I expect a man to be protective towards me" and "I expect a man to be attentive to me," $r = .66$, $p < .001$) and two other propositions

referred to the prescription of gender egalitarianism ("I expect a man to accept that I am as competent as he" and "I expect a man to accept that I have the same tasks as he," $r = .47$, $p = .002$). Items of protective paternalism were based on Glick and Fiske's (1996, 1997) conceptualization of Protective Paternalism such as presented in the Ambivalent Sexism Theory. Importantly, we worded the items in a way that they could apply similarly to a romantic and a work context.

Results and Discussion

We performed two independent sample t tests with context (romantic or work) as a between-subjects factor and protective paternalism and gender egalitarianism prescriptions as dependent variables. Our results concerning protective paternalism prescription showed a significant effect of context, $t(38) = 4.88$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .38$. As expected, women prescribed more protective paternalistic behavior for men in a romantic context ($M = 5.55$, $SD = 0.87$) than in a work one ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.74$). Conversely, our results showed that women prescribed more gender egalitarianism in a work context ($M = 5.90$, $SD = 0.99$) than in a romantic one ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 1.55$), $t(48) = 2.27$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .15$.

In summary, by activating a work or a romantic context, women's evaluation of protective paternalism and gender egalitarianism were affected in opposite ways. Women prescribed protective paternalism more in a romantic context than in a work one, whereas the reverse happened for gender egalitarianism, which was prescribed more in a work context than in a romantic context. Overall, this pattern confirms our main hypothesis according to which women would prescribe protective paternalism for men in a romantic setting and equality in a work one.

We designed a second study to replicate the results of Study 1 using a more implicit manipulation of the context. Moreover, we targeted prescription at the group level (men toward women) rather than at the personal level. We predicted that, even at the group level at which discrimination is more easily perceived as such, women would seek protective paternalism from men. We also used a different scale and items for evaluating prescription.

Study 2

Method

Participants

Participants were 50 Caucasian female undergraduate students ($M_{\text{age}} = 21.88$, $SD = 2.10$, range = 18–29). They were all native French speakers and heterosexual. Participants were all volunteers and received no incentive to participate in the research. They were recruited in various locations on the campus of a Belgian university (e.g., in the library, in the study room, or in the cafeteria). They were asked to participate in

two separate short studies. The first one was presented as a pretest (context manipulation), and the second one was introduced as a study on relationships between men and women (prescription measure). Participants were randomly assigned to a romantic ($n = 26$) or a work context ($n = 24$).

Procedure and Materials

In order to manipulate the context, participants were first shown a series of 20 pictures that had been selected as relating to either a romantic or a work setting. These pictures were presented to participants on a computer screen. Romantic pictures contained, for instance, lovers on a beach, flowers, and a romantic bed. Work pictures contained, for instance, a desk with a computer, a scientist in a lab, and people in a library. The number of pictures displaying people was equal in both contexts. In order to ensure that participants took in the content of each picture, they were asked to rate them on aesthetic and positivity 7-point Likert-type scales. Participants were then thanked for their participation in the alleged first study.

All participants were instructed that the second study concerned relationships between men and women. To measure prescriptions of protective paternalism and gender egalitarianism, we asked participants to evaluate four propositions relating to how men–women relationships should ideally be and how men should ideally behave toward women. For each proposition, the response scale ranged from 1 (*it bothers me*) through 2 (*it's not necessary but it doesn't bother me*), 3 (*that's great but it doesn't bother me if men don't do that*), and 4 (*it's important that men do that*), to 5 (*it should be like that and it bothers me if it isn't*).

In random order, two propositions referred to the prescription of protective paternalism (“That men are protective towards women” and “That men play the rescuers for women,” $r = .65, p < .001$) and two propositions referred to prescription of gender egalitarianism (“That men strive for women having the same power as them” and “That men consider women as their equals,” $r = .41, p = .003$). As in Study 1, we based the items of protective paternalism on Glick and Fiske’s (1996, 1997) definition, and we worded the items in such a way that they could apply similarly to romantic and work contexts. As a manipulation check, participants were asked to what extent the series of pictures presented at the beginning of the session evoked either a work (1) or a romantic (9) context. After completing the questionnaire, participants were thanked and fully debriefed.

Results and Discussion

Manipulation Check

Participants who were exposed to a romantic priming context clearly labeled it as romantic ($M = 8.15, SD = 1.57$), which was significantly different from the midpoint of the scale, $t(25) = 10.26, p < .001$. On the other hand, participants who were exposed to a work priming context clearly

identified it as work ($M = 1.46, SD = 0.51$), which was also significantly different from the scale’s midpoint, $t(23) = -34.09, p < .001$.

Protective Paternalism and Gender Egalitarianism

We performed two independent sample t tests with context (romantic or work) as a between-subjects factor and protective paternalism and gender egalitarianism prescriptions as dependent variables. Concerning protective paternalism, results showed that women tended to prescribe it more for men in a romantic context ($M = 2.90, SD = 0.80$) than in a work one ($M = 2.44, SD = 0.97$), $t(48) = -1.86, p = .07, \eta^2 = .07$. Inversely, our results showed that women prescribed more gender egalitarianism for men in a work context ($M = 3.69, SD = 0.69$) than in a romantic one ($M = 3.17, SD = 0.89$), $t(48) = 2.27, p = .03, \eta^2 = .10$.

Using a more implicit induction of context and by targeting behavior at the group level, we replicated the pattern of results found in Study 1. We confirmed that women prescribed more protective paternalism from men in a romantic context than in a work one and prescribed more gender egalitarianism in a work context than in a romantic one, whether the prescription was targeted at the individual (Study 1) or at the group level (Study 2).

In Study 3, we wanted to extend our results to a sample of male participants. We predicted that men, like women, would prescribe protective paternalism from men in a romantic setting but gender egalitarianism in a work one (Bohner et al., 2010; Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Gill, 2004). We activated context in the same way as in Study 1 (explicitly) but in a within-subjects design. We evaluated prescriptions for men with a new use of dependent measures and with a scale similar to that of Study 1 but with 9 points. In Study 3, as in Studies 4 and 5, we targeted prescription at the group level.

Study 3

Method

Participants

Participants were 54 Caucasian undergraduate students (24 men: $M_{\text{age}} = 26.12, SD = 6.19$; 30 women: $M_{\text{age}} = 24.07, SD = 6.02$) recruited in various locations on the campus of a Belgian university (e.g., in the library, in the study room, or in the cafeteria). They were all native French speakers, heterosexual, and volunteers who received no incentive to participate in the research. All participants were informed that the study concerned relationships between men and women.

Procedure and Materials

We activated the context in the same way as in Study 1 (explicit description of the context) but using a counterbalanced

within-subjects design. Participants were randomly assigned to one or the other order. We asked that they imagine one context without any intrusion from the other. Then, participants rated various statements concerning relationships between men and women (prescription measures). Specifically, we asked participants to state how ideal these relationships should be and how men should ideally behave toward women. Prescriptions were measured with a series of 8 items presented for both contexts. Answers were given on a 9-point scale anchored from 1 (*Do not agree at all*) to 9 (*Totally agree*). Items of protective paternalism corresponded to Glick and Fiske's (1996, 1997) conceptualization. Examples of items were "Men should provide help to women for some tasks" and "Men should protect women" (α s = .84 and .83 for work and romantic contexts, respectively). Examples of gender egalitarianism items were "Men should promote equality between men and women" and "Men should seek to ensure that women have the same responsibilities as they have" (α s = .80 and .85 for work and romantic contexts, respectively). We worded the items in such a way that they could apply similarly to romantic and work contexts.

Results and Discussion

We performed two 2 (Context: work vs. romantic) \times 2 (Gender) \times 2 (Order of presentation) analyses of variance (ANOVAs) separately on the measures of protective paternalism and gender egalitarianism prescriptions, with context as a within-subjects factor. Results revealed that participants prescribed more protective paternalism in a romantic context ($M = 6.28$, $SD = 1.38$) than in a work one ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.44$), $F(1, 50) = 136.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .73$. No effect of order or gender emerged, as well as no interaction: all F s(1, 50) < 1.65 ; all p s $> .26$.

Concerning gender egalitarianism, as expected, participants showed higher prescription ratings in a work context ($M = 7.28$, $SD = 1.36$) than in a romantic context ($M = 6.66$, $SD = 1.54$), $F(1, 50) = 14.02$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$. We found no main effect of order of presentation and no main effect of gender, both $F(1, 50) < .17$, p s $> .49$. The effect of context was, however, qualified by a significant interaction with order of presentation, $F(1, 50) = 5.67$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .10$. Specifically, when a romantic context was presented in first position, participants prescribed significantly more gender egalitarianism for men in a work context ($M = 7.55$, $SD = 1.18$) than in a romantic context ($M = 6.52$, $SD = 1.72$), $t(26) = 3.68$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .34$. When a romantic context was presented in second position, we recorded the same pattern of results ($M = 7.02$, $SD = 1.50$ for work; $M = 6.80$, $SD = 1.36$ for romantic), but the difference was smaller and not statistically significant, $t(26) = 1.34$, $p = .19$. So, the interaction did not call our results into question because it was mainly a matter of degree.

Finally, the interaction between gender and order of presentation also emerged as significant, $F(1, 50) = 25.90$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .14$. Specifically, when a romantic context was presented

in first position, women ($M = 7.41$, $SD = 1.06$) prescribed generally (i.e., the grand mean of prescription for both contexts) more gender egalitarianism than men did ($M = 6.28$, $SD = 1.48$), $t(25) = 2.30$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .17$. When a romantic context was presented in second position, women ($M = 6.66$, $SD = 0.99$) generally prescribed gender egalitarianism to the same extent that men ($M = 7.50$, $SD = 1.49$) prescribed it, $t(25) = -1.77$, $p = .09$. However, and most importantly, no context by gender interaction emerged, $F(1, 50) = 2.66$, $p = .11$, as well as no three-way interaction, $F(1, 50) = 2.03$, $p = .16$.

As expected, irrespective of their gender, participants prescribed more protective paternalism from men in a romantic context than in a work one, whereas the reverse was found for the prescription of gender egalitarianism. Both women and men consider protective paternalism as more important for an ideal relationship between men and women in a romantic context but prescribe more gender egalitarianism for an ideal between-sex work relationship. We found an effect of order of presentation for gender egalitarianism prescription, but this qualification did not call our main results into question.

Although Studies 1 through 3 demonstrated that protective paternalism is prescribed for men more in a romantic context than in a work one, they did not examine *why* it happens. Offering help, protection, advice, and caring might be seen as proof of intimacy that is congruent with romantic and intimate relationships but not with work relationships. More specifically, we predicted that the mere meaning of protective paternalistic behavior would change according to context. Consider a man repeatedly helping a woman to understand statistics, discouraging her from driving on a long trip or complimenting her on her caring ability or her dressing style. If the man is the romantic partner of the woman, is such a behavior seen by her as emanating from the man's wishes to have romantic intimacy, and not from sexism? However, if the man is the boss of the woman, the very same behavior would now be more ambiguous. Is this work example no longer intimate behavior, but rather explicit proof of sexism from the man? To address this question, we asked male and female participants to evaluate the same men's protective paternalistic behavior within both contexts using two scales: one evaluating the behavior as intimacy; the other, as sexist superiority.

Study 4

Method

Participants

Participants were 32 Caucasian undergraduate students (15 men: $M_{\text{age}} = 23.27$, $SD = 4.56$; 17 women: $M_{\text{age}} = 21.18$, $SD = 1.88$) recruited in various locations on a campus of a Belgian university (e.g., in the library, in the study room, or in the cafeteria). They were all native French speakers, heterosexual, and volunteers who received no incentive to

participate in the research. All participants were instructed that the study concerned relationships between men and women.

Procedure and Materials

Participants were told that any behavior could be seen very differently depending on the context in which it occurs. Context manipulation was the same as in Study 3, that is, as an explicit description in a within-subjects design. We asked participants to imagine one context without any intrusion of the other. Order of context was counterbalanced as in Study 3, and participants were randomly assigned to one order condition. Participants had to evaluate men's behavior through 8 items which were worded so that they could apply similarly to romantic and work contexts. Items of protective paternalism were based on Glick and Fiske's (1996, 1997) definition. Examples of these items are "When men protect women" and "When men propose help to women." For each behavior, participants were asked to evaluate its origin on two separate scales. On the first scale, they evaluated the extent to which each man's behavior was "coming from men's wishes to keep or reinforce intimacy between them and women" on a 7-point scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Totally*) ($\alpha = .90$ in a romantic and $.86$ in a work context). On the second scale, participants rated the degree to which each man's behavior was "coming from the sexist feeling of superiority of men toward women" using a 7-point scale from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Totally*) ($\alpha = .84$ in a romantic and $.73$ in a work context).

Results and Discussion

We performed two 2 (Context: work vs. romantic) \times 2 (Gender) \times 2 (Order of presentation) mixed multivariate analyses of variance on both measures of intimacy and sexism with context as a within-subjects factor. There was a main effect of order of presentation on both measures indicating that when a romantic context was presented in first position, scores of intimacy, $F(1,28) = 4.90$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .15$, and of sexism, $F(1,28) = 12.97$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .32$, were lower than when a romantic context was presented in second position. In order to simplify the results and because order of presentation did not interact with the other independent variables, we dropped this factor from the subsequent analysis.

Men's behavior was interpreted more as intimacy in a romantic ($M = 5.39$, $SD = 1.16$) than in a work context ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.19$), $F(1, 30) = 37.57$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .56$, whereas it was interpreted equally as sexism in a romantic ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.22$) and in a work context ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.05$), $F(1, 30) = .48$, $p = .49$. Importantly, further analyses showed that both means were significantly different from the mid-scale in a romantic context. Specifically, intimacy was higher than the mid-scale, $t(31) = 6.75$, $p < .001$, and sexism was lower compared to the mid-scale,

$t(31) = -3.14$, $p = .004$. Whereas in a work context, none of the means was different from the mid-scale, $t(31) = .95$, $p = .35$ and $t(31) = -.34$, $p = .73$.

For the measure of sexism only, analyses revealed a significant interaction between context and gender, $F(1, 30) = 14.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .32$. In a romantic context, male ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.53$) and female ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.90$) participants evaluated men's behavior as equally low on sexism, $t(30) = .25$, $p = .80$. In a work context, male ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 1.31$) participants evaluated men's behavior as more sexist than female ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.56$) participants did, $t(30) = 2.21$, $p = .04$. However, further analyses showed that male participants did not identify men's behavior as clearly sexist because the score did not differ from the mid-scale, $t(30) = 1.03$, $p = .32$. For female participants, they clearly identified men's behavior as very low on sexism because their mean score was significantly below the mid-scale, $t(30) = 3.11$, $p = .01$.

Confirming our hypothesis, for both male and female participants, men's protective paternalistic behavior was perceived as more intimate in a romantic context than in a professional context. Furthermore, whereas a romantic context makes "protective paternalistic" behavior a clear proof of men's desire for intimacy, the very same behavior is more ambiguous when evaluated in a work context in which it is no longer regarded as proof of intimacy. Both male and female participants evaluated men's behavior as equally low on sexism in a romantic context but men evaluated it as more sexist than women in a work context. Finally, only female participants clearly identified men's behavior as very low on sexism in a work context. These patterns may partly explain why protective paternalism is maintained within heterosexual relationships. First, it is perceived by both men and women as intimate in a romantic context but as neutral relative to intimacy in a work context. Second, it is perceived as very low on sexism by female participants in a work context whereas it is neutral relative to sexism for male participants.

Going one step further, in Study 5 we examined the hypothesis that women's personal score of Protective Paternalism would contribute actively to maintaining protective paternalism within gender relationships whatever the context. In other words, the more a woman endorses Protective Paternalism, the more she would prescribe protective paternalistic behavior for men. Moreover, Study 4 suggested that protective paternalism is prescribed for men in a romantic context because it is perceived as being clearly motivated by men's wishes to display or reinforce intimacy between men and women. Therefore, we suggested that women's endorsement of Heterosexual Intimacy would also predict protective paternalism prescription for men—but only in a romantic setting. As stated before, Heterosexual Intimacy, according to the reasoning of Glick and Fiske (1996, 1997), is a particular form of BS which reinforces men's privileges by casting women in their traditional role of making men truly complete and happy, without considering women's own

Table 1. Linear Regression Analyses for Study 5

	Romantic Context					Work Context				
	B	SE	t	p	R ²	B	SE	t	p	R ²
HS	− 0.13	0.12	− 1.12	0.27	0.04	−0.11	0.11	−1.04	0.31	0.04
PP	0.25	0.13	1.82	0.08	0.11	0.27	0.12	2.26	0.03	0.16
HI	0.21	0.09	2.28	0.03	0.16	0.13	0.08	1.63	0.11	0.09
CGD	0.07	0.12	0.69	0.49	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.19	0.85	0.00

Note. Linear regression analyses in each context (Romantic vs. Work) with prescription of protective paternalism as the dependent variable and participants' scores of Hostile Sexism (HS) and scores on the three components of benevolent sexism (Protective Paternalism = PP, Heterosexual Intimacy = HI, Complementary Gender Differentiation = CGD) as predictors.

needs for “completeness.” Stated otherwise, this particular form of intimacy is men-centered and does not really serve women’s (genuine) need for intimacy. In fact, it is a form of sexist intimacy that supports men’s privileges and that women would facilitate by prescribing protective paternalism (rather than genuine mutual intimacy between the sexes).

Study 5

Method

Participants

Participants were 32 Caucasian female undergraduate students ($M_{\text{age}} = 22.69$, $SD = 8.06$, range = 18–59; analyses removing the two oldest participants yielded the same pattern of results as reported here). They were recruited in various locations on the campus of a Belgian university (e.g., in the library, in the study room, or in the cafeteria). They were all native French speakers, heterosexual, and volunteers who received no incentive to participate in the research. All participants were instructed that the study concerned relationships between men and women.

Procedure and Materials

The general procedure closely followed that of Study 3 (within-subjects design with explicit description of both contexts counterbalanced). However, at the very beginning of the study, participants completed the French-language translation of the ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1996). This scale has been validated extensively in the French-speaking linguistic community in Belgium (Dardenne et al., 2006). The ASI comprises two 11-item subscales, one measuring hostility ($\alpha = .87$) and the second evaluating benevolence and encompassing three related but distinct components of benevolence: Protective Paternalism (4 items; e.g., “Women should be cherished and protected by men,” $\alpha = .71$); Heterosexual Intimacy (4 items; e.g., “Every man ought to have a woman he adores,” $\alpha = .72$); and Complementary Gender Differentiation (3 items; e.g., “Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess,” $\alpha = .70$). Consistent with prior research, these three components were positively correlated ($r_s \geq .35$, $p_s \leq .05$).

Prescription of protective paternalism for men was measured with the same 8 items as in Study 3 but with the scale used in Study 2 ($\alpha_s = .81$ in a romantic and $.83$ in a work context).

Results and Discussion

The measure of protective paternalism prescription for men was first analyzed with a 2 (Context: work vs. romantic) \times 2 (Order of presentation) mixed ANOVA with the first factor as within-subjects. Replicating Studies 1 through 3, participants prescribed more protective paternalism for men in a romantic context ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 0.59$) than in a work one ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 0.51$), $F(1, 30) = 133.60$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .82$. The effect of order of presentation was also significant. Specifically, there was a higher overall prescription of protective paternalism for men when a work context was presented first ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.62$) than when it was presented second ($M = 2.19$, $SD = 0.62$), $F(1, 30) = 12.07$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .30$. However, and most importantly, the interaction between context and order of presentation was not significant, $F(1, 30) = .64$, $p = .43$. So, the effect of order of presentation did not qualify the pattern of results.

We then conducted two independent multiple regression analyses in order to predict prescription of men’s protective paternalism, separately for both contexts, from participants’ scores on hostility and on the three components of benevolence (see Table 1). Because all predictors were mean centered, the b coefficients were the increase of prescription when the predictor changed by 1 unit and when all other predictors were at their respective mean. Tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) values were reviewed to examine potential collinearity. Tolerance values were greater than $.52$ and VIF values were less than 1.94 , indicating that collinearity was not a problem in any of our analyses.

In a romantic context (Table 1), the only statistically significant effect was that women reported more prescription of protective paternalism for men if women scored higher in endorsement of Heterosexual Intimacy, $b = .21$, $SE = .09$, $p = .03$, $R^2 = .16$. We also found a tendency indicating that women prescribed more protective paternalism if women scored higher in endorsement of Protective Paternalism, $b = .25$, $SE = .13$, $p = .08$, $R^2 = .11$. For the complete model,

the total R^2 was .42. In a work context, the only significant effect was that women reported more prescription of protective paternalism for men if they scored higher in endorsement of Protective Paternalism, $b = .27$, $SE = .12$, $p = .03$, $R^2 = .16$. For the complete model, the total R^2 was .37. In both contexts, no other predictors were significant.

As we expected, Study 5 demonstrated that participants prescribed more protective paternalism for men in a romantic context than in a work one, replicating our previous results. Study 5 also demonstrated that, in both contexts, prescription of protective paternalism was higher among women who endorse higher levels of Protective Paternalism. Moreover, in a romantic context only, women's endorsement of (sexist) Heterosexual Intimacy also independently predicted the prescription of protective paternalism for men, therefore adding to the ambiguity of protective paternalism.

General Discussion

The current studies investigated how protective paternalism, a particular form of benevolent sexism, is maintained and supported through men's and women's prescriptive norms and how these norms vary across contextual and individual factors. Across five studies, we demonstrated that context is an important variable to take into account for the understanding of protective paternalism preservation within gender relationships. Moreover, results of the last study demonstrated that women's personal attitudes, specifically their endorsement of benevolent sexist ideologies, play a role in this process.

In Studies 1 and 2, we activated explicitly (Study 1) or implicitly (Study 2) either a romantic context or a work one. Protective paternalism targeted at the personal level (Study 1) as well as at the group level (Study 2) was prescribed by women more for men in a romantic context than in a work one. In Study 3, we activated explicitly a romantic context and a work one in a within-subjects design with female and male participants. Men prescribed more protective paternalism for themselves in a romantic than in a work context and to the same extent as women prescribed it to them. In Study 4, we showed that a "protective paternalistic" behavior is indeed seen as more positive in a romantic context than in a professional one; furthermore, it is perceived as the result of men's desire to be intimate with women in a romantic context but not in a work one. In a work context, its interpretation was more ambiguous because it was seen to the same extent as both intimate and sexist, at least for men. Even more so, it was perceived as demonstrably very low on sexism by women. In Study 5, we documented that women's personal endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs influences their prescription of protective paternalism for men. Specifically, women's endorsement of Protective Paternalism predicted prescription of protective paternalism for men in both contexts. Moreover, women's endorsement of Heterosexual Intimacy, a men-centered intimacy such as defined by the Ambivalent Sexism Theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996), predicted

prescription of protective paternalism for men, but only in a romantic context.

It would be useful to focus on how prescription of egalitarianism is sometimes higher than prescription of protective paternalism in both contexts (see Studies 2 and 3). The absolute magnitude of the prescription of protective paternalism and egalitarianism seems to indicate that gender egalitarianism could be a more important factor than protective paternalism, whatever the context. This is an interesting topic for future investigations because our studies do not allow us to explore it further. Indeed, our items assessing protective paternalism and gender egalitarianism prescriptions were not the same. So, both types of prescription cannot be directly compared as simple within-subjects measures because this effect could be due to the specific items used in our studies. For example, items of egalitarianism might have higher social desirability than items of protective paternalism, especially to the extent that some people recognize protective paternalism as a form of sexism. Indeed, the effect of the order of context presentation might also be interpreted as a social desirability one. Specifically, after prescribing some protective paternalism in a romantic context when it was presented first, participants tended to prescribe more gender egalitarianism in a work context (see for instance, Study 2).

The human cognitive system operates in its social context (Wyer & Srull, 1986). By activating a romantic or a work context, we presumably enhanced the accessibility of some specific knowledge and goals. Indeed, accessibility is a temporary state produced by prior processing of a stimulus or a situation that activates related knowledge and goals (Bruner, 1957). If a construct is highly accessible, it will likely come to the fore in one's mind and influence an individual's interpretation of a situation (for instance, see Förster & Liberman, 2007). On one hand, a romantic context could activate knowledge relating to traits such as sentimental, charming, chivalrous, dreamy, and loving. On the other hand, a work context could activate traits such as competent, efficient, qualified, and skilful. Similarly, specific goals were certainly activated by a romantic context versus a work one. We suggest that a romantic context could activate the idea that men and women are interdependent because of intimacy and sexual reproduction needs. So, it could be partly through men's protective paternalistic behavior that these needs are expressed. In contrast, a work context may activate goals such as autonomy, self-sufficiency, and independence. Consequently, gender egalitarianism could be more prescribed for men because it is consistent with these goals. All in all, depending on the context, one possibility is that different knowledge and goals are made accessible. But, if it is the case, how is it possible to have more than one meaning system according to the specific context?

The literature on the working self-concept could give us some answers. This literature suggests that individuals have many self-representations but not all of them are accessible at the same time (Markus & Wurf, 1987). The working

self-concept is a continually active, shifting array of accessible self-knowledge (Hinkley & Andersen, 1996), so that the specific contextual cues combined with an individual's personal needs and motivations lead one self-concept to be prevalent at a particular time (Markus & Kunda, 1986). According to this theory, one possibility is that women and men hold different representations of themselves at home and at work. It could explain why they prescribe different behaviors or behave in different ways in order to be in line with the self-representation activated in each type of context. Specifically, a romantic context could activate a working-self related to a picture of communal women and lead to perceptions of women as needing masculine protection. On the other hand, a work context may activate a working-self related to a portrait of competent women as independent and autonomous. Consequently, women in this work context could be perceived to be the equals of men.

Our results are consistent with those of previous studies about the impact of contextual and individual variables on relationships between men and women. For instance, Moya et al. (2007) showed that women's level of acceptance of paternalistic protective restrictions was greater when it came from a husband than from a coworker, but only for benevolently sexist women. We go one step further by demonstrating that protective paternalism is not just better accepted by benevolently sexist women in a romantic than in a work context, it is also prescribed for men in a romantic context. We insist on the term *prescribed* because prescription of traits or behaviors corresponds to the characteristics that group members *should* possess, and if individuals fail to conform to these characteristics, they often become the targets of sanctions (e.g., Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Heilman, 2001). Recent studies were interested in trait prescriptions for women according to contextual variables. Women were prescribed to be warm (Prentice & Carranza, 2002) and affiliative (Hess et al., 2005), and those women violating these prescriptions might be the victims of a backlash (Rudman & Glick, 2001).

But warmth prescription for women is also a function of the context: Warmth traits were more prescribed for them in a private than in a work context (Delacollette, Dumont, Sarlet, & Dardenne, 2012). In our studies, we demonstrated that protective paternalism is prescribed for men, particularly in a romantic context and particularly if women endorsed higher levels of Protective Paternalism and Heterosexual Intimacy. Consequently, a man who breaks this prescription could be targeted with negative repercussions just as when women violate gender prescriptions (e.g., backlash effect). For example, a man who does not follow his prescription could be sanctioned by not being considered a good romantic partner and by not being perceived as attractive in a woman's eyes. The explanation of such negative consequences for men who do not behave as prescribed would be a relevant and innovative topic for a future empirical focus.

The present studies highlight the importance of benevolent sexism in shaping relationships between men and women in a

romantic context. Likewise, Good and Sanchez (2009) found that men's endorsement of benevolent sexism was positively associated with their investment in romantic ideals and family. Recently, Lee, Fiske, Glick, and Chen (2010) showed that women's partner ideals for both American and Chinese participants were guided by benevolent sexist ideologies. As noted by these authors, "Positive feelings, even when they act to legitimize inequality are crucial for both the maintenance of romantic relationships and are a product of those relationships or potential relationships" (Lee et al., 2010, p. 585). However, this conclusion should not lead us to overlook the negative implications of benevolent sexism for women inside, as well as outside, the home. Indeed, benevolent sexism is positively related to ideologies and values which encourage traditional gender roles (Eastwick et al., 2006; Feather, 2004; Glick et al., 2002; Sibley, Wilson, & Duckitt, 2007; Taşdemir & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2010; Viki, Abrams, & Hutchison, 2003). It is also negatively related to women's participation in economies and in politics across nations (Glick et al., 2000) and to women's interests in education, career goals, and earning money (Rudman & Heppen, 2003). Recently, Expósito et al. (2010) demonstrated, with a Spanish sample, that women who had a high level of benevolent sexism predicted a perception of a husband as more threatened by his wife's job promotion and more likely to display violence toward her. The authors suggested that women high in benevolent sexism may fit traditional gender roles (accepting and even requesting protective paternalism as shown in the current studies) in part to avoid the partner's violence, which then supports social gender inequalities. This is in line with the idea that benevolent sexism plays a protective role against hostile sexism: the higher perceived hostility, the more women endorse benevolent sexism as a protection (Fischer, 2006; Glick et al., 2004; Phelan et al., 2010). So, it is possible that women prescribe protective paternalism from men in a romantic context in order to protect themselves against men's hostile sexist attitudes. This possibility also would be an interesting hypothesis for future studies.

Study 4 demonstrated that in a romantic context, protective paternalism is perceived as being motivated by men's wishes for intimacy. Moreover, we found that women's level of Heterosexual Intimacy predicts prescription of protective paternalism for men in this type of context (Study 5). But why is this so? One possibility is that, as for benevolent sexism in general (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005), some women would not evaluate protective paternalism (as confirmed by Studies 4 and 5 as well as by Dardenne et al., 2007) and heterosexual intimacy as being sexist (or at least as less sexist than hostile sexism). So, these women's "genuine" need for intimacy would translate into high endorsement of men-centered heterosexual intimacy, and protective paternalist behavior would be seen by some women as a proof of men's need for intimacy. Therefore, protective paternalism would be actively sought in a romantic context because it reinforces intimacy

at least subjectively and for women who strongly believe that women are necessary (in their roles of wife and mother) for men to feel complete and truly happy in their life. There is however another possibility. As in any form of intergroup relationships, men and women are embedded in a cycle of competition and cooperation partly because they are highly interdependent (Glick & Fiske, 1999). From such a point of view, women could accept and even request a sort of men-centered and then a “false” heterosexual intimacy in exchange for men’s protection, at least in a romantic setting. However, this trade-off could be dangerous because it has been showed that protective paternalism is deleterious for women (Dardenne et al., 2007).

Practice Implications

Nowadays, inequitable division of labor at home is still a reality. Prescription of benevolent sexism in a romantic context could directly reinforce this fact by encouraging women in their traditional role of homemaker. As Silván-Ferrero and López (2007) have shown, girls contribute more than boys to housework, especially for highly gender-typed housework and this was positively associated to girls’ endorsement of benevolent sexist ideologies. Thus, prescription of benevolent sexism could be a relevant means for maintaining established differences between genders in the division of labor at home.

Moreover, prescription of benevolent sexism at home could have an impact on women’s professional position and could contribute to the glass ceiling effect. Indeed, if women spend a lot of time to assume their traditional role and tasks at home, time available for progressing in professional sphere is limited. So, prescription of benevolent sexism at home could contribute to the underrepresentation of women in top hierarchical positions. Then, prescription of benevolent sexism should be considered as one of the tools by which inequalities between genders are reinforced, both at home and at work. People who have an active role in the road toward the equality between genders or who seek to improve the situation and the well-being of the women have to consider and take into account these kinds of ideologies.

Even though the concept of benevolent sexism has been known for more than 15 years, it is only recently that research has begun to identify its harmful consequences for women. A lot of work remains to be done. In particular, an important question concerns how to reduce benevolent sexist attitudes, as well as how to decrease or even eliminate their deleterious consequences for women. Informing perpetrators who display such attitudes (men as well as women) about their harmful consequences and pervasiveness has been shown to be an effective strategy to reduce their endorsement (Becker & Swim, 2012). Additionally, a practical means for reducing the detrimental effects for the targets would be to teach about such an attitude, which has been demonstrated effective in the case of the stereotype threat (Johns, Schmader, & Martens,

2005). Moreover, acting on the processes by which benevolent sexism impairs women’s performances (i.e., its activation of self-incompetence and its low visibility) would be a promising approach to counter its harmful effects on women (Dardenne & Dumont, 2012).

Limitations and Conclusion

Some limitations to our studies should be highlighted. First, we acknowledge that Studies 2 and 5 might indicate acceptance rather than prescription of protective paternalism. Indeed, the general mean for prescription of protective paternalism in a romantic context fell close to 3, which corresponds to the following statement: “That’s great but it doesn’t bother me if men don’t do that.” However, at least some participants might have been reluctant to express too obviously their request for protective paternalism. Further studies should more clearly delineate the role of social desirability, perhaps using a more indirect measure of prescription or items less difficult to endorse on the prescription side. Also, as demonstrated in Study 5, individual endorsement of sexist beliefs is associated with a higher score of prescription. Indeed, in a romantic context, an increase of 1 on the Heterosexual Intimacy scale is linked with an increase of .21 on the score of prescription and an increase of 1 on the Protective Paternalism scale is related with an increase of .25 on the score of prescription. Otherwise stated, an individual who would score at 1 standard deviation above the mean on the Protective Paternalism or Heterosexual Intimacy scales would get a score of prescription much closer to 4, which corresponds to “It’s important that men do that.” The potential meaning then of this scaling is that, at least for some women, protective paternalism from men is actively sought, not merely accepted. Second, our samples were composed of heterosexual college students whose experience with romantic relationships may outstrip their experience with employment. Future research should examine prescription of protective paternalism and of egalitarianism for men with diverse samples and, in particular, with women who are engaged in the professional world.

Prescription of protective paternalism for men is a complex phenomenon because it depends on contextual as well as individual variables. First, protective paternalism is prescribed for men in a romantic context, not in a work one. Second, it is perceived as proof of men’s intimacy in a romantic context, and it is not regarded as sexist in a work one. Third, it is influenced by women’s personal endorsement of benevolent sexist beliefs. These findings need to be added to the list of factors explaining how this particular form of sexism is maintained within gender relationships and how it contributes to women’s subordination. Ideologies that are accepted by subordinate members without rebellion and even actively sought by some of them, as in the case of protective paternalism in a romantic context, are very powerful tools for maintaining social inequalities. Improved understandings of

such ideologies, as proposed through the present studies, are necessary in order to move closer toward genuine equality between the sexes.

Authors' Note

Marie Sarlet is a Research Fellow of the Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research (FRS-FNRS). We thank Johanne Huart for her many helpful comments and fruitful discussions.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research was supported by an incentive grant I-06/07 to Benoit Dardenne and by a grant SFR 2007 to Marie Sarlet, both from the University of Liège.

References

- Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Böhner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 111–125. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111
- Anderson, S. J., & Johnson, J. T. (2003). The who and when of “gender-blind” attitudes: Predictors of gender-role egalitarianism in two different domains. *Sex Roles, 49*, 527–532. doi:10.1023/A:1025836807911
- Antill, J. K. (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 145–155. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.45.1.145
- Asch, S. (1952). *Social psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. doi: 10.1037/ 10025-000
- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). The burden of benevolent sexism: How it contributes to the maintenance of gender inequalities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 633–642. doi:10.1002/ejsp.270
- Benokraitis, N. V. (1997). *Subtle sexism: Current practices and prospects for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2012). Reducing endorsement of benevolent and modern sexist beliefs: Differential effects of addressing harm versus pervasiveness of benevolent sexism. *Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000091
- Böhner, G., Ahlborn, K., & Steiner, R. (2010). How sexy are sexist men? Women's perception of male response profiles in the ambivalent sexism inventory. *Sex Roles, 62*, 568–582. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9665-x
- Bradbury, T. M., Campbell, S. M., & Fincham, F. D. (1995). Longitudinal and behavioral analysis of masculinity and femininity in marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 328–341. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.328
- Bruner, J. S. (1957). On perceptual readiness. *Psychological Review, 64*, 123–152. doi:10.1037/h0043805
- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 5*, 665–692. doi:10.1037/1076-8971.5.3.665
- Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity and compliance. In D. T. Gilbert S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 151–192). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Connelly, K., & Heesacker, M. (2012). Investigating the relations between benevolent sexism, system justification, and life satisfaction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Manuscript accepted for publication.
- Dardenne, B., Delacollette, N., Grégoire, C., & Lecocq, D. (2006). Latent structure of the French validation of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: l'Echelle de Sexisme Ambivalent. *L'Année Psychologique, 106*, 235–264. doi:10.4074/S0003503306002041
- Dardenne, B., & Dumont, M. (2012). Lessening women's readiness to accept the status quo helps avoiding benevolent sexism's deleterious impact on performance. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Dardenne, B., Dumont, M., & Bollier, T. (2007). Insidious dangers of benevolent sexism: Consequences for women's performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 764–779. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.764
- Delacollette, N., Dumont, B., Sarlet, M., & Dardenne, M. (2012). *Benevolent sexism, men's advantages and prescription of warmth to women*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Eastwick, P. W., Eagly, A. H., Glick, P., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., Fiske, S. T., Blum, A. M. B., ... & Volpato, C. (2006). Is traditional gender ideology associated with sex-typed mate preferences? A test in nine nations. *Sex Roles, 54*, 603–614. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9027-x
- Expósito, F., Herrera, M. C., Moya, M., & Glick, P. (2010). Don't rock the boat: Women's benevolent sexism predicts fears of marital violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34*, 36–42. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01539.x
- Feather, N. T. (2004). Value correlates of ambivalent attitudes about gender relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 3–12. doi:10.1177/ 0146167203258825
- Fischer, A. R. (2006). Women's benevolent sexism as reaction to hostility. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 410–416. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00316.x
- Ford, T. E., Wentzel, E. R., & Lorion, J. (2001). Effects of exposure to sexist humor on perceptions of normative tolerance of sexism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 677–691. doi:10.1002/ejsp.56
- Förster, J., & Liberman, N. (2007). Knowledge activation. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 201–231). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gilbert, L., Deutsch, C., & Strahan, R. (1978). Feminine and masculine dimensions of the typical, desirable, and ideal woman and man. *Sex Roles, 4*, 767–778. doi:10.1007/ BF00287337

- Gill, M. J. (2004). When information does not deter stereotyping: Prescriptive stereotyping can foster bias under conditions that deter descriptive stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 619–632. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2003.12.001
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 1323–1334. doi:10.1177/01461672972312009
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491–512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 119–135. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). Sexism and other “isms”: Interdependence, status, and the ambivalent content of stereotypes. In W. B. Swann Jr., Langlois, J. H. & L. A. Gilbert (Eds.), *Sexism and stereotypes in modern society: The gender science of Janet Taylor Spence* (pp. 193–222). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10277-008
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent stereotypes as legitimizing ideologies: Differentiating paternalistic and envious prejudice. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 278–306). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., Abrams, D., Masser, B., . . . & López, W. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 763–775. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.79.5.763
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., & Castro, C. (2002). Education and catholic religiosity as predictors of hostile and benevolent sexism toward women and men. *Sex Roles, 47*, 433–441. doi: 10.1023/A:1021696209949
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., . . . & Wells, R. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 713–728. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.5.713
- Good, J. J., & Sanchez, D. T. (2009). Communal stereotypes prime men’s benevolent sexism: Implications for romance and family. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 10*, 88–94. doi:10.1037/a0013427
- Green, B. L., & Kenrick, D. T. (1994). The attractiveness of gender-typed traits at different relationship levels: Androgynous characteristics may be desirable after all. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 244–253. doi:10.1177/0146167294203002
- Haines, E. L., & Jost, J. T. (2000). Placating the powerless: Effects of legitimate and illegitimate explanation on affect, memory, and stereotyping. *Social Justice Research, 13*, 219–236. doi:10.1023/A:1026481205719
- Hebl, M. R., King, E. B., Glick, P., Singletary, S. L., & Kazama, S. (2007). Hostile and benevolent reactions toward pregnant women: Complementary interpersonal punishments and rewards that maintain traditional roles. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1499–1511. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1499
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women’s ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 657–674. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00234
- Hess, U., Adams, R. B., & Kleck, R. E. (2005). Who may frown and who should smile? Dominance, affiliation, and the display of happiness and anger. *Cognition and Emotion, 19*, 515–536. doi: 10.1080/02699930441000364
- Hinkley, K., & Andersen, S. M. (1996). The working self-concept in transference: Significant-other activation and self-change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 1279–1295. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.71.6.1279
- International Labour Organization. (2012). *Gender equality*. Retrieved from <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/equality-and-discrimination/gender-equality/lang-en/index.htm>
- Jackman, M. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class and race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Johns, M., Schmader, T., & Martens, A. (2005). Knowing is half the battle: Teaching stereotype threat as a means of improving women’s math performance. *Psychological Science, 16*, 175–179. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00799.x
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 498–509. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498
- Koenig, A. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2010). The contextual endorsement of sexblind and sexaware ideologies about sex differences. *Social Psychology, 41*, 186–191. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000026
- Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., Glick, P., & Chen, Z. (2010). Ambivalent sexism in close relationships: (Hostile) power and (benevolent) romance shape relationship ideals. *Sex Roles, 62*, 583–601. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9770-x
- Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability of the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 858–866. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.4.858
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 38*, 299–337. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.38.020187.001503
- Moya, M., Glick, P., Expósito, F., de Lemus, S., & Hart, J. (2007). It’s for your own good: Benevolent sexism and women’s reactions to protectively justified restrictions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1421–1434. doi:10.1177/0146167207304790
- Phelan, J. E., Sanchez, D. T., & Broccoli, T. L. (2010). The danger in sexism: The links among fears of crime, benevolent sexism, and well-being. *Sex Roles, 62*, 35–47. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9711-8
- Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn’t be, are allowed to be, and don’t have to

- be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26, 269–281. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 743–762. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00239
- Rudman, L. A., & Heppen, J. B. (2003). Implicit romantic fantasies and women's interest in personal power: A glass slipper effect? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1357–1370. doi: 10.1177/0146167203256906
- 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 rightwing authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 160–172. doi: 10.1177/0146167206294745
- Silvan-Ferrero, M. P., & Lopez, A. B. (2007). Benevolent sexism toward men and women: Justification of the traditional system and conventional gender roles in Spain. *Sex Roles*, 57, 607–614. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9271-8
- Taşdemir, N., & Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2010). The relationships between ambivalent sexism and religiosity among Turkish university students. *Sex Roles*, 62, 420–426. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9693-6
- Taylor, D. M., Wright, S. C., Moghaddam, F. M., & Lalonde, R. N. (1990). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group, but not myself, to be a target for discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 16, 254–262. doi: 10.1177/0146167290162006
- Viki, G. T., & Abrams, D. (2003). Infra-humanization: Ambivalent sexism and the attribution of primary and secondary emotions to women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 492–499. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00031-3
- Viki, G. T., Abrams, D., & Hutchison, P. (2003). The “true” romantic: Benevolent sexism and paternalistic chivalry. *Sex Roles*, 49, 533–537. doi:10.1023/A:1025888824749
- Wyer, R. S., & Srull, T. K. (1986). Human cognition in its social context. *Psychological Review*, 93, 322–359. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.93.3.322
- Yamawaki, N. (2007). Rape perception and the function of ambivalent sexism and gender-role traditionality. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 406–423. doi:10.1177/0886260506297210