UC Riverside
UCR Honors Capstones 2021-2022

Title

EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF SCREEN VIOLENCE EXPOSURE ON BENEVOLENT AND HOSTILE SEXISM

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3371f8q3

Author

Gwynne Fryett, Isabel Elinor

Publication Date

2022-05-06

Data Availability

The data associated with this publication are not available for this reason: N/A

EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF SCREEN VIOLENCE EXPOSURE ON BENEVOLENT
AND HOSTILE SEXISM

By

Isabel Elinor Gwynne Fryett

A capstone project submitted for Graduation with University Honors

May 6, 2022

University Honors
University of California, Riverside

APPROVED

Dr. Amy Kroska
Department of Sociology

Dr. Richard Cardullo, Howard H Hays Jr. Chair
University Honors

ABSTRACT

Studies suggest that exposure to sexual violence against women increases acceptance of violence against women. Yet, it is not clear if exposure to *non*sexual violence against women and violence more generally affect attitudes toward women. Therefore, I explore those questions. Drawing on social learning theory and existing studies, I advance three hypotheses. More specifically, I expect both short-term exposure violence against women and a history of exposure to violent media to increase both benevolent and hostile sexism, as measured with the ambivalent attitudes about women scale (Glick and Fiske, 1996), and I expect the history of exposure to increase the effects of a single exposure on both benevolent and hostile sexism. I examine these hypotheses using an online experiment in which 270 participants were randomly assigned to one of six conditions: exposure to male-on-male violence, female-on-female violence, male-on-female violence, female-on-male violence, non-gendered violence, and no violence. Contrary to predictions, exposure to images with females as victims of violence did not increase benevolent or hostile sexism; instead, exposure to male-on-male violence decreased benevolent sexism. Consistent with predictions, a history of exposure to violent media was associated with higher benevolent sexism and hostile sexism. But, contrary to the predictions, that history did not moderate the effect of a single exposure to violence on either type of sexism. I discuss the theoretical, empirical, and policy implications of these results and consider avenues for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION

Exposure to media of violence against women increases acceptance to violence against women in real life (Custers and McNallie, 2016; Custers and Van den Bulck, 2012; Easteal, et al., 2014; Galdi and Guizzo, 2020; Kahlor and Eastin, 2011; Malamuth and Check, 1981; Scharrer, 2005; Wright and Tokunaga, 2016). Numerous studies also show that exposure to violence against women in media that has a positive sexual outcome increases men's likelihood of harassing and assaulting women, a pattern that did not hold for women (Easteal, et al., 2014; Galdi and Guizzo, 2020; Malamuth and Check, 1981; Wright and Tokunaga, 2016). People who are exposed to this type of media are also more likely to adopt these attitudes if the attitudes will positively benefit them, a pattern that is stronger for men than for women (Custers and McNallie, 2016; Galdi and Guizzo, 2020; Scharrer, 2005). A history of exposure to media portrayals of stereotypical gender attitudes increases male and female agreement with said stereotypes about gender (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020).

Despite the long history of research on the effects of sexual violence on viewers' attitudes and behaviors, few studies have examined the attitudinal effects of exposure to *non*sexual violence against women—that is, violence that provides no sexual gratification for either party. Few studies also examine the effects of violence against men and how that influences viewers' attitudes and behaviors towards men. Therefore, I explore those questions by using an online experiment to examine the effects of both immediate and long-term exposure to media violence on attitudes toward women. I operationalize immediate violence exposure with short clips of movie violence, and I cross the gender of the victim and the gender of aggressor to create four experimental conditions (male-on-male violence, male-on-female violence, female-on-female violence, and female-on-male violence), a design that allows me to determine if and how the

gender of the aggressor and the gender of the victim differentially affect attitudes toward women. I also examine the way that participants' history of exposure to violent media is related to these attitudes and moderates the effect of the immediate exposure to violence.

Theoretical Background

Social learning theory suggests that our behavior is guided by rewards and punishments. The motivation to do something or to not do something is influenced by perceptions of how others are treated when doing said action (Bandura, 1977). According to the theory, individual's behavior is shaped by the anticipated consequences of one's actions, with the expectation that individuals seek positive outcomes. This theory suggests, therefore, that individuals who are repeatedly exposed to violence in the media where one is rewarded for violence increases the likelihood of adopting attitudes that favor that kind of behavior. Studies I review are consistent with these predictions, showing that exposure to negative treatment of women increases acceptance to violence or negativity toward women.

Studies have shown that actions that are positively reinforcement are more likely to be repeated (Custers and McNallie, 2016; Signorielli, 1989). When violent media portrays positive rewards for people doing negative actions against women, it reinforces the idea that those actions will be rewarded in real-life. Not only does this encourage males to act with violence against women, but it also teaches women to be accepting of these attitudes (Custers and McNallie, 2016; Kahlor and Eastin, 2011). Media is used in a powerful way which influences the way people act and how they believe they should be treated (Custers and McNallie, 2016; Holbert et al., 2003). Men tend to be taught that their aggressive behavior is acceptable compared to women (Scharrer, 2005), so having this type of behavior reinforced through media depictions teaches

men, more so than women, that their behavior is okay which reinforces the idea that they can act in a certain way.

Exposure to Violence Against Women in Media

Exposure to the objectification of women in the media—with and without aggression toward women—is positively correlated with men's tendency to view women as sex objects and this increase holds even when the objectification does not involve aggression towards women (Wright and Tokunaga, 2016). In addition, men's exposure to media depictions of women as decorative or sexual objects increases their likelihood of sexually harassing and assaulting women (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020). According to Wright and Tokunaga, some male participants reported considering women to be nothing more than an object of sexual gratification after being exposed to media which objectified women (Wright and Tokunaga, 2016). Women who are exposed to sexually objectifying media are also more likely to endorse traditional gender roles (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020).

Men who view media that exhibits a positive outcome for a man harassing a woman believe that it may be okay for them to do the same thing (Custers and McNallie, 2016; Malamuth and Check, 1981). Constant exposure to media that depicts women as little more than objects for men's enjoyment reinforces stereotypes and myths about women (Easteal, et al., 2014; Galdi and Guizzo, 2020). Viewing media that portrays acts of gender harassment normalizes female objectification and harassment saying that it is a part of male behavior of sexual interest (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020). Studies have found an increase between exposure to images of violence against women and accepting violence against women (Custers and McNallie, 2016; Kahlor and Eastin, 2011).

7

Most studies on violence in media focuses on male perpetrators and female victims, but this study goes beyond other studies by examining the effects of nonsexual violence against both men and women in both the perpetrator and victim role. Using an online experiment, I examine if and how exposure to violence in short video clips affects both benevolent and hostile sexism, as measured with the ambivalent attitudes about women scale (Glick and Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexist attitudes are marked by paternalism, gender differentiation, and ideals of heterosexual intimacy (Glick and Fiske, 1996), while hostile sexist attitudes reflect an antipathy toward women who do not conform to traditional gender roles (Glick and Fiske, 1996). I also examine the moderating role of a history of violent media, as measured with the exposure to media violence scale (Mrug et al., 2014). Drawing on social learning theory and existing research, I advance three hypotheses regarding the way that exposure and a history of exposure to nonsexual violent media independently and jointly affect attitudes toward women.

This study goes beyond the current literature because it looks at *non*sexual violence and by examining the consequences of viewing both female and male victims *and* aggressors. With this study, by looking at violence that has no positive outcome and is also not sexual, we examine the way violence against a man or a woman by a man or a woman affects the way we perceive gender and if this violence reinforces gender stereotypes.

Together these studies suggest patterns connected to social learning theory because once people view media that shows violence against women with positive consequences, they are more accepting of violence against women. Drawing on social learning theory and these empirical patterns, I expect that exposure to images of violence against women will increase sexist attitudes and exposure to violence against men will decrease sexist attitudes.

Hypothesis 1: Exposure to images of violence against women will increase both

benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes.

Men are more likely than women to be the perpetrator of violence over women in media

(Scharrer, 2005) and are less likely to be victimized, so there are very few studies that can lead

me to hypothesize about the effects of male victimization. Because of this, I also examine the

effects of exposure to male victimization in violent media but given the limited work on this kind

of violent media, I do not advance hypotheses for the effects of that kind of exposure.

History of Exposure to Violence in the Media

Individuals in the U.S. spend a moderate amount of time watching television and movies,

and during this time, they are exposed to images and ideas that influence their perspectives on

gender (Easteal, et al., 2014; Galdi and Guizzo, 2020; Kahlor and Eastin, 2011; Malamuth and

Check, 1981; Thomas et al., 1977; Wright and Tokunaga, 2016). In line with social learning

theory, numerous studies show that those with intrinsic exposure are more likely to develop

negative attitudes toward women. Exposure to screen media and the messages it portrays may

distort the way people view the world in such a way that that individuals' view on life and the

world starts to resemble the screen media's view (Custers and Van den Bulck, 2012; Messner,

1986; Scharrer, 2005). Greater exposure to sexually objectifying media increases male and

female agreement with traditional masculine and feminine gender norms (Galdi and Guizzo,

2020). After exposure to sexually objectifying media, male participants exhibit increased

compliance with gender-harassing behavior (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020). Frequent exposure to

media-depictions of sexual violence against women with positive consequences, increases male

acceptance of interpersonal violence against women (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020; Malamuth and

Check, 1981; Wright and Tokunga, 2016). Once people view this type of media and see that

there are no negative consequences for these actions, they become more inclined to participate in those types of attitudes. Therefore, I expect a history of exposure to violent media will increase both benevolent and hostile sexism.

> *Hypothesis 2*: A history of exposure to violent media will increase both benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes.

Exposure to violent media influences those who are prone to aggression to act more aggressively if presented with a similar scenario (Messner, 1986; Scharrer, 2005). Those with a history of exposure are also more likely to present sexist qualities if the media they viewed has a positive outcome (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020). I examine if and how a history of exposure moderates the effect of immediate exposure, hypothesizing that a history of exposure to violent media will increase the positive effects of exposure to images of violence against women.

> *Hypothesis 3*: A history of exposure to violent media will moderate the effect of exposure to images of violence against women on sexist attitudes. More specifically, that history will increase the positive effect of recent exposure on sexist attitudes.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The data were collected using an online survey collected from 270 participants who reside in the U.S. from surveying a general population, using the resource Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). The sample was restricted to respondents currently within the United States to control for possible international differences. The participants were 18-years or older.

Conditions

Participants were randomly assigned to one of six conditions: exposure to male-on-male violence, exposure to female-on-female violence, exposure to male-on-female violence, exposure to female-on-male violence, exposure to non-gendered violence (a control), and exposure to no violence (a control). Each of the six conditions exposed participants to same four video clips of two people fighting. Depending on the condition, one or both people in the clips were covered by a black square hiding their gender. A different combination of faces were concealed across the conditions. In the male-on-male violence condition, all female faces were covered. In the female-on-female violence condition, all male faces were covered. In the female-on-male violence condition, the aggressor's face was covered in clips with a male aggressor and the victim's face was covered with in clips with a female victim. In the male-on-female condition, the aggressor's face was covered in clips with a female aggressor, and the victim's face was covered in clips with a male victim. This approach ensured that all participants in the experimental conditions were exposed to the same images and that they only viewed faces of victims and aggressors that matched their condition.

There were two controls. One control was a non-gendered violence condition where the gender of both the aggressor and victim were hidden in all four clips. And the other control contained no violence, where there were four clips of people, animals, or objects containing zero violence.

The videos used in this experiment are all from popular movies, along with a non-violent video which is a collection of videos from YouTube. These videos are all thirty-four-seconds long, with twenty-seconds containing an actual visual. The other fourteen-seconds contained a blank screen. The six conditions are a compilation of clips from YouTube, put together and edited to hide the gender of either the victim, the assailant, or both. The video for male-on-male

violence can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-nf7dr_3ovY&t=1s. The video

for female-on-female violence can be found here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=srpyy526140. The video for male-on-female violence can be

found here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BjVUu6e4ymQ&t=3s. The video for female-on-

male violence can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H3XdBu3X1zY. The

video for non-gendered violence can be found here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NwcGlZD0904. The video for no violence can be found

here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ff6FqekxEHw.

Independent Variable

I operationalized *exposure to violent media* using a modification of the Exposure to

Media Violence Scale (Mrug et al., 2014). I first took the sum of responses to two identical

items, one for the weekdays and one for the weekend days: "In the past year, how many hours

per weekday (Monday-Friday)/weekend (Saturday-Sunday) do you typically spend watching TV

shows, movies, and other media? Please exclude the news from your estimate," both with five

response options: 0-1 hour, 2-4 hours, 5-7 hours, 8-10 hours, 11-13 hours, and 14+ hours. I then

multiplied that exposure variable by an item assessing the percentage of screen time that is

violent: "What percentage of TV shows, movies, and other media that you watch (excluding the

news) show physical violence, shooting, or killing?," an item with four response options: 0-20

percent, 21-40 percent, 41-60 percent, 61-80 percent, 81-100 percent.

I also controlled for several participant attributes. *Age* is measured in years. *Gender* is

dichotomized with female and non-binary compared to male. *Education level* is also

dichotomized, with bachelor's degree or higher compared to lower levels of education which was

omitted. *Ethnic/racial background* is represented with three dummies: black, Latinx, and other,

with white omitted. *Sexual orientation/identity* is represented with two dummies: heterosexual and bisexual, with asexual, gay, lesbian, pansexual, and queer folded into one which was omitted. *Marital status* is represented with five dummies: cohabiting, divorced, separated, never married, and other, with married omitted. Participants reported their *political views* by selecting a position along a 101-point slider that ranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. I show the descriptive statistics for these and the other variables in the in Table 1.

There were two attention checks in place to test the participants throughout the survey. These checks were placed within the Ambivalent Sexism questions. The first attention check requested the participants mark "none of the above" in order to pass the check (Mean = .88). The second attention check requested the participants to mark a "0" in the correct box in order to pass the attention check (Mean = .97).

Dependent Variables

Benevolent and *hostile sexism* were measured with the twelve female-focused items from the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske, 1996): (1) "Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess," (2) "Women should be cherished and protected by men," (3) "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men," (4) "Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores," (5) "Men are incomplete without women," (6) "Women exaggerate problems they have at work," (7) "Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash," (8) "When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against," (9) "Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances," (10) "Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility," (11) "Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives," (12) "Feminists are

13

making unreasonable demands of men." Respondents reported their level of agreement with a 101-point slider, with 0 marked "strongly disagree" and 100 marked "strongly agree."

I applied principal components factor analysis with varimax with kaiser normalization and found two factors, "benevolent sexism" and "hostile sexism." Table 2 displays these loadings for each of the twelve items. I then summed like items that loaded for each of the two factors and used those sums as my dependent variables.

RESULTS

Benevolent Sexism

Table 3 displays an OLS regression of benevolent sexism on the conditions and controls, which includes participant attributes (English as first language, gender, age, education, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, marital status, and political conservatism) and controls for passing the two attention checks. According to Hypothesis 1, exposure to images of violence against women will increase sexist attitudes. Contrary to that hypothesis, Model 1 shows that female victimization does not increase benevolent sexism as shown by the non-significant coefficients for female-on-female ($b = -3.87$, $se = 5.12$, $p = .451$) and male-on-female violence ($b = -1.69$, $se = 5.15$, $p = .744$). I also found that exposure to male-on-male violence decreased benevolent sexism ($b = -11.56$, $se = 5.12$, $p = .025$). I also combined the two female victimization conditions and found no significant results in comparison to the male victimization conditions and the controls on benevolent sexism.

Consistent with Hypothesis 2, Model 2 shows a history of exposure to violent media is positively associated with benevolent sexism ($b = 1.47$, $se = .325$, $p < .001$). Social learning

theory shows that a history of exposure to something that relays positive information will encourage people to act in a similar way (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020; Scharrer, 2005).

Contrary to Hypothesis 3, Model 3 shows that a history of exposure to violent media does not moderate the effects of immediate exposure to violence on benevolent sexism as shown by the five non-significant interaction terms. I believe there are reasons for this non-finding, which I mention in my discussion. Model 3 is unchanged even with controls included (but this is not shown) and the non-significance holds even after controlling for participant attributes shown in Table 1.

In Model 4, I find that a history of exposure holds even with participant attributes holding at constant. It declines in size from $b = 1.47$ to $b = .742$ but remains a significant predictor.

Hostile Sexism

Table 3 displays an OLS regression of hostile sexism on the conditions and controls, which includes participant attributes (English as first language, gender, age, education, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, marital status, and political conservatism) and controls for passing the two attention checks. According to Hypothesis 1, exposure to images of violence against women will increase sexist attitudes. Contrary to that Hypothesis, Model 1 shows that female victimization does not increase benevolent sexism as shown by the non-significant coefficients for female-on-female ($b = -.635$, $se = 5.55$, $p = .909$) and male-on-female violence ($b = -.334$, $se = 5.59$, $p = .952$). I also combined the two female victimization conditions and found no significant results in comparison to the male victimization conditions and the controls on hostile sexism.

Consistent with Hypothesis 2, Model 2 shows a history of exposure to violent media is positively associated with hostile sexism ($b = 1.57$, $se = .353$, $p < .001$). Again, social learning theory shows that a history of exposure that possesses a positive outcome increases one's positive attitudes towards that action (Galdi and Guizzo, 2020; Scharrer, 2005).

Contrary to Hypothesis 3, Model 3 shows that there were no significant results when looking at our interaction effects of the conditions and a history of exposure to violent media on hostile sexism. Model 3 is unchanged even with controls included (but this is not shown) and the non-significance holds even after controlling for participant attributes shown in Table 1.

In Model 4, I find that a history of exposure holds even with participant attributes held constant. It declines in size from $b = 1.57$ to $b = .746$ but remains a significant predictor.

DISCUSSION

The motivation for this study was to look at how immediate exposure to violent media and a history of exposure to violent media affects the way we perceive gender. Most research studies have focused on sexism relating to media that sexually objectifies women. And how media relating to sexual violence against women affects sexism. The research that's missing is the effects of nonsexual violence on female victims and male victims. This research is mainly focused on female victims, but also does explore the effects on male victims. This research also looks at the different gendered offenders on different gendered victims. The importance is to see how what we see in our daily lives affects the way we act and treat other people. With social learning theory, we can see that the type and amount of media that we consume that promotes one type of behavior affects our overall attitude towards something, in this case, violent media on sexism.

The results of my study indicate that there is an increase between a history of exposure to violent media and both benevolent and hostile sexism. Consistent with studies on social learning theory and those studying sexual violence against women, numerous studies show those with extensive exposure are at heighten risk for developing sexist attitudes towards women. I found that people who frequently watch violent media, whether that be movies or television shows, have an increase in benevolent sexism and hostile sexism compared to those without a history of exposure. This supports social learning theory because once someone has a history of exposure that supports one type of behavior, that behavior is then adopted with the idea that that behavior will be supported. Despite a general measure for a history of exposure to violent media, there is a significant increase in both benevolent and hostile sexism, but this could be caused by socialization or people seeking this type of media, meaning those who possess sexist attitudes seek out violent gendered media. Male-on-male violence decreases benevolent sexism meaning that viewing this condition decreases participants view on female fragility. Viewing this media leads participants to think that a man is not strong enough to protect a woman, or that he does not have the means of protecting a woman. All of the conditions are non-significant in relation to hostile sexism.

Two patterns in my experimental results were unexpected. First, contrary to predictions I found that short-term exposure to violence against women did not increase benevolent or hostile sexism. That may be due to the short exposure and/or the inability to conceal the gender of the aggressor and victim in the non-featured video.

Second, I found that short-term exposure to male-on-male violence decreased benevolent sexism. It could be inferred that a male victim where a man is the aggressor decreases one's benevolent sexism because they can no longer view men in a stereotypical way. Seeing a male

victim and a male aggressor could instill that the male victim is not strong enough to protect women. Therefore, those exposed to this condition could view women who conform to traditional gender roles in a less positive light because since they can't be protected by a man, they shouldn't be as fragile or in need of said protection. They could also see women who need protecting by men as weak when those men can't protect themselves from another man.

Theoretical Implications

This research builds on social learning theory literature that suggests that short exposure does not have an effect, but that a history of exposure to violent media may increase our perceptions on gender. Those who have a history of exposure to violent media are more likely to possess sexist views. For this study, a majority of the literature review focused on sexual violence in media and how that affects gender and gender stereotypes. I was interested in the nonsexual violence in media and if that changes the way we perceive gender differently from sexual violence. While the conditions did not support my hypothesis, a history of exposure did, meaning there is more to look for when focusing on exposure to gendered violence in the media and how that affects the way we perceive gender.

Social learning theory also suggests that constant exposure to positive effects will increase the likelihood of someone participating in that behavior. With longer exposure, I believe that there will be significant increase in sexist behaviors on these conditions. I think the exposure to the conditions was too short to show an increase in sexism. The literature points to an increase in sexist views and behaviors if there is longer exposure to gendered violence.

Limitations and Further

One limitation to this experiment is the length of the video clips. According to the current literature, with longer exposure, possibly over a period of days, the increase of sexism would be greater on the conditions. Those patterns suggest that the twenty-seconds of exposure used in this study may have been too short to show an effect. Another limitation was the facial covering issues in the conditions. For future research, using a video clip of the same people with their gender changed would better increase the chances of results in relation to the hypotheses. The video clips used in this experiment were edits where either the aggressor, victim, or both genders were covered by a black box. This could have posed as a potential distraction for the participants, as well as not actually concealing their gender at all. Since the male-on-male violence condition decreased in benevolent sexism, it could have been that the condition was not purely about male-on-male which could then have influenced the participants. In the future, better editing software is needed in order to conceal the true gender of the people in the video clips.

Further studies should investigate the effects of different gendered perpetrators and different gendered victims on the way we perceive gender when exposed to violent media. There are many different ways we see violence in the media and there need to be studies that look at the effects of these different aspects so we can fully understand how the media we absorb affects the way we think and interact with others. There needs to be more research done where people look at the effects of male victims when it comes to sexual and nonsexual violence in the media. There also needs to be research done of females as the aggressor on both male and female victims and how that affects the way we perceive sexism. All of these factors influence the way we see gender and gender stereotypes and this media is all readily available and consumed every day. With people being so exposed to violence in media, it is important that we study all of the implications that that has on us as people.

CONCLUSION

The intent of this experiment was to see the effects of exposure to gendered nonsexual violence on the way we view gender. I hoped to see the effects of immediate exposure and a history of exposure on benevolent and hostile sexism. This was to see the implications of the media that we view on the way we view women. What I discovered is that a history of exposure to violent media does increase both benevolent and hostile sexism, but that an immediate exposure, at least one of very minimal time, does not affect benevolent or hostile sexism. I found that viewing violence where a man is the perpetrator and the victim decreases benevolent sexism, or sexism that views women as something precious and in need of being protected. Perhaps this unexpected pattern is related to the experience of viewing a man in a weak position, an experience that may reduce individuals' belief in their ability to save a woman and protect her. This instills the idea of men needing to be strong, macho, and tough. Those men that show weakness cannot support a woman and are not deserving enough of a woman. This shows how violent media does affect our views on sexism, but not in a way that I anticipated. It shows how men are viewed and the stereotypes that the media puts on the way men can act. I am interested in researching this further to look at how longer exposure to nonsexual gendered violent media increases sexism for both men and women. My study showed how a history of exposure to violent media increases benevolent and hostile sexism, but also how exposure to male-on-male violence affects perceptions on males. My hope is that this research leads to more discussions about how violence in media affects the way we see gender in hopes of showing people that what you see isn't always fact. We are influenced by everything we consume, and I hope this study makes people more aware of the content they are consuming and how that affects the way they see things.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Sample (N = 270)

Variables in Analyses	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Dependent Variables				
Benevolent sexism	66.98	24.45	0	100
Hostile sexism	60.57	26.74	0	100
Independent Variables				
Conditions				
Female on female violence	.17		0	1
Male on female violence	.16		0	1
Male on male violence	.17		0	1
Female on male violence	.17		0	1
Non-gendered violence	.17		0	1
Control: no violence (omitted)	.16		0	1
History of exposure to violent media	7.30	4.39	1	25
Passed manipulation check 1	.88		0	1
Passed manipulation check 2	.97		0	1
Participant attributes				
English is first language	.99		0	1
Female and nonbinary (male omitted)	.40		0	1
Age	35.43	15.75	20	71
Age squared	1502.38	1166.09	400	9801
Education				
Bachelor's degree or higher	.77		0	1
Sexual Orientation				
Bisexual	.35		0	1
Heterosexual	.59		0	1
Other sexual orientations[1] (omitted)	.06		0	1
Race/Ethnicity				
Black	.082		0	1
Latinx	.052		0	1
White (omitted)	.700		0	1
Other ethnicities[2]	.167		0	1
Marital Status				
Cohabiting	.023		0	1
Divorced	.048		0	1
Married (omitted)	.722		0	1
Separated	.004		0	1
Never Married	.185		0	1
Other[3]	.011		0	1
Political conservatism	60.83	32.78	0	100

Notes: [1] Includes asexual, gay, lesbian, pansexual, queer, and other. [2] Includes Asian/Asian American, international, Native American, Pacific Islander, and other. [3] Includes widowed and other.

Table 2. Factor loadings for benevolent and hostile sexism using principal component analysis (N = 270)

	Benevolent Sexism	Hostile Sexism
Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess	**.814**	.352
Women should be cherished and protected by men	**.851**	.174
Women seek to gain power by getting control over men	.287	**.805**
Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores	**.823**	.316
Men are incomplete without women	**.748**	.457
Women exaggerate problems they have at work	.332	**.821**
Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash	.349	**.796**
When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against	.296	**.861**
Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances	.361	**.821**
Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility	**.730**	.433
Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives	**.702**	.462
Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men	.377	**.766**
Eigenvalue	7.882	1.266
Percentage of variance	65.683	10.547

Notes: With varimax with kaiser normalization

Table 3. OLS Regressions of Benevolent Sexism on Conditions and Controls (N=270)

		Benevolent Sexism			
Model:		1	2	3	4
Conditions					
Female on Female Violence		-3.87	-3.01	.360	-1.17
		(5.12)	(4.94)	(9.76)	(4.14)
Male on Female Violence		-1.69	-.456	-7.68	-1.42
		(5.15)	(4.98)	(9.84)	(4.21)
Male on Male Violence		-11.56*	-10.81*	-19.50	-9.03*
		(5.12)	(4.94)	(10.10)	(4.13)
Female on Male Violence		.373	1.31	-10.63	5.28
		(5.06)	(4.89)	(9.74)	(4.12)
Non-gendered Violence		-6.01	-4.19	-4.52	-1.96
		(5.14)	(4.97)	(8.94)	(4.16)
History of Exposure to Violent Media			1.47***	1.02	.742**
			(.325)	(.736)	(.280)
Interaction Effects					
History of Exposure x Female on Female				-.500	
				(1.11)	
History of Exposure x Male on Female				.961	
				(1.14)	
History of Exposure x Male on Male				1.12	
				(1.15)	
History of Exposure x Female on Male				1.59	
				(1.11)	
History of Exposure x Non-gendered				-.042	
				(1.01)	
Pass Attention Check 1		-10.92*	-10.81*	-10.23*	-3.12
		(4.57)	(4.41)	(4.44)	(4.12)
Pass Attention Check 2		-3.51	-.993	-1.57	-6.50
		(9.30)	(8.98)	(9.02)	(7.63)
Constant		83.81	69.58	73.21	50.09
		(10.70)	(10.79)	(12.08)	(11.22)
R^2		.052	.121	.138	.450
Adjusted R^2		.027	.094	.094	.398

Notes: Unstandardized coefficients; standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; Model 4 controls for participant attributes listed in Table 1.

Table 4. OLS Regressions of Hostile Sexism on Conditions and Controls (N=270)

		Hostile Sexism			
Model:		1	2	3	4
Conditions					
Female on Female Violence		-.635	.272	7.40	2.209
		(5.55)	(5.37)	(10.62)	(4.19)
Male on Female Violence		-.334	.974	-.570	.022
		(5.59)	(5.41)	(10.70)	(4.26)
Male on Male Violence		-5.25	-4.53	-11.67	.819
		(5.55)	(5.37)	(10.99)	(4.19)
Female on Male Violence		-2.95	-1.96	-11.10	4.82
		(5.49)	(5.31)	(10.59)	(4.17)
Non-gendered Violence		-9.39	-7.45	-5.74	-4.23
		(5.57)	(5.40)	(9.72)	(4.21)
History of Exposure to Violent Media			1.57***	1.43	.746**
			(.353)	(.800)	(.283)
Interaction Effects					
History of Exposure x Female on Female				-.989	
				(1.21)	
History of Exposure x Male on Female				.200	
				(1.24)	
History of Exposure x Male on Male				.948	
				(1.25)	
History of Exposure x Female on Male				1.24	
				(1.21)	
History of Exposure x Non-gendered				-.282	
				(1.09)	
Pass Attention Check 1		-16.32***	-16.20***	-15.93***	-5.43
		(4.96)	(4.79)	(4.83)	(4.16)
Pass Attention Check 2		13.64	16.31	16.31	9.19
		(10.08)	(9.76)	(9.81)	(7.73)
Constant		64.79	49.67	50.50	46.97
		(11.61)	(11.72)	(13.14)	(11.37)
R^2		.068	.133	.147	.527
Adjusted R^2		.043	.107	.104	.483

Notes: Unstandardized coefficients; standard errors in parentheses; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; Model 4 controls for participant attributes listed in Table 1.

REFERENCES

Bandura, Albert. (1973). *Aggression: A Social learning theory.* Prentice-Hall. 39-53.

Custers, Kathleen, and Jan Van den Bulck. 2012. "The Cultivation of Fear of Sexual Violence in
    Women: Processes and Moderators of the Relationship Between Television and Fear."
    Communication Research 40(1):96-124.

Custers, Kathleen, & McNallie, J. (2016). The relationship between television sports exposure
    and rape myth acceptance: The mediating role of sexism and sexual objectification of
    women. *Violence Against Women, 23*(7):813–829.
    https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216651340

Easteal, Patricia, et al. 2014. "Enduring themes and silences in media portrayals of violence
    against women." *Women's Studies International Forum* 48:103-113.

Galdi, Silvia, and Francesca Guizzo. 2020. "Media-Induced Sexual Harassment: The Routes
    from Sexually Objectifying Media to Sexual Harassment." *Sex Roles*. Retrieved March 4,
    2020 (https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01196-0).

Glick, Peter, and Susan T. Fiske. 1996. "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating
    Hostile and Benevolent Sexism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*
    70(3):491-512.

Holbert, R.L., Shah, D.V. and Kwak, N. (2003), Political Implications of Prime-Time Drama and
    Sitcom Use: Genres of Representation and Opinions Concerning Women's Rights.
    Journal of Communication, 53: 45-60. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-
    2466.2003.tb03004.x

Kahlor, LeeAnn, and Matthew S. Eastin. 2011. "Television's Role in the Culture of Violence Toward Women: A Study of Television Viewing and the Cultivation of Rape Myth Acceptance in the United States." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 55(2):215-231.

Malamuth, Neil M., and James V. P. Check. 1981. "The Effects of Mass Media Exposure on Acceptance of Violence against Women: A Field Experiment." *Journal of Research in Personality* 15:436-446.

Messner, Steven F. 1986. "Television Violence and Violent Crime: An Aggregate Analysis." *Social Problems* 33(3):218-235.

Mrug, Sylvie, et al. 2014. "Emotional and Physiological Desensitization to Real-Life and Movie Violence." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 44(5):1092-1108.

Scharrer, Erica (2005) "Hypermasculinity, Aggression, and Television Violence: An Experiment." *Media Psychology* 7(4):353-376: DOI: 10.1207/S1532785XMEP0704_3

Signorielli, Nancy. 1989. "Television and Conceptions About Sex Roles: Maintaining Conventionality and the Status Quo." *Sex Roles* 21(5/6): 341-360.

Thomas, Margaret Hanratty, et al. 1977. "Desensitization to Portrayals of Real-Life Aggression as a Function of Exposure to Television Violence." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 35(6):450-458.

Weisbuch, M., Pauker, K., & Ambady, N. (2009). The subtle transmission of race bias via televised nonverbal behavior. *Science*, *326*(5960), 1711-1714.

Wright, Paul J., and Robert S. Tokunaga. (2016). "Men's Objectifying Media Consumption, Objectification of Women, and Attitudes Supportive of Violence Against Women." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 45:955-964.