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Summaries of Small Domains

As the number of identified domains was relatively large ($N_{\text{domains}} = 27$, $N_{\text{subdomains}} = 23$), the focus is on the five largest domains (in terms of the number of articles), which thus allowed for a more coherent synthesis of the findings. Smaller adjacent domains are described in the synthesis based on similarity of concepts and consistency of patterns with the large domains. Other, smaller domains that exhibited less distinctive patterns are only mentioned briefly in the synthesis, but interested readers can find detailed summaries of these domains below.

Domains Related to the Social Ideologies Domain

Religiosity ($n_{\text{articles}} = 21$)

Articles linking ambivalent sexism to religiosity point to a number of differences across religions. The indicators of religiosity included endorsement of religious and spiritual beliefs (e.g., Burns & Busso, 2005), practices (e.g., Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014), and identity (e.g., Balkin et al., 2009), as well as agreement with the core tenets of one’s religion (e.g., Maltby et al., 2010). These indicators encompassed both institutional (public) and personal (private) aspects of religiosity/spirituality (for a review of different definitions of these concepts, see Zinnbauer & Pargament, 2005).

Consistent with its role in maintaining traditionality, BS is positively associated with religiosity among both men and women in the three following religions: Christianity (Burn & Busso, 2005; Glick et al., 2002; Maltby et al., 2010; Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014), Islam (Husnu, 2016; Maitner & Henry, 2018; Taşdemir & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2010), and Judaism (Gaunt, 2012). One article showed that the religiosity-BS association in Christians may be explained by prioritizing values of conservatism over openness to change (Mikołajczak & Pietrzak, 2014).

By contrast, HS is positively associated with religiosity in Islam (Husnu, 2016), especially among men (Taşdemir & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2010). HS in Christians is in most cases unrelated to
religiosity (e.g., Glick et al., 2002), but is positively related to biblical interpretations that endorse the
gender hierarchy (Eliason et al., 2017; Orme et al., 2017) and belief in male god concepts (Howard et

Thus, overall, both HS and BS are associated with levels of religiosity, with mixed evidence in
terms of the directionality of these associations. The way ambivalent sexism maintains religious
observance seem to depend on the type of sexism endorsed. BS maintains women’s distinct role in the
religion (e.g., in the case of Judaism; Gaunt, 2012), whereas HS maintains men’s dominance over
women as part of the religion (e.g., in the case of Islam; Taşdemir & Şakalli-Uğurlu, 2010). Again, BS
reflects values, whereas HS reflects concerns over rank.

Due to the correlational nature of most of these articles, no causal conclusions can be drawn,
although a reciprocal relationship, especially for BS, seems fairly plausible and should be tested in the
future. Although BS may tend to favor religious beliefs and practices that support the basic values
reflected in its ideology, exposure to religious concepts can also directly promote BS (as indicated in
one article that employed an experimental design; Haggard et al., 2019). Nevertheless, some evidence
also suggests that social ideologies play a more crucial role than religiosity in predicting HS or BS
(Hellmer et al., 2018; Van Assche et al., 2019).

**Personality (n articles = 19)**

Articles that have examined the relationship between ambivalent sexism and a variety of
personality variables demonstrate that both HS and BS (with more findings reported for HS than BS)
are positively associated with a set of relational difficulties.

In both men and women (in most instances), HS is associated with dark-triad personality traits
(i.e., narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism; Gluck et al., 2020; Keiller, 2010; Methot-Jones
et al., 2019; Sanchez-Ruiz et al., 2021), interpersonal cognitive distortions (e.g., unrealistic
expectations from relationships; Bozkur & Gundogdu, 2018), alexithymia (i.e., difficulty to process
emotions cognitively; Garaigordobil, 2013), a sense of personal inadequacy and lower intimacy with significant others (Cowan & Ullman, 2006), interpersonal dominance characteristics and low interpersonal warmth (Goh & Tignor, 2020), lower empathic concern (Hellmer et al., 2018), and lower agreeableness (Hald et al., 2013). Thus, HS reflects personality related to dominance, perhaps with distinctly masculine tone (lacking female-role communion).

As for BS, some (but relatively few) articles do point to patterns similar to those of HS, such as with feelings of alienation (Nicol & Rounding, 2013), lower openness and agreeableness (Christopher et al., 2013), cognitive needs (e.g., need for closure; Hill et al., 2010; Roets et al., 2012), and biases in self-perception (e.g., when individuals view themselves as more agreeable than their friends see them; Goh & Tignor, 2020). BS was also positively associated with men’s interpersonal dominance and warmth (Goh & Tignor, 2020) and women’s psychological entitlement (i.e., a facet of narcissism encompassing feelings of superiority and deservingness; Grubbs et al., 2014; Hammond et al., 2014); the latter implies that the benefits presumably offered by BS (praise and provision to women) are central to women’s adoption of it. Thus, BS may relate to some extent to self-esteem from fulfilling one’s gender role.

Finally, two articles examined how attachment styles differentially relate to ambivalent sexism (Hart et al., 2012; Yakushko, 2005). Both report, with some gender differences, that attachment avoidance is positively associated with HS, whereas attachment anxiety is positively associated with both HS and BS. A relevant meta-analysis that approached mostly data that were not included in this review, such as correlations that were previously unpublished (M. I. Fisher & Hammond, 2019; $k = 22$ for both genders in total), supports our analysis and sheds light on previous inconsistencies regarding gender differences. Specifically, they found that while the link of HS and BS to attachment anxiety applies for both men and women, the HS-attachment avoidance link applies only for men.
The findings overall provide some evidence that endorsement of *both HS and BS* (with more evidence for HS) has roots in personality related to relational difficulties and early attachment insecurities. Although articles generally hypothesize that the personality variables antecedent endorsement of ambivalent sexism, most studies employed correlational, cross-sectional designs (for exceptions, see Hald et al., 2013; Hammond et al., 2014) which thus limit their ability to make causal inferences. Ideally, future research could come closer to testing causal predictions.

**Demographics (n_articles = 11)**

Articles that reported demographic correlates of ambivalent sexism were included in this domain. Gender differences in ambivalent sexism were not analyzed systematically, because according to our inclusion and exclusion criteria, articles that only reported descriptive analyses were not included (including those only reporting gender differences). However, the (included) cross-cultural investigation by Glick et al. (2000) points to gender differences in the endorsement of ambivalent sexism, and suggested that across nations, women (in comparison with men) rejected HS but often accepted BS, to the extent in some countries of endorsing BS significantly more strongly than men. Also, national averages of HS and BS associate with gender inequality indices across nations (Glick et al., 2000). Furthermore, education (Garaigordobil, 2013; Glick et al., 2002; Hellmer et al., 2018; Ruthig et al., 2017) and age (Mesquita et al., 2018; Ohse & Stockdale, 2008; Zakrisson et al., 2012) are negative predictors of ambivalent sexism (the findings were inconsistent as to the differential associations of HS and BS with these demographic correlates).

We also included here articles that reported general patterns related to the endorsement of ambivalent sexism. One article based on seven annual waves of longitudinal panel data (Huang et al., 2019) showed that for men and women, both HS and BS demonstrated high levels of rank-order stability across time (i.e., individuals’ relative position in their level of endorsement of ambivalent sexism remained stable) and that both the mean levels of HS and BS generally decreased over time
(with some gender differences in deceleration rates). Two other articles employing longitudinal designs found that women’s BS predicted changes in their own HS (Sibley et al., 2007) and that societal perceptions of men’s (but not women’s) BS produced changes in both men’s and women’s own BS (Sibley et al., 2009). Articles using cross-sectional designs (Glick et al., 2000; see also Zakrisson et al., 2012) found that when societal levels of ambivalent sexism are high, women are more likely to embrace it (with a tendency to accept more BS than HS). As for the correlations between the ambivalent sexism constructs, HS and BS correlate positively across nations (Glick et al., 2000).

**Intersectionality (n_articles = 19)**

Articles also examined intersections of demographic and social indicators in relation to ambivalent sexism. HS and BS constructs were treated either as dependent variables (e.g., Cowie et al., 2019) or as measured (e.g., Hodson et al., 2021) or manipulated (Kirkman & Oswald, 2020) independent variables intersecting with others to test the effects on a variety of outcome variables. Because the articles in this domain were highly diverse in terms of the variables tested, only the main intersections are described.

Articles examining the intersection of gender and race generally show that BS, more than HS (but cf. Hodson et al., 2021; Katz et al., 2018), is associated with anti-Black bias. To illustrate, Black (vs. White) men were “penalized” for exhibiting BS behavior (i.e., they are perceived as more sexist; Kirkman & Oswald, 2020). BS was expressed more toward White (vs. Black) women; yet, BS was expressed more toward chaste Black (vs. White) women, suggesting that Black women were overcompensated for their conformity with traditional gender norms, but their BS behavior did not translate into more positive evaluations of them overall (McMahon & Kahn, 2016). When evaluating an ambiguous case of police violence against a woman suspect, BS individuals perceived a White (vs. Black) woman suspect as more feminine, which in turn elicited less victim-blaming (Brown-Iannuzzi et

---

1 Although this information was not extracted from the articles (as it constitutes basic validity information of the ASI; see the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the Method section), the vast majority of articles in the review observed positive correlations between HS and BS.
al., 2021). Among men (especially White), racial bias may also be related to a desire to protect women, as indicated in the finding that induced crime threat increased the endorsement of the protective paternalism component of BS, which in turn predicted greater racial bias: negative views of immigration, less support for policies that benefit racial minority groups, and greater denial of racial bias in policing (McMahon & Kahn, 2018).

Two other notable intersections are associated with ambivalent sexism. In terms of gender and sexual orientation, endorsement of both HS and BS was higher for heterosexual people than non-heterosexual people and higher for heterosexual men than heterosexual women (Cowie et al., 2019; López-Sáez et al., 2020; Pistella et al., 2018; Warriner et al., 2013; Zhao & Zheng, 2021), with the lowest BS among gay men (Cowie et al., 2019) and lowest HS among lesbian women (Zhao & Zheng, 2021), compared to other combinations of gender and sexual identity. An article that examined the intersection of gender and age using six waves of longitudinal panel data (Hammond et al., 2018) found that endorsement of ambivalent sexism over time tended to decrease for most ages but that these patterns were contingent on gender. Specifically, over time, HS for both men and women and women’s BS followed a U-shaped curvilinear trajectory, but men’s BS followed a positive linear trajectory.

Overall, generalizations about ambivalent sexism and intersectionality were hard to make as in some cases the appropriate comparison groups in terms of evaluators and targets were missing. Future research should conduct systematic investigations to achieve a deeper understanding of intersectional ambivalent sexism (for noteworthy examples, see Cowie et al., 2019; Hammond et al., 2018).

**Domains Related to the Violence Domain**

*Law (n_{articles} = 33)*

Articles classified in the Law domain examined how ambivalent sexism is related to judgments of defendants and plaintiffs in criminal cases. The paradigms here usually involved exposure to cases that were either hypothetical (e.g., Herzog & Oreg, 2008) or based on real events (e.g., Wiener et al.,
2010), using written vignettes (Skinner et al., 2015) or video reenactments (O’Connor et al., 2004). The experiments manipulated different aspects of the case, such as the gender of the defendant (e.g., Cutroni & Anderson, 2021) or plaintiff (e.g., Cox & Kopkin, 2016), other demographic characteristics of the parties (e.g., race; Eldabli et al., 2021; sexual orientation, Russell et al., 2009), adherence of the plaintiff to traditional gender roles (e.g., Herzog & Oreg, 2008), nature of the crime (e.g., Herzog, 2007; Skinner et al., 2015), and legal standards (e.g., Wiener & Hurt, 2000). A few articles employed correlational designs in which they assessed the relationship between ambivalent sexism and more general law-related outcomes (e.g., support for death penalty for rape offenders; Uysal et al., 2021), with some focusing on specific police forces (e.g., Gracia et al., 2014) and convicted felons (e.g., Vecina, 2018). The contexts examined were mostly gender-based crimes related to sexual violence (e.g., Viki et al., 2004), domestic violence (e.g., Herrera et al., 2012), or sexual harassment (e.g., Wiener et al., 2010), with a few examining other, more general contexts (e.g., driving; Skinner et al., 2015).

The evidence indicates that across diverse criminal contexts, in both men and women (with some gender differences and with some caveats), HS (but mostly not BS) is associated with blaming-related outcomes (e.g., lower credibility, higher responsibility, harsher punishment) of women defendants (Girvan et al., 2015) and women plaintiffs (Cutroni & Anderson, 2021; Herrera et al., 2012; O’Connor et al., 2004; Valor-Segura et al., 2011), and with greater leniency for men defendants (Cutroni & Anderson, 2021; Herzog, 2007; Schwartz & Hunt, 2011; Uysal et al., 2021; Wiener et al., 1997), and lower perceptions of the severity or seriousness of men’s crime (Herzog, 2007; Wiener et al., 2010; Wiener & Hurt, 2000) (for a more detailed overview of the role of HS in judgments of sexual harassment cases, see the Sexual Harassment domain). Conceptually similar patterns are reflected in the associations between HS and convicted felons’ perceptions of their own crimes (Guerrero-Molina et al., 2020; Lila et al., 2014; Vecina, 2018).
By contrast, some evidence indicates that BS predicts strict evaluations (Herzog & Oreg, 2008; Wiener et al., 1997) and harsh punishment (Herzog, 2007; Uysal et al., 2021) for men offenders, but also leniency for women defendants (e.g., in self-defense cases; Cuttoni & Anderson, 2021; Girvan et al., 2015; Russell et al., 2009; but cf. Ragatz & Russell, 2010). The protective effect for women may extend to women plaintiffs, contingent on the specifics of the case (Gracia et al., 2014; Lila et al., 2013; Viki et al., 2004; for more details, see the Violence domain), and the women, either as defendant or plaintiff, when adhering to traditional gender roles (e.g., perceived as feminine; Brown-Iannuzzi et al., 2021; e.g., stay-at-home mothers; Herzog & Oreg, 2008) as compared to stark violations of prescribed gender roles (e.g., a woman arrested for prostitution, Eldabli et al., 2021; Viki et al., 2005).

Overall, consistent with the patterns observed for HS in the Violence domain, HS is associated with judging women plaintiffs or defendants in a criminal case harshly, and being more lenient with men defendants. By contrast, BS may have a protective, but conditional, effect on women defendants and plaintiffs. As few articles examine BS, future research should aim to better understand whether BS has a protective effect on women in criminal cases, whether this effect holds for both women defendants and plaintiffs, and whether it is conditional on aspects of the case and the woman’s behavior. In addition, because the contexts examined in this domain were mainly focused on gender-based violence (but cf. Brown-Iannuzzi et al., 2021; Herzog & Oreg, 2008; Skinner et al., 2015), future research should examine whether the potential negative bias of HS, and the positive bias of BS, toward women in criminal cases, also extend to other types of crimes.

**Media and Art (n_articles = 29)**

Articles were included in this domain if they examined the relationship between ambivalent sexism and using or preferring certain types of media and art, or if they examined the relationship between ambivalent sexism and diverse outcomes (e.g., related to violence) in other domains but in a
context related to the media. Consistent with the interpretation of HS as preoccupied with hierarchy, most articles here reported effects for HS, rather than BS, in the context of online gaming and pornography. In articles about online gaming, HS is associated with engagement in sexist and sexual forms of harassment (Seo et al., 2021; Tang et al., 2020; Tang & Fox, 2016). Also, anonymous (Fox et al., 2015; Shim & Paul, 2014) or sexualized (LaCroix et al., 2018; Rollero, 2013) online environments, as well as exposure to pornography (Hald et al., 2013; Shim & Paul, 2014; Skorska et al., 2018) increase HS (see also the Body/Face Evaluations Domain). HS is also linked to online forms of violence, such as engagement in cyberbullying (Martinez-Pecino & Durán, 2019), revenge porn (Pina et al., 2017), and acceptance of cyberstalking (A. Becker et al., 2021). However, whether the gender differ is unclear, because some articles assessed only men (e.g., Seo et al., 2021), while others assessed both men and women but reported effects either for both (e.g., Fox et al., 2015) or solely for men (e.g., Rollero, 2013). Not much evidence assesses the association between HS and certain forms of media use, with one article finding that HS is associated with pornography consumption (Hald et al., 2013) but two other articles providing mixed evidence as to whether online gaming is associated with HS (Fox & Potocki, 2016) or BS (Stermer & Burkley, 2015).

By contrast, two articles found that BS among women is associated (Altenburger et al., 2017 [similar patterns for HS]) and is enhanced (Harris et al., 2017) by the consumption of erotic literature (e.g., the fictional series Fifty Shades), and is related to the interpretation of this erotic literature (which is often violent and depicts traditional roles) as romance (Altenburger et al., 2017). One article also found that BS in women increased after exposure to pornography (Hald et al., 2013). Other media and art contexts have been linked to ambivalent sexism more generally, although there are not enough

---

2 Qualitative research that examined representations of ambivalent sexism in the media (e.g., Blumell et al., 2019; Moore, 2018) was excluded in the screening stage of the review (see the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the Method section).
articles to define specific patterns in music (Cobb & Boettcher, 2007; Hyatt et al., 2017) and sports (Custers & McNallie, 2017; Forbes et al., 2006; Rogers, 2020).

Overall, online gaming appears to provide HS with a rich platform for manifesting harassment, and HS is likely to increase as a result of exposure to online sexual content. Erotic literature may provide BS in women a chance to manifest in the disguise of romance. These preliminary findings would benefit from future work to further understand the differential roles of HS and BS in media and art contexts (with potential gender differences), especially in terms of the outcomes of use and preferences, because current evidence is scant, and findings are mixed.

**Domains Related to the Workplace Domain**

**Politics (n_articles = 29)**

Articles that examined the role of ambivalent sexism in politics refer specifically to the 2016 US presidential election (e.g., Zucker et al., 2019), although a few refer to other US elections (e.g., Tate, 2014), or perceptions of politicians in general (without focusing on specific candidates; e.g., Barnes et al., 2020). Articles that focused on characteristics of voters point to a relationship between ambivalent sexism (with more evidence for HS than BS) and political affiliation and beliefs. Individuals who showed higher levels of sexist attitudes were also high on political conservatism (vs. liberalism) (Blumell & Rodriguez, 2020; Maitner & Henry, 2018 [in the UAE]; Prusaczyk & Hodson, 2019; Ruthig et al., 2017), with right-wing (vs. left-wing) ideological approaches (Heras-Sevilla & Ortega-Sánchez, 2020 [in Spain]), and being Republicans (vs. Democrats) (Dehlin & Galliher, 2019; for an intersection with religious identification, see Cassese, 2020). Two articles found that political party, more so than gender, accounts for endorsement of ambivalent sexism (Cassese, 2020; Cassese & Holman, 2019).

In terms of evaluations of specific candidates and voting behavior, HS (but mostly not BS, in the articles that assessed it), when controlling for political orientation, predicted favoring Trump and
disfavoring Clinton (Cassese & Holman, 2019; Glick, 2019; Ratliff et al., 2019; Shook et al., 2020; Vescio & Schermerhorn, 2021), as well as support (Monteith & Hildebrand, 2020; Schaffner et al., 2018; Valentino et al., 2018), voting intentions (Cassese & Holman, 2019; Shook et al., 2020), and actual reported voting (Bock et al., 2017; Cassese & Barnes, 2019; Ratliff et al., 2019; Rothwell et al., 2019; Vescio & Schermerhorn, 2021) for Trump over Clinton. HS’s negative link to favoring (Glick, 2019) and voting (in 2008, Gervais & Hillard, 2011) for Clinton was unique to women (but not men). Two factors may have exacerbated some of these effects: exposure to Trump’s “woman’s card” attack at Clinton (Cassese & Holman, 2019) and voters’ left-leaning orientation (as left-leaning voters may feel more cross-pressured by their sexist attitudes compared to right-leaning voters; Banda & Cassese, 2020; Rothwell et al., 2019). Possible mechanisms underlying these effects are feelings of anger (Valentino et al., 2018; see also Cassese & Holman, 2019) and perceived gender discrimination toward men (Monteith & Hildebrand, 2020). HS may have been especially influential in understanding election outcomes in the 2016 election compared to previous elections (Cassese & Barnes, 2019; Tate, 2014; but cf. Gervais & Hillard, 2011). By contrast, articles reporting effects for BS are scarce, finding that it was associated with a protective effect toward Clinton (e.g., greater favorability; Cassidy & Krendl, 2019; Glick, 2019) and also Palin (i.e., greater likelihood of voting; Gervais & Hillard, 2011), but paradoxically less opposition to Trump (Cassidy & Krendl, 2019). BS also declined after the 2016 elections in men (but not women) Democrats (Zucker et al., 2019).

Other articles examined political outcomes in generic candidates. These articles exposed participants to fictional (Barnes et al., 2020; Costa et al., 2020) or known (Franks, 2020; Schlehofer et al., 2011) politicians, or asked them to think in general about politicians they knew (Cassidy & Krendl, 2019). HS predicted lower warmth and competence ratings of women senators (when exposed to negative media about the politician; Schlehofer et al., 2011), reduced intentions to vote for women candidates through lower perceived electability (Franks, 2020), and greater forgiveness of sexist acts of
men politicians (Costa et al., 2020). Despite BS predicting higher evaluations of women senators as especially competent under some circumstances (i.e., only when evaluated against women but not men), higher BS was nevertheless associated with expectations of men success (Cassidy & Krendl, 2019). One article also found differential effects such that BS predicted punishing both men and women political candidates for sex (vs. corruption) scandals, while HS predicted punishing women only (Barnes et al., 2020).

Overall, more evidence supports the role of HS than BS in understanding political affiliation and behavior. The evidence suggests that HS, which is more dominant among conservative voters, was associated with favoring and supporting Trump over Clinton, as well as a more general tendency to show bias against women politicians. Thus, the Politics domain may represent an instance of HS reactance to women in powerful positions, as well as a positive bias toward men in such positions. The scarce effects for BS imply that it may promote a protective, but somewhat limited effect toward women politicians. These findings are generally parallel to the patterns observed in the Workplace domain and suggest that politics is one primary arena in which ambivalent sexism reinforces women’s lower status in the workforce.

In terms of limitations, most of the articles here were conducted in the US (for exceptions, see Heras-Sevilla & Ortega-Sánchez, 2020; Maitner & Henry, 2018; Sensales et al., 2020), and referred specifically to US candidates. Future research should be based on cross-cultural investigations to determine whether the patterns observed are similar in other countries with different political systems. In addition, some of the articles did not assess BS (e.g., Rothwell et al., 2019; Valentino et al., 2018), mostly as a result of using the American National Election Studies (ANES) data that only include a scale of HS but not BS (see www.electionstudies.org). Thus, future work should include both measures, because the unique role of BS in politics remains unexplored. Finally, because the articles assessing political evaluations and behavior mostly focused on specific candidates, future research
should explore the mechanisms underlying support for certain types of candidates. Rather than treating these effects as candidate-specific, the candidates may represent broader prototypes of political candidates (see Miller et al., 1986), or more specifically prototypes of certain types of men and women.

**Collective Action (n articles = 13)**

Several articles examined whether and how ambivalent sexism predicts intentions to engage in collective action to fight gender inequality, most of which implemented self-reports (but cf. J. C. Becker & Wright, 2011, for behavioral measures of collective action).

The evidence suggests that BS may inhibit collective action in women. To illustrate, exposure of women to BS decreased their engagement in collective action for social change, which was explained by increased gender-specific system justification and perceptions that there are personal advantages to being a woman (J. C. Becker & Wright, 2011). Similarly, women’s BS predicted their lower willingness to participate in actions supporting feminism (e.g., challenging sexism, signing a feminist petition; J. C. Becker & Wagner, 2009; Radke et al., 2018). Women also enforce other women’s actions, as indicated by the finding that women’s BS predicted positive attitudes towards women who chose not to challenge sexism (i.e., did not respond to a sexist comment made in a work context) and negative attitudes towards women who did (Kahn et al., 2021). However, when women’s actions are used to uphold traditional gender roles (rather than challenge them), women’s BS predicted support for these actions (Kahn et al., 2021).

BS in men promotes their willingness to participate in collective action, but only in action forms that are protective (e.g., sponsoring women to protect themselves from violence) rather than feminist (Radke et al., 2018). Similarly, men high on BS were more willing to confront sexism for paternalistic reasons (e.g., to show that a good man must protect women) rather than egalitarian reasons (e.g., to try to end the discrimination women experience in their daily lives) (Estevan-Reina et al., 2020). Another article partially supported these findings by showing that men’s reported actions to protest against the
sexist behavior of a man political figure (Silvio Berlusconi in Italy) were related to their feelings of humiliation, an emotion predicted by their support for BS (and condemnation of HS), suggesting BS may encourage men to act to restore their reputations (Paladino et al., 2014). Although engagement in protective actions on behalf of women may be perceived as benevolent, women low (vs. high) on BS responded more negatively (i.e., expressing more anger, and less happiness and empowerment) to a paternalistic, compared to an egalitarian, confrontation (Estevan-Reina et al., 2021).

By contrast, HS in men inhibits collective action. Men’s HS was associated with less willingness to engage in both feminist and protective actions (Radke et al., 2018), public actions against gender equality (Sudkamper et al., 2020), and actions against gender income inequality (Stewart, 2017). In a cross-cultural investigation (42 countries), men’s HS mediated the negative relationship between zero-sum thinking about gender (i.e., viewing women’s gains as directly related to men’s losses) and collective action intentions to support gender equality (Kosakowska-Berezecka et al., 2020).

Correlational analyses indicate that HS in women also seems to be negatively associated with their collective action intentions (J. C. Becker & Wagner, 2009; Radke et al., 2018). However, exposure to HS may provoke reactance among women, as indicated in their increased engagement in collective action for social change (via decreased gender-specific system justification and perceived advantages of being a woman; J. C. Becker & Wright, 2011) and competitive collective action intentions (via increased anger-frustration and decreased security-comfort; Lemonaki et al., 2015). Further supporting these findings, women low (vs. high) on HS showed more support for collective action to advance women’s rights and gender equality after stereotypical (vs. counter-stereotypical) exposure when a threat to their identity was present (i.e., reading that women are overtly discriminated against) (de Lemus et al., 2015). Similarly, women reported taking part in collective actions to express their anger against sexist behavior, an emotion that was predicted by the condemnation of sexist beliefs.
(HS and some aspects of BS) (Paladino et al., 2014) However, another article suggested that women’s strategies to confront sexism (HS or BS) may vary across cultures. Japanese, compared to German and Turkish, women preferred indirect conflict management styles that avoided open confrontation but maintained ingroup harmony (Fischer et al., 2017).

In summary, BS appears to undermine women’s engagement or intention to engage in collective actions to fight gender inequality; nevertheless, it can motivate men to take part in collective action, but only in paternalistic, and not egalitarian, forms. In contrast, HS in men and women is negatively associated with collective action; yet, HS can also motivate women’s collective action as a form of resistance. Methodologically, although the evidence is scant, the majority of articles used experimental designs manipulating either ambivalent sexism (J. C. Becker & Wright, 2011; Fischer et al., 2017; Lemonaki et al., 2015) or other contextual factors related to collective action (e.g., type of confrontation to sexism; Estevan-Reina et al., 2021; Kahn et al., 2021), thereby strengthening the internal validity of the conclusions as to the causal role of ambivalent sexism in shaping collective action tendencies. Future research could extend this work by testing whether the reverse causal direction exists as well; that is, whether exposure to collective action against gender inequality promotes either acceptance or rejection of ambivalent sexism, with the possibility of HS and BS being affected differentially.

Rights/Policies (n_articles = 9)

Several articles assessed the links between ambivalent sexism and support/opposition to rights and policies aimed to promote women in the workplace (Brady et al., 2015; Hideg & Ferris, 2016; Sibley & Perry, 2010; Udegbe, 2003), politics (Beauregard & Sheppard, 2021; Pereira & Porto, 2020), and civil rights in general (Dunbar et al., 2007; Walls, 2008).

Usually in both men and women, BS is associated with support, whereas HS is associated with opposition to policies and rights aimed to promote gender equality (Beauregard & Sheppard, 2021;
Fraser et al., 2015; Hideg & Ferris, 2016; Pereira & Porto, 2020; Sibley & Perry, 2010 [among women, longitudinal design]; Udegbe, 2003); two other articles found conceptually similar patterns only for HS (Dunbar et al., 2007; Walls, 2008 [among men]). BS’s positive effects on these outcomes is nevertheless moderated by several caveats. BS support for gender-based employment equity policies is limited to policies that promote the hiring of women in feminine, not masculine, positions (Hideg & Ferris, 2016; see the also Workplace domain). BS can also exhibit an opposing effect because it indirectly predicted opposition to equal pay and employment opportunities through its positive link to HS (Sibley & Perry, 2010). In the face of evidence that a company discriminated against women, the presence (vs. absence) of diversity policies led women high on BS to perceive the company as more procedurally just and less discriminatory (Brady et al., 2015; see also the Workplace and Subtleness domains).

In summary, although HS uniformly opposes rights/policies aimed to promote gender equality, BS provides support that is to some extent restricted, for example to women who adhere to traditional roles (see Hideg & Ferris, 2016). These findings complement the patterns observed in the Reproductive Functions domain (see as adjacent to the Intimate Relationships domain) in which BS promotes favorability toward reproductive women that is limited to women’s gender role adherence and restrictive to their reproductive rights (e.g., opposition to abortion).

One article tested a possible mechanism for the positive effects of BS on support for rights/policies related to compassion toward women (Hideg & Ferris, 2016). However, another possible mechanism, which could be explored in future research, involves perceptions of women’s (in)competence to succeed on their own who thus need and deserve structural assistance in the form of rights/policies (for further support for these ideas, see the Workplace domain).
Domains Related to the Stereotypes Domain

*Gendered Prosocial Behavior (n_articles = 8)*

A few articles examined the role of ambivalent sexism, with a specific focus on BS, in shaping perceptions and behaviors related to cross-gender helping. These articles mostly used experimental designs manipulating either ambivalent sexism (Shnabel et al., 2016), the gender of the help provider/receiver (Bareket et al., 2021; Shnabel et al., 2016), responses to help offers (J. C. Becker et al., 2011; Wakefield et al., 2012), or the type of help (Ruiz, 2019). Outcomes included evaluations of helping scenarios (J. C. Becker et al., 2011; Ruiz, 2019), helping intentions (Bareket et al., 2021; Riley & Yamawaki, 2018; Shnabel et al., 2016), self-reported behavior (Leone et al., 2020), and actual helping behavior, which was assessed via behavioral measures (Bareket et al., 2021; Shnabel et al., 2016; Wakefield et al., 2012) or observations (Hammond & Overall, 2015).

BS (but not HS) encourages both women and men to engage in helping behaviors that prevent them from acquiring tools for independent coping in counter-stereotypical domains. In traditionally masculine tasks, and within cross-gender (but not same-gender) interactions, BS predicted women’s seeking of dependency-oriented help (e.g., asking for the final answer to a difficult math problem instead of an explanation on how to solve the problem on their own) and men’s offering of such help (Shnabel et al., 2016; see also the Workplace domain). The mirror image of this helping dynamic was observed in traditionally feminine domains, in which within cross-gender (but not same-gender) interactions, BS predicted women’s provision of dependency-oriented help (e.g., offering to change a baby’s diaper instead of explaining how to do it) and men’s seeking of such help (Bareket et al., 2021; see also the Women-Dominated Arenas).

In intimate relationships, BS (but not HS) predicted men’s provision of dependency-oriented support to their women partner (providing goal-related plans and neglecting their abilities), ultimately leading them to feel less competent and positively regarded. By contrast, BS predicted women’s
provision of relationship-oriented support to their men partners (communicating a secure base for men to pursue their goals), leading them to perceive greater regard and intimacy (Hammond & Overall, 2015; see also the Intimate Relationships domain).

The other articles indicate that BS (with no comparison to HS) promotes negative perceptions of women beneficiaries of paternalistic helping. In particular, individuals who endorse BS perceived women who accepted patronizing help offered by a man co-worker as warm but incompetent and less suited for a competence-related position, whereas women who declined help were perceived as competent but cold and less suited for a warmth-related position (J. C. Becker et al., 2011). Negative evaluations were also observed among individuals low (vs. high) on BS such that women beneficiaries of dependency-oriented (compared to autonomy-oriented) help were perceived as lower in status, competence, and promotability (Ruiz, 2019). The data hint that women may be sensitive to such harsh evaluations, as indicated in the finding that women who witnessed another woman’s negative response to a man’s benevolent sexist act (i.e., being made aware of the dependency stereotype against women) were less willing to seek help, such that the more they sought help, the worse they felt (Wakefield et al., 2012). By contrast, BS predicted rewarding men helpers by favorable perceptions of both warmth and competence, especially when this help was accepted rather than refused (J. C. Becker et al., 2011), which may explain the finding that men high on BS perceived their provision of helping behaviors as a way to demonstrate their high status (see Leone et al., 2020).

Overall, BS (but not HS) promotes prosociality in cross-gender interactions in ways that reinforce gender roles, by emphasizing the role of BS in maintaining cooperation (rather than competition) between men and women, in both low-commitment (e.g., in work-related contexts; Shnabel et al., 2016) and high-commitment (e.g., among couples; Bareket et al., 2021; Hammond & Overall, 2015) relationships. Thus, prosocial behavior serves as a carrot-like social function that better matches the ideology of BS than HS when translating sexist beliefs into seemingly positive practices.
that maintain gender inequality. The evidence further suggests that the type of help provided or sought, such as dependency-oriented help or other types of patronizing help, has negative implications for the maintenance of gender roles and status differences. Women encounter a lose-lose situation in which high BS penalizes women “confronters” whereas low BS penalizes women “accepters” of sexist/patronizing help.

Although some articles exposed participants to different forms of help (Ruiz, 2019) or reactions to help (e.g., J. C. Becker et al., 2011), all articles treated BS as an antecedent rather than a consequence of engagement in patronizing forms of help. Because individuals may develop their attitudes based on their behavior (Bem, 1972), future research could examine the reverse causal direction to test whether exposure to gendered forms of helping would increase the endorsement of BS (for similar ideas, see Shnabel et al., 2016). Although the evidence suggests that BS rather than HS plays a substantial role in prosociality, future research could attempt to identify whether HS may also relate to prosocial behavior only in specific ways. For example, HS may decrease men’s tendency to provide empowering forms of help to women because by doing so they would increase women’s relative power in the tested domain (for initial support for this argument, see Bareket et al., 2022).

**Masculinity (n_articles = 13)**

Articles that report a link between ambivalent sexism and masculinity constructs have almost exclusively used self-reports (but cf. Wong et al., 2017) and correlational designs (but cf. Dahl et al., 2015). They report findings that apply to both HS and BS, and associate them to traditional forms of masculine ideologies.

In both men and women, in a cross-cultural examination (62 countries) ambivalent sexism was positively associated with the endorsement of precarious manhood beliefs (i.e., that men’s, relative to women’s, gender status is considered elusive, tenuous, and proven through public action; Bosson et al., 2021), and in another study with masculine honor beliefs (i.e., the belief that aggression is sometimes
justifiable and necessary, such as in response to insult or threat; Saucier et al., 2016). Several articles used two common scales of male role norms (related to avoidance of femininity, restrictive emotionality, etc.; for the scales, see Levant et al., 2016; Thompson & Pleck, 2016), and reported positive associations with both BS and HS in both men and women (McDermott et al., 2020; Vescio & Schermerhorn, 2021). Ambivalent sexism also mediated the relationship between men’s endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and their support of myths minimizing the impact of intimate partner violence (Gage & Lease, 2021; see also the Violence domain). Another article adopted ambivalent sexism as an outcome, and found that men employed in workplaces with stronger masculinity contest norms reported both HS and BS sexist workplace norms (Kuchynka et al., 2018).

Two other articles reported effects specific to BS. One used an experimental design and found that BS mediated the relationship between men’s endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and perceived competence in providing emotional support to women (but not men) coworkers (Lease et al., 2020). Another used a related, self-developed scale to assess endorsement of prescriptive and proscriptive masculine norms (e.g., related to emotional toughness, providing for the family) and found it to be related to men’s BS more than HS (Wong et al., 2020). There was only one finding for HS (but not BS) indicating that it was associated with men’s endorsement of hyper-masculine values (involving toughness, the need to avoid femininity, and control of women’s sexuality; Archer, 2010).

Two other articles focused on threats to masculinity among men, and reported findings solely for BS (but not HS); yet, the findings were somewhat mixed. In an experiment, inducing a masculinity threat (i.e., telling men they scored on a par with women on a gender knowledge test) led to higher BS (Dahl et al., 2015); but in a correlational design, men’s BS was not associated with aspects of masculine contingency related to threat (i.e., self-worth is threatened by a lack of masculinity), but rather with those related to boosting (i.e., self-worth is boosted by confirmation of masculinity) (Burkley et al., 2016).
Finally, two articles found that ambivalent sexism was positively associated with men’s masculine identification/self-concept, either explicitly (Glick et al., 2015) or implicitly (assessed by a semantic misattribution procedure; Wong et al., 2017).

Overall, *ambivalent sexism is positively associated with the endorsement of traditional forms of masculine ideologies, with scant evidence that BS might be more receptive to masculine norms than HS*. However, the majority of the articles here focused on assessing the psychometric properties of various masculinity-related scales (e.g., Bosson et al., 2021; Burkley et al., 2016). As the initial evidence suggests a link between ambivalent sexism and masculinity constructs, future work should go beyond validity studies to examine the differential roles of BS and HS in understanding masculinity. Furthermore, except for one article employing an implicit measure (Wong et al., 2017), all the articles exclusively employed self-reports for assessing masculine norms and practices. Future research should extend the generalizability and ecological validity of this work by measuring actual masculine behavior (for ideas on how this could be done, see Vandello & Bosson, 2013). Although the majority of the articles only examined men participants, articles that assessed men and women found effects that apply to both. Future research could extend this work to better understand sexist women’s role in reinforcing men’s masculinity.

**Marketing (n_{articles} = 8)**

Several articles tested the links between ambivalent sexism and evaluations of advertisements and purchase intentions, in both men and women (except for Hegarty et al., 2018, that examined only men). These articles used experimental designs manipulating different aspects of advertisements (e.g., whether the ad is women-disparaging or not; Grougiou et al., 2020; Zawisza et al., 2018), with one article manipulating HS beliefs in an ad (Brito-Rhor et al., 2019). The products chosen as stimuli were in most cases gender-neutral (e.g., Infanger et al., 2012; Ten et al., 2021).
Two articles reported differential patterns for HS and BS. BS predicted positive evaluations of communal women advertising characters (e.g., a woman holding a baby), whereas HS predicted (but only under time pressure) less positive evaluations of agentic women characters (e.g., businesswomen), with consequences for purchase intent (i.e., positive evaluations were associated with higher purchase intent; Infanger et al., 2012). Similarly, BS predicted purchase intent for paternalistic housewives advertisements, whereas HS negatively predicted purchase intent for envious businesswomen advertisements (with some cross-cultural differences; Zawisza et al., 2018).

The rest of the articles reported findings specific to either HS or BS, or applying to both. Femvertising (i.e., women’s empowerment advertising), compared to ads depicting traditional portrayals of women (preoccupied with their appearance), was more effective in boosting positive ad attitudes and purchase intent, but only for individuals with low (but not high) HS (Ten et al., 2021). Ads depicting HS ideology (compared to those depicting sexual appeals) were perceived in a negative light (Brito-Rhor et al., 2019). BS predicted perceiving women-disparaging ads as ethical, regardless of their level of humor (Grougiou et al., 2020). Finally, both men’s HS and BS predicted positive attitudes toward the consumption of men’s magazines compared to other forms of sexual consumption (Hegarty et al., 2018; see also Schooler, 2015, for null effects of objectifying ads on levels of BS or HS), suggesting that these magazines normalize sexist attitudes among men.

In summary, although the findings vary substantially, some are overall consistent with the patterns observed in the Stereotypes domain. In particular, ads depicting traditional women seem to be appealing to individuals who endorse BS, whereas ads depicting non-traditional women (especially powerful women) appear to appeal less to individuals who endorse HS. Because stereotypes translate into consumer-brand interactions (Kervyn et al., 2012, 2021; Malone & Fiske, 2013), future research should extend the initial evidence to provide a better understanding of the role of ambivalent sexism in
general, and the differential functions of BS and HS in particular in shaping brand evaluations and consumer behavior.

**Domains Related to the Intimate Relationship Domain**

**Sexuality \( n_{\text{articles}} = 13 \)**

Articles assessing sexuality-related outcomes dealt with attitudes related to sexuality and self-reported sexual behavior and satisfaction. The initial findings lay the groundwork for the argument that ambivalent sexism may enforce traditional forms of sexuality, but are viewed differently in HS and BS.

BS predicted negative views of women who engage in premarital sex (Sakalli-Uğurlu & Glick, 2003) and men’s negative evaluations of highly sexually active women targets (Zaikman & Marks, 2014). BS may not be specific to women’s sexuality because it also predicted men’s less favorable attitudes toward their own engagement in casual sex, which in turn predicted their reporting lower numbers of casual sex partners (Danube et al., 2014). Thus, BS may play a role in restricting men’s sexuality as well.

HS seems to be purely centered on enforcing women’s (but not men’s) sexuality. HS (but not BS) explains the gender difference in which men, more than women, endorse and encourage the sexual double standard (i.e., beliefs that men gain status from engaging in casual sex or having many sexual partners, but women are stigmatized for it), thus implying than men are likely to suppress women’s sexuality because they resist women’s empowerment (Rudman et al., 2013; Rudman & Fetterolf, 2014). One finding that partially supports this claim is that men (but not women) who are high on ambivalent sexism overstated aspects of their sexual behavior to a woman (but not a man) research assistant when they were told that women are now more sexually permissive than men (T. D. Fisher, 2007). There is also some evidence for a similar sexual double standard endorsed by women: one finding indicated that women’s HS predicted negative evaluations of highly sexually active women targets (Zaikman & Marks, 2014).
Evidence as to how ambivalent sexism actually affects (mostly heterosexual) men’s and women’s sexual behavior is mixed. Men’s HS was associated with favorable attitudes toward their engagement in casual sex (Danube et al., 2014) and with their sexual desire (Nimbi et al., 2018b, 2019, but cf. 2018a); yet, it was also associated with sexual disgust (Patev et al., 2019 [controlling for gender]). In women, articles that examined the links between ambivalent sexism and sexual satisfaction reported mixed findings. Women’s BS was associated with lower orgasm frequency through increased perceptions of men’s sexual selfishness and in turn lower willingness to ask the partner for sexual pleasure (Harris et al., 2016), but also with women’s faking of fewer orgasms over their lifetime (Harris et al., 2019). However, another article did not find BS to be related to either sexual satisfaction or orgasm frequency (Lentz & Zaikman, 2021). Although HS was positively associated with women’s sexual satisfaction (but not orgasm frequency; Lentz & Zaikman, 2021) in one article, in another it was associated with faking more orgasms (Harris et al., 2019).

Overall, there is scant evidence that BS could promote traditional ways of thinking about sexuality, possibly for both women and men, but HS promotes a sexual double standard (especially among men), implying it is more concerned with women’s sexual power than purity (compared to BS). Future work is needed to further understand the more fine-grained differences between HS and BS in promoting sexual attitudes, behaviors, and satisfaction.

**Health (n\textsubscript{articles} = 22)**

Articles that examined associations between ambivalent sexism and health-related outcomes\(^3\) were divided into three subdomains according to the type of outcome assessed. Most articles focused on outcomes related to well-being (first subdomain) and risk behaviors (second subdomain) whereas only a few articles dealt with physical health (third subdomain).

---

\(^3\) Articles that examined health-related outcomes that were domain-specific, such as those related to intimate relationships (e.g., relationship and sexual satisfaction) or the workplace (e.g., workplace anxiety) are classified in their respective domains.
Well-Being ($n_{articles} = 10$). Articles in this subdomain assessed outcomes related to well-being and mental health symptoms, using self-report measures.

Most of the evidence suggests that BS is linked to positive well-being and mental health outcomes for men and women (with some exceptions). BS is positively associated with life satisfaction (Connelly & Heesacker, 2012; Hammond & Sibley, 2011; Waddell et al., 2019; but cf. Horrell et al., 2020, among Evangelical men), with system justification identified as a potential mediator (Connelly & Heesacker, 2012; Hammond & Sibley, 2011; see also the Social Ideologies domain). BS may also have protective functions in terms of PTSD symptoms for both men and women rape survivors (Wilson et al., 2017; Wilson & Scarpa, 2017; see also the Violence domain). One article suggested that the positive effects of BS on women’s well-being may depend on the BS subfactor being investigated: although experiencing complementary gender differentiation was positively associated with well-being indices (i.e., less self-doubt and higher self-esteem, psychological well-being, and flourishing), experiencing protective paternalism was associated with lower well-being (Oswald et al., 2019). On the negative side, one study indicated that BS is associated with higher perceived rumination in women (i.e., related to depression, brooding, and reflection; Yoder & Lawrence, 2011).

The data generally link HS to negative well-being and mental health in both men and women. HS was either negatively associated (Hammond & Sibley, 2011; Waddell et al., 2019) or not associated (Connelly & Heesacker, 2012) with life satisfaction. HS also predicted depression, anxiety, and stress in both men and women (Borgogna & Aita, 2020). Ambivalent sexism (HS more than BS, when controlling for gender) was positively related to psychological traits associated clinically with eating disorders (Garaigordobil & Maganto, 2013). Although women reported experiencing BS events more frequently than HS events, hostile events were perceived as more distressing (Oswald et al., 2019).

Two articles, however, qualify the associations reported between HS and BS with life satisfaction. One article found that the benefits of being in a serious romantic relationship on life
satisfaction were accentuated for those higher (vs. lower) on BS, but attenuated for those higher (vs. lower) on HS (Waddell et al., 2019). Another article found that the positive BS-life satisfaction association in men was enhanced by the simultaneous endorsement of HS (Hammond & Sibley, 2011), suggesting that for men, taking an ambivalent sexist approach (i.e., endorsing complementary ideologies) may be more beneficial for well-being than only being a benevolent sexist.

**Risk Behaviors** \( (n_{\text{articles}} = 9) \). Articles that examined the links between ambivalent sexism and risk behaviors focused on outcomes of condom use, alcohol consumption, and disease-avoidance tendencies (all assessed by self-report measures).

Articles that examined condom use seem to provide more evidence that BS may inhibit condom use, whereas HS may promote it; still, there are also mixed findings and gender differences. One article found that women’s experiences of BS were associated with lower condom use, mediated by their endorsement of relational sex motives (i.e., a desire to give pleasure to their partner; Fitz & Zucker, 2015), but another article found that only men’s (but not women’s) endorsement of BS was associated with lower condom use with their main (but not occasional) partners (Albarracin & Plambeck, 2010). One article found that men’s HS was associated with higher condom use with both main and occasional partners (Albarracin & Plambeck, 2010), whereas another article found that it was associated with risky sexual behavior, as indicated by lower condom use, more positive attitudes toward risky behavior, and a history of sexually transmitted infections (in South Africa; Mthembu et al., 2014). Women’s exposure to HS (but not BS) increased expectations to initiate condom use in the future when they also evidenced high vs. low feminist beliefs (Fitz & Zucker, 2014).

Articles that examined alcohol use in men did not find that HS (Lisco et al., 2012; Lynch & Renzetti, 2020; Mthembu et al., 2014) or BS (Lisco et al., 2012) are associated with risky drinking behaviors. They also examined men’s HS as a moderator of the positive association between alcohol use and intimate partner violence; however, they yielded mixed findings (Lisco et al., 2012; Lynch &...
Renzetti, 2020; Renzetti et al., 2018; for further details, see the Violence domain). In women, a field study on women college students found that their exposure to either HS or BS (with stronger effects for HS) increased their subsequent consumption of alcoholic drinks (Hamilton & DeHart, 2020). Finally, one article examined disease-avoidance (i.e., disgust sensitivity, contamination concerns, germ aversion), and found a positive association with BS, but an inconsistent association with HS (with right-wing authoritarianism accounting for some of these associations; Fitzgerald et al., 2021).

**Physical** ($n_{\text{articles}} = 3$). Since only three articles assessed the association between ambivalent sexism and physical health outcomes, no generalizations can be made. The findings are as follows. BS moderated the association of political preferences with COVID-19 public health compliance, offsetting patterns of non-compliance among Republicans and Independents (compared to Democrats) (Chen & Farhart, 2020). BS also predicted acknowledgment of the benefits of vasectomy for men (Hernández-Aguilera & Marván, 2015). By contrast, HS was associated with the number of gynecological and sexual symptoms reported by women (Kosterina et al., 2021).

Overall, **BS seems to be beneficial for well-being and mental health (with more qualifications for women than men), whereas HS seems to have more deleterious consequences on mental health.** The findings for risk behaviors are inconclusive, with some evidence that BS (but not HS) may expose men and women to more danger in terms of sexual conduct (i.e., via its association with lower condom use). The findings for physical health are scarce, but lay the groundwork for a plausible prediction that BS may be associated with positive decisions related to personal physical health, while HS may be related to negative physical outcomes.

Overall, there are not enough studies on ambivalent sexism and health-related issues, despite the obvious benefits to men’s and women’s better health outcomes. Although structural sexism has been linked to health outcomes (Heise et al., 2019; Homan, 2019, 2021), it is crucial to achieve a better understanding of whether and how individual differences in sexism may also play a role (see, for
example, a call for research examining ambivalent sexism and cardiovascular health; Molix, 2014).

Notably, previous research has been useful in explaining part of the picture by focusing on how individual differences in endorsement of masculine norms shape men’s health outcomes (e.g., Gerdes & Levant, 2018; Wong et al., 2016); however, ambivalent sexism makes it possible to test how both men and women are affected by its focus on the interaction between the genders. Thus, future research should test the role of ambivalent sexism in shaping diverse health outcomes for both men and women to provide a fuller appraisal of its overall impact.

In terms of methodology, only two articles employed experimental designs (Fitz & Zucker, 2014; Hamilton & DeHart, 2020), and none manipulated ambivalent sexism. Thus, future research should use experimental designs in general, and manipulations of ambivalent sexism in particular, to test causal effects related to ambivalent sexism and health outcomes.

**Parental Influence (n articles = 11)**

Although the articles classified here were highly varied, the evidence suggests that BS (Gutierrez et al., 2019; Montañés et al., 2012), or both BS and HS (Aikawa & Stewart, 2020; Lipowska et al., 2016; Oswald et al., 2012; Overall et al., 2021), as reflected in parents’ attitudes (e.g., Lipowska et al., 2016) and communication (e.g., Gutierrez et al., 2019), shape parenting styles (Aikawa & Stewart, 2020; Lipowska et al., 2016; Overall et al., 2021), and are also associated with their children’s endorsement of ambivalent sexism (Gutierrez et al., 2019; Klann et al., 2018; Montañés et al., 2012) and other diverse outcomes (e.g., academic performance, body esteem; Montañés et al., 2012; Oswald et al., 2012; see also Khorashad et al., 2016). Differential patterns were observed as a function of the type of sexism (e.g., Overall et al., 2021), or the parent’s and child’s gender (e.g., Montañés et al., 2012; Oswald et al., 2012). There is also some evidence for other parental processes/behaviors that are associated with children’s endorsement of ambivalent sexism (as reported in adulthood), such as
marital violence (Ibabe et al., 2017, 2020), parental rejection (Romero-Martinez et al., 2013), and parent-child relationship quality (Klann et al., 2018).

The articles here employed a cross-sectional design (but cf. Overall et al., 2021, for a longitudinal design assessing outcomes before and during the COVID-19 lockdown). Future research should use longitudinal designs to track ambivalent sexism in parents and children over time to draw more reliable conclusions about the intergenerational transmission of ambivalent sexism (e.g., Montañés et al., 2012) and the possible outcomes for children’s development (e.g., Oswald et al., 2012).
Summary Tables of Subdomains Associated with the Large Domains

**Table S1: Findings by the Subdomains of Social Ideologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdomains</th>
<th>Main Findings for Subdomains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism</strong> <em>(n_articles = 37)</em></td>
<td>HS (more than BS) is associated with social dominance orientation, whereas BS (more than HS) is associated with right-wing authoritarianism; stronger evidence for a differential account for men than for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Justification</strong> <em>(n_articles = 14)</em></td>
<td>BS (more than HS), mostly in women, is associated with system-justifying beliefs and practices. Limited evidence that the association between HS or BS and system justification is associated with well-being benefits (especially for women).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Social Ideologies</strong> <em>(n_articles = 43)</em></td>
<td>Both HS and BS are associated with other, diverse social ideologies that are general, group-specific, or gender-specific. BS (more than HS) is associated with prejudicial views of sexual and gender minorities. Limited evidence: HS is associated with ideologies related to (in)equality. BS is associated with “positive” prejudice against other groups. Ambivalent sexism is related to value priorities (with some differential patterns for HS and BS).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If not mentioned otherwise (a) the findings described here hold for both men and women participants; and (b) the associations described are positive.

**Table S2a: Findings by the Subdomains of Violence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdomains</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual violence</strong> <em>(n_articles = 55)</em></td>
<td>HS (but not BS) in men is associated with proclivity toward sexual violence against women. HS is associated with the acceptance of rape myths; the role of BS is inconclusive. BS is associated with perceptions that blame victims of sexual violence and exonerate perpetrators; limited evidence for the role of BS in women’s recognition of sexual violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic violence</strong> <em>(n_articles = 66)</em></td>
<td>HS (but not BS) in men is associated with proclivity toward physical and psychological violence against women partners. BS is associated with victim-blaming in cases of acquaintance rape. Limited evidence that BS makes women more vulnerable to domestic violence (through unrecognized and tolerated violence).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General forms of gender-based violence</strong> <em>(n_articles = 11)</em></td>
<td>Limited evidence: HS-violence proclivity link extends to general forms of gender-based violence (beyond sexual and domestic violence). BS is associated with victim-blaming and justifications of harm (contingent on perpetrators’ and victims’ characteristics). Limited evidence that BS makes women more vulnerable to domestic violence (through unrecognized and tolerated violence).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If not mentioned otherwise (a) the findings described here hold for both men and women participants; and (b) the associations described are positive.
Table S2b: Findings by the Subdomains of Sexual Harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdomains</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public ( (n_{articles} = 18) )</td>
<td>HS (but not BS) in men is associated with sexual harassment perpetration in public settings (e.g., online gaming, the street).&lt;br&gt;HS is associated with tolerating and trivializing sexual harassment; the role of BS is inconclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace ( (n_{articles} = 16) )</td>
<td>HS (but not BS) in men is associated with sexual harassment perpetration in workplace settings.&lt;br&gt;HS (more than BS) is associated with justification and minimization of workplace sexual harassment, perceptions of victim-blaming and exoneration of perpetrators, and less acknowledgment of sexual harassment at work as such.&lt;br&gt;Limited evidence that BS derogates victims of workplace sexual harassment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If not mentioned otherwise (a) the findings described here hold for both men and women participants; and (b) the associations described are positive.

Table S2c: Findings by the Subdomains of Body/Face Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdomains</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectification ( (n_{articles} = 27) )</td>
<td>Exposure to objectified women and degrading sexual content increases men’s HS (but not BS).&lt;br&gt;HS predicts the objectification of women (but not men); findings for BS are inconclusive.&lt;br&gt;Limited evidence:&lt;br&gt;BS (and sometimes HS) is associated with positive objectifying experiences for women, with possible work-related performance deficits.&lt;br&gt;BS increases women’s self-objectification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance ( (n_{articles} = 20) )</td>
<td>Both BS and HS are associated with endorsement and internalization of Western beauty ideals, as well as engagement in beauty-related practices.&lt;br&gt;Enforcement of prescriptive beauty norms for women among individuals high on ambivalent sexism (both HS and BS) reflects motives to maintain the gender hierarchy.&lt;br&gt;Limited evidence linking HS and BS to attractiveness evaluations and body dissatisfaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If not mentioned otherwise (a) the findings described here hold for both men and women participants; and (b) the associations described are positive.
Table S3: Findings by the Subdomains of Workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdomains</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Bias</td>
<td>HS (but not BS) directly encourages diverse forms of workplace bias and discrimination against women (but not men); BS is not directly related to bias but it subtly justifies workplace gender inequality (e.g., by promoting occupational gender segregation and paternalism in the work environment). Limited evidence: HS predicts a positive bias toward men in the workplace. BS promotes favorable impressions of women who conform to gender roles and expectations in workplace settings while eliciting backlash responses against those who violate them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations and Performance</td>
<td>BS (but not HS) is associated with negative performance-related outcomes in women; the role of HS is inconclusive. BS (rather than HS) is negatively associated with women’s career-related interests and aspirations. Limited evidence that HS (more than BS) negatively impacts women’s work-related well-being.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. If not mentioned otherwise (a) the findings described here hold for both men and women participants; and (b) the associations described are positive.*

Table S4: Findings by the Subdomains of Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdomains</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical Perceptions and Behavior</td>
<td>HS predicts negative, whereas BS predicts positive evaluations and stereotypes about women. BS is associated with warmth stereotypes about women; findings for competence stereotypes are inconclusive. Limited evidence: HS and BS differentially map into corresponding stereotype-consistent behaviors among men. Both HS and BS are associated with a variety of implicit gender stereotype biases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical Subtypes of Women</td>
<td>HS predicts negative evaluations of nontraditional women subtypes (e.g., career women), whereas BS predicts positive evaluations of traditional women types (e.g., housewives). Non-traditional sexual subtypes (e.g., promiscuous) elicit HS, whereas traditional sexual subtypes (e.g., chaste) elicit BS. Ambivalent sexism (in total, or both HS and BS) is associated with polarized views of women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical Humor</td>
<td>HS is associated with positive reactions to stereotypical jokes; findings for BS are scarce and inconclusive. HS (but not BS) functions as a moderator of the effects of exposure to stereotypical jokes on manifestations of other forms of prejudice. HS (but not BS) is associated with men’s use of stereotypical jokes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. If not mentioned otherwise (a) the findings hold for both men and women participants; and (b) the associations described are positive.*
Table S5: Findings by the Subdomains of Intimate Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdomains</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mating Preferences</td>
<td><strong>Main Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n articles = 13)</td>
<td>BS is associated with a preference for partners who fit traditional gender stereotypes (e.g., higher warmth in a potential woman mate and higher dominance in a potential man mate) and roles (e.g., a man breadwinner and a woman caregiver/homemaker).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS is associated with men’s preferences for traditional and attractive women mates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited evidence that individuals show romantic interest in partners characterized by BS (under various conditions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating and Family Norms</td>
<td>Both HS and BS predict endorsement of traditional dating and family scripts: BS operates more in norms related to traditional roles and paternalism, whereas HS operates more in power-related norms (especially in men).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n articles = 21)</td>
<td>Limited evidence that both HS and BS are associated with more general, antagonistic beliefs about dating and relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited evidence that HS predicts backlash against individuals who violate traditional relational norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Processes</td>
<td>HS shapes men’s view of the relationship in destructive ways (negative and biased perceptions of relationships, fear of being relationally dependent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n articles = 16)</td>
<td>HS in men predicts a series of negative relationship outcomes (e.g., relationship dissatisfaction) for the parties involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS is associated with positive outcomes for men (e.g., relationship satisfaction, getting relationship-oriented support from women partners).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BS is somewhat associated with positive outcomes for women (e.g., relationship adjustment), but also with negative outcomes (e.g., being less successful in resolving relationship conflicts) when expectations from the relationship are not realized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* If not mentioned otherwise (a) the findings described here hold for both men and women participants; and (b) the associations described are positive.
Additional Figures

Figure S1: Articles Mentioning Ambivalent Sexism on PsycINFO

Note. The number of publications retrieved per year from 1996 to 2020 in the search conducted at the end of July 2021 in the PsycINFO database. The search targeted peer-reviewed articles that have mentioned one or more of the following terms in their titles, abstracts, or keywords: “ambivalent sexis*”, “benevolent sexis*”, “hostile sexis*”, with relevant limiters. The gray line represents the developing trend of publications across the years. The data file for this figure (as well as the full search query) is available at the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/b6h8x).
Note. Illustration of the geographical areas of the samples reported in the included articles ($N_{\text{articles}} = 654$; $N_{\text{countries}} = 75$). This figure contains also data from four large cross-cultural investigations (more than 10 countries sampled) that were included in the review (Bosson et al., 2021; Glick et al., 2000, 2004; Kosakowska-Berezecka et al., 2020). A table with the list of countries and the number of samples within each country is available at the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/b6h8x).
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