DOES HE SEE WHAT SHE SEES? MEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR WOMEN PARTNERS' EXPERIENCES OF SEXISM

ALYSSA DEBLAERE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN PSYCHOLOGY
YORK UNIVERSITY
TORONTO, ONTARIO

JUNE 2026

©Alyssa DeBlaere, 2026

Abstract

Gender inequality remains a persistent global issue, yet increasing men's awareness of sexism continues to be a key barrier to progress. Prior research suggests that men often struggle to recognize sexism, but this work has largely focused on perceptions of women in general or hypothetical scenarios. This thesis examines men's perceptions of their women partners' experiences of sexism across two studies. In Study 1, men's perceptions largely aligned with women's reports from a demographically similar sample. In Study 2, using dyadic data from man–woman couples and the Truth and Bias model, men's perceptions tracked women's reports (accuracy) but were also shaped by men's own experiences (projection). Men also consistently overperceived their partners' experiences of sexism (directional bias). Men's reported discussions about sexism were associated with greater overperception, which was linked to broader awareness and allyship. These findings highlight romantic relationships as an important context shaping men's recognition of sexism.

Acknowledgements

Completing this thesis has been incredibly rewarding, and I am grateful to everyone who has helped me along this journey. First and foremost, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Amy Muise, whose support has been instrumental throughout this process. Thank you for your constant encouragement, guidance, and support. Your positivity, kindness, and enthusiasm for research have continually inspired me and helped me grow both as a researcher and as a person. It has been a privilege to learn from you and work alongside you.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my committee members. To my primary committee member, Dr. Joey Cheng, thank you for your feedback and thoughtful advice which helped strengthen this work. To my defense chair, Dr. Cindel White, and my external committee member, Dr. Winny Shen, thank you for taking the time to review my thesis and serve on my committee. I look forward to discussing this work with you.

I am thankful to Dr. Emily Cross for her mentorship and support throughout this degree. Emily, your excitement and passion for research are truly inspiring, and I greatly appreciate the kindness and encouragement you have shown me over the years. Thank you for the many insightful and thought-provoking discussions and collaborative experiences that made my graduate experience so positive and fulfilling.

To everyone in the Sexual Health and Relationships (SHaRe) Lab, thank you for filling the past two years with laughter, encouragement, and well-timed puzzle breaks during stressful days. I feel incredibly lucky to have shared this experience with such a wonderful group of people.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends and family for their unwavering support and encouragement throughout this journey. Thank you for always believing in me, encouraging me,

and supporting me through both the challenges and accomplishments along the way. I am extremely grateful for everything you have done to make this possible.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii
Acknowledgements iii
Table of Contents v
List of Tables vii
Introduction 1
The Prevalence and Consequences of Sexism 1
Men's Perceptions of Women's Experiences of Sexism 3
The Role of Sexist Attitudes 5
Disclosure of Sexism in Romantic Relationships as a Path to Recognition 7
Broader Awareness and Allyship Behaviour Through Accurate Perceptions 8
The Current Research 9
Study 1 10
Methods 11
Procedure and Participants 11
Measures 12
Data Analytic Strategy 16
How Do Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism Compare to Women's Own Reported Experiences of Sexism? 19
How Are Men's Sexist Attitudes Associated with Their Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism? 20
Study 1 Discussion 22
Study 2 22
Methods 24
Procedure 24
Participants 25
Measures 27
Data Analytic Strategy 29

Results 31
How Do Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism Compare to Women Partners' Own Reported Experiences of Sexism? 37
Are Men's Sexist Attitudes Associated with Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism? 40
Is the Extent to Which Women Disclose Experiences of Sexism Associated with Men's Accuracy and Bias? 43
Is Greater Accuracy and Less Bias in Men's Perceptions Associated with Greater Awareness of Sexism and Greater Allyship? 48
Allyship. 51
Study 2 Discussion 54
General Discussion 56
Romantic Relationships as a Novel Context for Men's Awareness of Sexism 57
Ideological Beliefs and Perceptions of Sexism 61
Discussions in Romantic Relationships as a Context for Understanding Sexism 62
Awareness and Allyship Shape Bias in Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism 64
Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions 66
References 73
Supplemental Materials 89

List of Tables

Table 1: Study 1 Demographics Across Men and Women 11

Table 2: Items Assessing Experiences of Sexism Across Scales 14

Table 3: Correlations Among Experiences of Sexism and Perceptions of Partners' Experiences by Gender 17

Table 4: Study 1 Descriptive Statistics 18

Table 5: Independent Samples t-test of Mean Differences Between Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism and Women's Reported Experiences of Sexism 20

Table 6: Men's Sexist Attitudes Predicting Their Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism Controlling for Men's Own Reported Experiences 21

Table 7: Study 2 Demographics Across Men and Women 26

Table 8: Correlations Among Sexism Experience Scales and Moderation Variables by Gender 34

Table 9: Study 2 Descriptive Statistics 35

Table 10: Men's and Women's Perceptions of Experiences of Sexism for Women in General . 36

Table 11: Partial Truth and Bias Models of Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism 39

Table 12: Moderations of Benevolent and Hostile Sexism on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism 41

Table 13: Moderations of Sexism Disclosure on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism 45

Table 14: Moderations of Greater Awareness of Sexism on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism 49

Table 15: Moderation of Allyship on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism 52

Introduction

Despite increasing public awareness of gender inequality (Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Zhou et al., 2024), sexism and gender discrimination persist in Canada and globally (Archer & Kam, 2020; United Nations, 2024). One reason sexism persists is because societal norms and limited personal experience make it difficult for men to recognize sexism (Stewart et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2024). Men have more trouble identifying sexist behaviours and perceive sexist scenarios to be less sexist and less realistic compared to women (Blodorn et al., 2012; Rotundo et al., 2001; Smith, 1992; Zhou et al., 2024). Given recent calls for researchers to address the need to reduce harmful gender-based attitudes (Becker et al., 2014; Glick, 2014) and engage men in these issues (Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Women and Gender Equity Canada, 2020), the current research takes a novel approach that leverages the interdependence between men and women in romantic relationships (Rusbult & van Lange, 2003) to investigate men's perceptions of their romantic partners' experiences of sexism. Specifically, the goal of the current research is to test whether men's perceptions of their romantic partners' experiences of sexism align with women's reported experiences. I test this key question across two studies—one involving independent but demographically comparable samples of men in relationships with women and women in relationships with men, and one dyadic study of man–woman couples. Across studies, I also test the role of men's sexist attitudes in their perceptions of their partners' experiences (Studies 1 and 2) and women's and men's reported discussions of experiences of sexism (Study 2), and whether greater accuracy and less bias is associated with men's broader awareness of sexism and allyship behaviours (Study 2).

The Prevalence and Consequences of Sexism

Despite increased awareness and efforts to address inequality, sexism and gender discrimination remain prevalent (Becker & Swim, 2011; Calder-Dawe & Gavey, 2016; Guthridge et al., 2022; Lawson, 2020; Parker & Funk, 2017; United Nations, 2024). Experiences of sexism and gender discrimination disproportionately affect women, who report an average of 1–2 experiences per week (Swim et al., 2001). These experiences range from subtle, everyday forms of sexism—such as paternalistic treatment rooted in the belief that women require control or protection from men (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997)—to more overt forms, including unwanted sexual attention, harassment, gender-based violence and hostility, and professional exclusion (Becker & Swim, 2011; Cundiff et al., 2014; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Flood & Pease, 2009; Heise, 2011; Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Lawson, 2020; Martínez-Bacaicoa et al., 2024). For example, sexual objectification is commonly reported by women, with women experiencing objectification once every two days and witnessing it daily (Holland et al., 2017). Experiences of sexism also occur across contexts, with nearly three-quarters of women reporting harassment in public spaces (i.e., catcalling) each month (Saunders et al., 2017), and 40% reporting gender discrimination in the workplace, such as unequal pay or exclusion from opportunities (Parker & Funk, 2017). These experiences carry meaningful consequences for women's well-being, including lower self-esteem and psychological safety, as well as heightened anger, anxiety, and depression (Contreras-Merino et al., 2024; Saunders et al., 2017; Swim et al., 2001).

Recognizing sexism is a critical step in confronting and addressing gender inequality (Iyer & Ryan, 2009; Wiley et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2025). Although structural and institutional changes are necessary to achieve equality, these changes depend, in part, on the ability to identify sexism when it occurs. Many forms of sexism are subtle or seemingly normalized in

everyday interactions (Basford et al., 2014; Swim et al., 2001), making them less likely to be challenged. As such, recognizing sexism is a critical precursor for addressing gender inequality.

Men's recognition of sexism is particularly important given their social position (World Economic Forum, 2022) and role in allyship (Van Laar et al., 2024). Research on relative deprivation finds that men who recognize women's disadvantaged position are more willing to engage in collective action for gender equality (Mazzuca et al., 2022). This is important because when men confront sexism, they are often evaluated more positively than women (see Drury & Kaiser, 2014 for a review). In contrast, women who confront sexism can face social and interpersonal penalties (e.g., Becker et al., 2011; Czopp & Monteith, 2003; Dodd et al., 2001; Kaiser & Miller, 2001). As a result, men may be particularly well-positioned to challenge sexist behaviour and norms without experiencing the same degree of backlash, making their awareness of sexism especially important for efforts to reduce gender inequality. Accordingly, men's awareness of sexism not only shapes their own engagement, but also their capacity to influence others, positioning them as critical in either challenging—or perpetuating—gender inequality.

Men's Perceptions of Women's Experiences of Sexism

On average, women report more instances of sexism and gender discrimination than men (de la Torre-Pérez et al., 2022; Rotundo et al., 2001; Swim et al., 2001; Zhou et al., 2024), and research consistently shows that men perceive lower levels of sexism than women both in hypothetical scenarios (Blodorn et al., 2012; Rothgerber et al., 2021; Smith, 1992), and in experiences observed in daily life (Becker & Swim, 2011). Gender differences in perceptions of sexism vary depending on the type of experience (i.e., specific subcategories of sexism) and context (Rothgerber et al., 2021). For example, when judging vignettes depicting workplace interactions of harassment, men's underperception was especially evident for behaviours

involving hostile work harassment, derogatory attitudes towards women, dating pressure, and physical sexual contact, whereas men and women have more similar perceptions of sexual coercion or sexual propositions in the workplace (Rothgerber et al., 2021). Meta-analytic evidence also indicates that men perceive fewer behaviours as sexual harassment compared to women (Rotundo et al., 2001). Although men and women have both become more likely to recognize sexual harassment than they were 25 years ago, gender differences in perceptions have remained stable (Zhou et al., 2024), with men continuing to perceive fewer behaviours as harassment than women. Together, this work suggests that men tend to underestimate the prevalence and severity of sexism compared to women.

One explanation for these gender differences is that men have less direct experience with sexism and therefore it is less personally relevant. According to a projection account, individuals rely on their own experiences to interpret ambiguous situations (Smith, 1992). Because women are more frequently the targets of sexism (Swim et al., 2001), they may be more attuned to recognizing it, whereas men may be less likely to identify the same situations as sexist (Blodorn et al., 2012). Consistent with this account, individuals who have witnessed or experienced sexism are more likely to perceive similar situations as discriminatory (Becker & Swim, 2011; Stangor et al., 1999).

Although men may be less likely to recognize sexism in certain contexts, their ability to view a situation as sexist increases when they can empathize with the target (Zawadzki et al., 2014). For example, although paying attention to daily acts of sexism reduces women's sexist attitudes, the same effect only appears for men when they are instructed to take the perspective of the (unknown) woman experiencing discrimination (Becker & Swim, 2011). This effect is even more pronounced when the target of discrimination is a romantic partner. Men who read

about a scenario of gender discrimination targeting their ostensible romantic partner (compared to a friend or stranger) were more likely to perspective-take with the target, appraise the situation as sexist, and subsequently report greater awareness of gender discrimination and lower endorsement of sexist attitudes (Cross et al., 2025). Given that perspective-taking and empathy are important processes that help men recognize and confront sexism (Becker & Swim, 2011; Cundiff et al., 2014; Gervais et al., 2010; Good et al., 2018; Zawadzki et al., 2014), the relationships men have with their romantic partners may be one context where men are better able to recognize situations of sexism and gender discrimination. However, previous research has largely focused on perceptions of sexism directed at women in general in hypothetical scenarios (Saunders & Senn, 2009; Smith, 1992) or in daily life (Becker & Swim, 2011), rather than sexism experienced by a specific close other, such as a romantic partner. In other words, little is known about men's accuracy (and bias) in perceiving a partner's experiences of sexism or whether this represents a pathway to increasing men's broader awareness of sexism. Therefore, the central goal of my thesis is to examine men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism, and the extent to which these perceptions align with women's reports.

The Role of Sexist Attitudes

Men's awareness of sexism is shaped by their own gender-based attitudes. Ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) posits that the societal gendered power imbalance paired with the relational interdependence between men and women gives rise to two related forms of sexist attitudes: hostile and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism reflects overtly negative attitudes towards women, portraying women as incompetent and seeking to unfairly undermine men's power. These attitudes promote and uphold men's social status by punishing women who challenge traditional gender hierarchies. In contrast, benevolent sexism reflects subjectively

positive but paternalistic beliefs that women are nurturing and in need of men's protection. Although less overtly antagonistic towards women, benevolent sexism reinforces traditional relationship dynamics in which women undertake caregiving roles and provide emotional support to men, often at the cost of their own goals and desires (Alba et al., 2024; Hammond & Overall, 2015). Together, these two forms of sexism operate in complementary ways, with hostile sexism punishing women who challenge traditional gender hierarchies and benevolent sexism reinforcing interdependence through complementary gender roles.

Although no prior work, to my knowledge, has directly examined how sexist attitudes are associated with men's perceptions of their women partners' experiences of sexism, existing research suggests that these attitudes may shape how sexist scenarios are interpreted. Higher levels of hostile sexism are associated with disengagement from and greater tolerance of sexual harassment (Page et al., 2016; Russell & Trigg, 2004). Accordingly, men who endorse hostile sexism—especially those who also endorse benevolent sexism—may be prone to minimize or reinterpret their partners' experiences of sexism and discrimination in ways that align with their pre-existing attitudes towards women (Russell & Trigg, 2004). Therefore, men who are higher in hostile sexism may be less accurate and more likely to underperceive their partners' experiences of sexism.

Benevolent sexism may operate differently than hostile sexism. On one hand, men higher in benevolent sexism may acknowledge their partners' experiences but reinterpret them in ways that position women as vulnerable and in need of protection. This reframing can minimize the severity of discrimination by portraying the incident as well-intentioned, ultimately undermining women's autonomy and reinforcing traditional gender roles. Consistent with this, men who endorse benevolent sexism tend to provide support that, despite appearing caring, diminishes

their partners' feelings of autonomy and self-efficacy (Hammond & Overall, 2015). On the other hand, benevolent sexism may also heighten sensitivity to certain forms of discrimination, such as gender stereotyping, since this aligns with their ideals of men and women having distinct, but complementary roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Because benevolent sexism emphasizes women's need for care and protection (Glick & Fiske, 1996), men higher in benevolent sexism may be more attuned to potential threats to their partner, leading to greater recognition—or even overperception—of their partners' experiences. Therefore, across studies, I test how hostile and benevolent sexism are associated with men's accuracy and bias in perceiving their partners' experiences of sexism, providing insight into how gender-based attitudes shape interpersonal perceptions of gender discrimination.

Disclosure of Sexism in Romantic Relationships as a Path to Recognition

Women frequently share their experiences of sexism with close others, including their romantic partners (Cross et al., 2026; Maimon & Sanchez, 2022). Although disclosure has been well documented for more severe experiences (e.g., sexual assault; Ahrens & Aldana, 2012; DiMauro & Renshaw, 2021; Lorenz et al., 2018; Lukacena & Mark, 2022), less is known about the extent to which women disclose everyday or ambiguous forms of sexism within romantic relationships. Emerging evidence suggests that a substantial proportion of women (76%) report disclosing experiences of sexism to their men partners, including experiences of exclusion, objectification, paternalism, gender stereotyping, and derogation (Cross et al., 2026). Women also share experiences of sexism or gender discrimination with their romantic partners in the context of receiving support following these experiences (Maimon & Sanchez, 2022). These findings indicate that romantic relationships are an important context in which women communicate experiences of gender discrimination and seek support.

Correspondingly, men report being recipients of these disclosures at similar rates. Recent work shows that the majority of men (79%) report that their partner has disclosed an experience of sexism to them (Cross et al., 2026). However, about 25% of men and 20% of women indicate that these experiences were not labelled as sexism. Importantly, when men engaged in greater perspective-taking with their partner during the disclosure, they were more likely to recognize these experiences as sexist, and in turn, report greater awareness of sexism and greater allyship behaviours (Cross et al., 2026).

Together, this work positions disclosure of sexism within romantic relationships as a key interpersonal pathway through which men may become more aware of sexism. Given the interdependent nature of romantic relationships, men may be more likely to recognize and accurately perceive sexism when it affects their partner directly, as opposed to women in general or strangers (Cross et al., 2025). This may be particularly true when women discuss personal experiences of sexism and gender discrimination with their romantic partner, and when men are receptive to these disclosures (Cross et al., 2025; Cross et al., 2026; Maimon & Sanchez, 2022). Therefore, in Study 2, I test whether men are more accurate and less biased in their perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism when their woman partner discloses their experiences. I also test whether men's reports of discussions with their partners about sexism are associated with the accuracy and bias of their perceptions of their partners' experiences.

Broader Awareness and Allyship Behaviour Through Accurate Perceptions

Accurately perceiving a partner's experiences of sexism may be one pathway through which men develop broader awareness of gender discrimination and allyship intentions. Allyship—actions taken by individuals from privileged groups to support and advocate for marginalized groups—has been shown to play an important role in confronting sexism

(Campbell, 2023; Drury & Kaiser, 2014; Washington & Evans, 1991). However, effective allyship requires recognizing systemic inequality and one's own social privilege, being motivated by personal values, engaging in sustained and effortful allyship behaviours, and extending support to marginalized group members, including those with intersecting marginalized identities (Pietri et al., 2024). Learning about—and accurately perceiving—a partner's experiences of sexism may contribute to this understanding by providing direct, personally relevant insight into gender discrimination. In contrast to abstract or hypothetical examples, experiences involving a romantic partner may be more emotionally salient and personally relevant given the interdependence between partners (Rusbult & van Lange, 2003), which if accurately perceived, may be linked to broader awareness and allyship.

More broadly, research on intergroup contact suggests that close cross-group relationships can increase advantaged group members' support for social change when those relationships involve meaningful engagement with inequality rather than interpersonal closeness alone (see Mikołajczak et al., 2025, for a review). Man–woman romantic relationships may be a particularly important, yet underexplored, context for this process given their high interdependence and the opportunity for direct engagement with a partner's experiences of sexism. Consistent with this idea, research on racial prejudice suggests that learning about experiences of discrimination from a close other can increase general awareness of racism (Carter & Murphy, 2017). Therefore, in Study 2, I test whether men who are more accurate and less biased in perceiving their partners' experiences of sexism report greater broader awareness of sexism and more allyship behaviours, such as speaking out against sexism and supporting gender equality initiatives.

The Current Research

Across two studies, I examine whether men's perceptions of their women partners' experiences of sexism align with women's self-reported experiences, how these perceptions are influenced by sexist attitudes and relational dynamics, and whether these perceptions are associated with men's broader awareness of sexism and allyship. In Study 1, I test whether men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism align with women's reports (from an independent, demographically similar sample of women), providing an initial assessment of accuracy in these perceptions. I also examine the extent to which men's perceptions are associated with their hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. In Study 2, I extend this work using dyadic data from man–woman couples and apply the Truth and Bias Model to more precisely assess men's accuracy and bias in perceiving their partners' experiences of sexism. This approach allows me to simultaneously estimate accuracy (the extent to which men's perceptions align with their partners' self-reports) and directional bias (systematic over- or underperception), while accounting for projection (the extent to which men's own experiences shape their perceptions). In addition to examining the role of sexist attitudes, I extend Study 1 by testing whether women's reported disclosure of sexist experiences to their partner, and men's perceptions of having conversations in the relationship about sexism, are associated with men's greater accuracy and lower bias. Finally, I test whether men who are more accurate and less biased in perceiving their partners' experiences report greater broader awareness of gender inequality and greater engagement in allyship behaviours. Together, these studies provide a comprehensive test of how interdependence in romantic relationships shapes men's perceptions of sexism and their broader awareness and responses to gender inequality.

Study 1

The key aims of Study 1—which includes demographically comparable independent samples of men in relationships with women and women in relationships with men—are to provide an initial test of how men's perceptions of their partners' experiences compare to women's self-reported experiences and to test the role of men's sexist attitudes in these perceptions.

Methods

Procedure and Participants

I analyzed data from two existing studies that included a sample of 559 men (M_{age} = 42.67, *SD* = 12.85; 90% cohabitating; 99% monogamous; 68% married) in relationships with women recruited from Prolific Academic (www.prolific.com). I sought to compare men's perceptions of their romantic partners' experiences of sexism to the reports of an independent sample of 517 women in relationships with men (also recruited from Prolific) who were similar on age and other relevant demographics (M_{age} = 42.79, *SD* = 13.36; 91% cohabitating; 99% monogamous; 67% married). Therefore, in this study, I did not compare the reports of romantic partners but rather used a sample of women who reported on their own experiences as a benchmark against which to compare men's perceptions of their romantic partners' experiences. Here, I compared men's average perceptions of their romantic partners' experiences to (other) women's average reports of their own experiences to provide an initial test of my predictions. All participants were in relationships for at least a year and were recruited from the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. For complete demographics, see Table 1.

Table 1
Study 1 Demographics Across Men and Women

	Men (*N* = 559)	Women (*N* = 517)

Age	Mean = 42.7 *SD* = 12.9 Range = 20–78	Mean = 42.8 *SD* = 13.4 Range = 20–81
Identification with Sex Assigned at Birth		
Cisgender	93.4% (*n* = 513)	97.3% (*n* = 503)
Transgender	0.2% (*n* = 1)	0.2% (*n* = 1)
None of these describe me	5.8% (*n* = 32)	2.3% (*n* = 12)
Unsure or prefer not to answer	0.5% (*n* = 3)	0.2% (*n* = 1)
Sexual Orientation		
Straight/Heterosexual	99.1% (*n* = 554)	100% (*n* = 517)
Bisexual	0.9% (*n* = 5)	0.0% (*n* = 0)
Relationship Status		
In relationship for more than 1 year	100% (*n* = 559)	100% (*n* = 517)
Cohabitating	90.3% (*n* = 505)	91.1% (*n* = 469)
Monogamous	99.3% (*n* = 554)	99.2% (*n* = 513)
Married	68.3% (*n* = 382)	67.3% (*n* = 348)
Seriously Dating	17.2% (*n* = 96)	19.7% (*n* = 102)
Casually Dating	0.4% (*n* = 2)	0.2% (*n* = 1)
Engaged	7.3% (*n* = 41)	5.8% (*n* = 30)
Common-Law	5.9% (*n* = 33)	5.8% (*n* = 30)
Other	0.9% (*n* = 5)	1.2% (*n* = 6)
Country of Residence		
United Kingdom	65% (*n* = 360)	0.0% (*n* = 0)
United States	17.4% (*n* = 97)	85.1% (*n* = 440)
Canada	10.8% (*n* = 60)	13.5% (*n* = 70)
Australia	4.1% (*n* = 23)	0.0% (*n* = 0)
New Zealand	2.0% (*n* = 11)	0.0% (*n* = 0)
Other	0.4% (*n* = 2)	1.4% (*n* = 7)
Race/Ethnicity		
White: e.g., North American, European, etc.	68.0% (*n* = 380)	77.9% (*n* = 402)
Black: e.g., African, Caribbean, etc.	12.0% (*n* = 67)	4.3% (*n* = 22)
East Asian: e.g., Chinese, Korean, etc.	5.9% (*n* = 33)	6.4% (*n* = 33)
South Asian: e.g., Indian, Pakistani, etc.	4.5% (*n* = 25)	1.6% (*n* = 8)
Latin American: e.g., Mexican, Colombian, etc.	3.6% (*n* = 20)	4.7% (*n* = 24)
Indigenous: e.g., First Nations, Métis, Inuit, etc.	0.2% (*n* = 1)	0.2% (*n* = 1)
Middle Eastern: e.g., Egyptian, Saudi Arabian, etc.	2.0% (*n* = 11)	0.2% (*n* = 1)
Bi- or multi-ethnic/racial	2.3% (*n* = 13)	3.1% (*n* = 16)
Other	1.6% (*n* = 9)	1.7% (*n* = 9)

Note. Country of residence was inferred using currency reported for personal income.

Measures

Experiences of Sexism. Participants originally completed all 25 items of the Becker and Swim (2011) Experiences of Sexism Scale and women completed all 12 items of the McDonald and colleagues (2016) Everyday Sexism Survey. I conducted measurement invariance tests and an exploratory factor analysis to examine whether the factor structure aligned with previous research. Some changes in the factor structure emerged, prompting me to drop a few items and rename some factors to enhance clarity and better reflect their underlying constructs. Further details can be found in Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplemental Materials. The final items and category names can be found in Table 2.

Therefore, the current analyses focus on an adapted 22-item version of the Becker and Swim (2011) Experiences of Sexism Scale, which captured a range of experiences of sexism, including *objectification* (e.g., "I have experienced staring, ogling, unwanted touching"), *undermining claims of discrimination* (e.g., "I have heard that women interpret innocent remarks as sexist"), *hearing hostility towards women* (e.g., "I have heard sexist jokes"), and *paternalism and complementary gender roles* (e.g., "I have heard paternalistic stereotypes about women (e.g., women should be cherished and protected by men)"). For the objectification subscale, I further considered *experiencing* objectification and *witnessing* objectification separately because it was the only subscale with items that distinguished these types of experiences. In general, these items are designed to be completed by both men and women, as they primarily capture exposure to sexism through hearing about or witnessing gender discrimination, rather than being the direct target. Alphas across subscales ranged from .74 to .92.

In addition, women also completed an adapted 11-item version of the Everyday Sexism Survey (McDonald et al., 2016), capturing incidents related to *career stereotyping* (e.g., "I have been excluded from important tasks or decision making because I am a woman"), *minimizing on*

basis of gender (e.g., “I have had a man interrupting or talking over me in meetings”), and *patrolling femininity* (e.g., “I have been called too emotional”). Items were rated on a five-point scale (1 = *Never*, 5 = *Happens very often)*. All items were averaged to create a mean score, with higher scores indicating more frequent experiences of sexism. Unlike the previous measure, these items assess gender-specific experiences of sexism and were therefore only administered to women. Alphas across subscales ranged from .80 to .89.

Table 2

Items Assessing Experiences of Sexism Across Scales

Experiences of Sexism Survey Items (adapted from Becker & Swim, 2011)	
Experiencing Objectification	Experienced staring, ogling, unwanted touching. Received unwanted sexual attention. Unwanted flirting.
Witnessing Objectification	Heard catcalls. Heard comments about parts of your or someone’s body or clothing. Heard comments about sexual behavior someone would like to engage in with you or another person.
Undermining Claims of Discrimination	Heard that women are not able to have a fair competition because when they lose, they typically complain about being discriminated against. Heard that women interpret innocent remarks as sexist. Heard people say that discrimination is a thing of the past and women should stop complaining. Heard people say that women push themselves where they are not wanted. Heard negative attitudes about gender equality. Not being taken seriously when making a complaint about a sexist incident.
Hearing Hostility Towards Women	Heard sexist jokes. Use of derogatory terms to refer to women or men (e.g., bitch, chick, bastard, wimp). Use of sexist language (e.g., referring to all people as ‘‘men,’’ a person of an unknown gender as ‘‘he,’’ or using nonparallel structure such as refer to women as ‘‘girls’’ while not calling men ‘‘boys’’). Heard traditional negative beliefs that women were not able to do things as well as men (e.g., low ability with math, sports, cars, or leadership). Heard hostile beliefs about women (e.g., women are too easily offended or exaggerate problems at work). Heard negative things about feminists.
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	Heard traditional beliefs about relationships (e.g., men are incomplete without women and that every man ought to have a woman whom he adores). Heard paternalistic stereotypes about women (e.g., women should be cherished and protected by men).

	Heard complementary beliefs about women and men (e.g., men and women are different but complement each other). Heard traditional positive stereotypes about women (e.g., women are better at certain things than men like cooking, shopping, and childcare).
Everyday Sexism Survey Items (adapted from McDonald et al., 2016)	
Minimizing On Basis of Gender	Your views not being listened to until they are re-stated by a man. Someone not trusting information you provide until a man confirms it. A man interrupting or talking over you in meetings. A man explaining something to you that you already have skills or knowledge about.
Career Stereotyping	Being excluded from important tasks or decision making because you are a woman. Being greeted or introduced on the basis of being a woman (e.g. in terms of personal/family role such as mother) rather than your work role. Someone assuming that you do not want a particular career opportunity or role (e.g. an operational or factory role) because you are a woman. Someone assuming you do not hold a senior role at work or that you are in a subordinate role to a male colleague.
Patrolling Femininity	Being criticized for not behaving "like a woman should". Being called too emotional. Being accused of being too bossy or not assertive enough.

Perceptions of Partners' Experiences of Sexism. Men rated the extent to which they thought *their partner* had experienced the same sexist behaviours (see Becker & Swim, 2011; McDonald et al., 2016). Items were rated on a five-point scale (1 = *Never*, 5 = *Happens very often)* and were averaged to create a mean score of perception of their partners' experiences of sexism, with higher scores indicating more frequent experiences. Alphas across subscales ranged from .79 to .88.

Sexist Attitudes. *Hostile sexism* (e.g., "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men") and *benevolent sexism* (e.g., "Women should be cherished and protected by men") were assessed with the 12-item short form of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) for the sample involving men. Men rated their agreement with each item using a 7-point scale (-3 = *Strongly disagree*, 3 = *Strongly agree*). Items were averaged to create mean hostile (α

= .92) and benevolent (α = .89) sexism scores, with higher scores indicating stronger sexist attitudes.

Data Analytic Strategy

To test my key questions about men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism and women's reports, I combined the sample of men and the sample of women and compared the means using independent samples t-tests. For questions about the role of men's sexist attitudes, I used only the men's sample and conducted regression analyses with men's sexist attitudes and their own experiences of sexism predicting their perceptions. As is typical of other similar work (Alba et al., 2024; Cross & Overall, 2019; Cross et al., 2019), hostile and benevolent sexism were positively correlated (r = .39). Accordingly, following standard practice, I modelled both hostile and benevolent sexism as predictors (*grand-mean centered*) to control for their positive association and clarify the independent effects of each form of sexism. I ran eight linear regressions, regressing each subcategory of sexist experiences on benevolent sexism and hostile sexism in eight independent models (i.e., experiencing objectification, witnessing objectification, undermining claims of discrimination, hearing hostility towards women, paternalism and complementary gender roles, career stereotyping, minimizing on basis of gender, and patrolling femininity). All reported models controlled for men's corresponding self-reported experiences of sexism because men's sexist attitudes may influence how they perceive sexist experiences (e.g., Russell & Trigg, 2004) and ultimately report them.

Table 3

Correlations Among Experiences of Sexism and Perceptions of Partners' Experiences by Gender

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Own Experiences	1. Experience Objectification	—	.88	.45	.51	.36	.	.	.	.42	.44	.36	.32	.28	.30	.29	.34
	2. Witness Objectification	.86	—	.48	.54	.41	.	.	.	.40	.46	.39	.34	.31	.33	.31	.36
	3. Undermining Claims of Discrimination	.47	.52	—	.68	.57	.	.	.	.42	.46	.65	.54	.45	.58	.56	.55
	4. Hearing Hostility Towards Women	.64	.69	.69	—	.60	.	.	.	.50	.52	.51	.67	.42	.44	.49	.47
	5. Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	.30	.35	.43	.49	—	.	.	.	.35	.39	.37	.44	.60	.38	.34	.35
	6. Career Stereotyping	.45	.53	.57	.56	.34	—	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	7. Minimizing on Basis of Gender	.48	.53	.57	.60	.25	.67	—	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	8. Patrolling Femininity	.53	.60	.60	.63	.26	.62	.62	—	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Perceived Partner Experiences	9. Experience Objectification	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.87	.59	.67	.38	.47	.51	.53
	10. Witness Objectification	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.62	.71	.46	.53	.53	.58
	11. Undermining Claims of Discrimination	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.72	.51	.61	.61	.63
	12. Hearing Hostility Towards Women	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.52	.56	.62	.59
	13. Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.41	.35	.37
	14. Career Stereotyping	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.79	.66
	15. Minimizing on Basis of Gender	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.70
	16. Patrolling Femininity	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—

Note. Correlations for men appear above the diagonal; correlations for women appear below the diagonal. Men do not report on their own experiences of sexism across Everyday Sexism Survey subscales, and women do not report on their perceptions of partners' experiences of sexism. All correlations significant at $p < .001$.

Table 4

Study 1 Descriptive Statistics

		Men's Experiences		Women's Experiences		Gender Differences in Self-Reported Experiences					
Variables		*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	*d*
Experiences of Sexism	Experiencing Objectification	2.23	1.04	2.92	0.99	-11.05	1068	<.001***	-0.81	-0.56	-0.68
	Witnessing Objectification	2.18	0.97	2.78	0.95	-10.20	1068	<.001***	-0.71	-0.48	-0.62
	Undermining Claims of Discrimination	2.73	0.88	2.74	0.85	-0.23	1068	.411	-0.12	0.09	-0.01
	Hearing Hostility Towards Women	3.04	0.81	3.23	0.80	-4.01	1068	<.001***	-0.29	-0.10	-0.25
	Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	3.15	0.87	3.30	0.80	-2.89	1067	.002**	-0.25	-0.05	-0.18
	Career Stereotyping	–	–	2.24	0.94	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Minimizing on Basis of Gender	–	–	2.66	1.04	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Patrolling Femininity	–	–	2.52	1.01	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sexist Attitudes	Benevolent Sexism	0.21	1.22	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
	Hostile Sexism	-0.46	1.38	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note. ***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$.

Results

Table 3 displays correlations and Tables 4 and 5 display descriptive statistics across key measures. Consistent with past literature (Becker & Swim, 2011), women reported more frequently experiencing objectification, witnessing objectification, hearing hostility towards women, and encountering paternalism and messages about complementary gender roles, compared to men. However, there were no significant differences in men's and women's reports of how often they heard undermining claims of discrimination, which may be due to the fact that most items assessed general exposure to sexist incidents (e.g., witnessing or hearing, potentially

when others are targets) rather than personally being the target (Table 4). Additionally, comparing men's own reported experiences to their perceptions of their partners' experiences (see Table S3 in the Supplemental Materials), men also perceived that their partners experience more sexism than they do, particularly for instances of experiencing objectification, witnessing objectification, hearing hostility towards women, and paternalism and complementary gender roles, but no differences in hearing undermining claims of discrimination.

How Do Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism Compare to Women's Own Reported Experiences of Sexism?

Our key question focused on the comparison between men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism and women's reports of their own experiences. Because these analyses involved multiple comparisons, I preregistered a more conservative significance threshold of $p < .01$. As shown in Table 5, men's perceptions were largely aligned with women's self-reported experiences (i.e., seven of the eight categories showed no significant differences between men's partner perceptions and women's self-reports). However, men perceived that their partners heard less hostility towards women than women reported, although the differences were quite small. While past research suggests men often underestimate the experiences of sexism for women in general, these findings imply that men may be more accurate when reporting on their perceptions of their romantic partners' experiences of sexism.

Table 5

Independent Samples t-test of Mean Differences Between Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism and Women's Reported Experiences of Sexism

Subcategory of Sexism	Men's Perceptions		Women's Reports		Men's Perceptions vs. Women's Reports					
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	*d*
Experiencing Objectification	2.85	0.99	2.92	0.99	1.10	1073	.273	-0.05	0.19	-0.07
Witnessing Objectification	2.70	0.93	2.78	0.95	1.44	1073	.149	-0.03	0.20	-0.09
Undermining Claims of Discrimination	2.78	0.83	2.74	0.85	-0.68	1070	.499	-0.14	0.07	0.04
Hearing Hostility Towards Women	3.11	0.77	3.23	0.80	2.58	1074	.010**	0.03	0.22	-0.16
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	3.30	0.78	3.30	0.80	-0.06	1072	.951	-0.10	0.09	0.00
Career Stereotyping	2.38	0.94	2.24	0.94	-2.50	1073	.013	-0.26	-0.03	0.15
Minimizing on Basis of Gender	2.56	0.94	2.66	1.04	1.65	1074	.098	-0.02	0.22	-0.10
Patrolling Femininity	2.50	0.96	2.52	1.01	0.32	1074	.748	-0.10	0.14	-0.02

Note. Due to multiple comparisons, I used a more conservative significance cutoff value of $p < .01$. $^{**}p < .01$.

How Are Men's Sexist Attitudes Associated with Their Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism?

As shown in Table 6, after accounting for men's own experiences of sexism, which have been associated with sexist attitudes, men higher (versus lower) in hostile sexism perceived that their partner had heard *less* hostility towards women (b = -.05, SE = .02, β = -.09, 95% CI [-.09, -.01] t = -2.60, p = .010). In contrast, men higher (versus lower) in benevolent sexism perceived their partners had experienced *more* paternalism and complementary gender roles (b = .11, SE = .02, β = .17, 95% CI [.06, .16] t = 4.46, $p < .001$). There were no other significant associations between men's sexist attitudes and perceptions of a partner's experiences of sexism. In sum, the results show that men's sexist attitudes play a role in shaping some, but not most, of their perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism.

Table 6

Men's Sexist Attitudes Predicting Their Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism Controlling for Men's Own Reported Experiences

	Benevolent Sexism					Hostile Sexism					Men's Own Experiences				
Subcategories of Sexism (DV)	*b*	*SE*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	*b*	*SE*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	*b*	*SE*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*
Experiencing Objectification	-0.02	0.04	.478	-0.09	0.04	0.00	0.03	.985	-0.06	0.06	0.40	0.04	<.001***	0.33	0.48
Witnessing Objectification	-0.01	0.03	.813	-0.07	0.06	-0.03	0.03	.347	-0.08	0.03	0.46	0.04	<.001***	0.38	0.53
Undermining Claims of Discrimination	0.02	0.02	.393	-0.03	0.07	-0.01	0.02	.704	-0.05	0.04	0.62	0.03	<.001 ***	0.55	0.68
Hearing Hostility Towards Women	0.02	0.02	.331	-0.02	0.06	-0.05	0.02	.010**	-0.09	-0.01	0.64	0.03	<.001***	0.58	0.70
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	0.11	0.02	<.001***	0.06	0.16	0.02	0.02	.278	-0.02	0.06	0.49	0.03	<.001***	0.43	0.55
Career Stereotyping	0.08	0.04	.037	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.03	.890	-0.06	0.07	–	–	–	–	–
Minimizing on Basis of Gender	0.02	0.04	.533	-0.05	0.09	-0.01	0.03	.740	-0.07	0.05	–	–	–	–	–
Patrolling Femininity	0.02	0.04	.592	-0.05	0.09	0.08	0.03	.020	0.01	0.14	–	–	–	–	–

Note. Benevolent and hostile sexism were entered simultaneously as predictors. When assessed, men's own experiences with the corresponding subcategory of sexism were entered as a covariate. Due to multiple comparisons, I used a more conservative significance cutoff value of $p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$.

Study 1 Discussion

Study 1 offers an initial insight into how men perceive their partners' experiences of sexism. Consistent with previous literature (e.g., Becker & Swim, 2011), men reported experiencing sexism less frequently compared to women, for all categories except for undermining claims of discrimination. However, when reporting on their perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism, men's perceptions were largely aligned with self-reports from an independent sample of women; although men tended to underestimate hearing hostility towards women, relative to women's reports, the differences were small. Compared to prior work examining perceptions of sexism and the experiences of women more broadly (e.g., Becker & Swim, 2011; Cundiff et al., 2014; Saunders & Senn, 2009; Swim et al., 2001), these findings offer initial evidence that men may be more aware of the sexism experienced by a romantic partner, which is important as recognizing sexism is the first step in being able to respond to and challenge it (Iyer & Ryan, 2009; Wiley et al., 2021). At the same time, there was meaningful variability in how men perceived their partners' experiences, highlighting the importance of examining what factors may shape men's awareness of sexism within close relationships. However, because men's perceptions were compared to women's self-reports from an independent sample, Study 1 cannot determine whether men accurately perceive the experiences of their own partners, whose self-reports would be required as an accurate benchmark. Therefore, additional work is needed to examine men's perceptions of their partners' experiences in a sample of actual couples, allowing for a more direct test of men's awareness of their partners' experiences and the interpersonal factors that may shape their awareness.

Study 2

While Study 1 provided an initial examination of men's perceptions using independent

samples of men and women, in Study 2 I recruited a sample of couples to directly compare men's perceptions to their actual romantic partners' reports of sexism. A dyadic sample allows me to use the Truth and Bias model to simultaneously test accuracy and bias, while accounting for men's projection of their own experiences. I retained the same two core aims of Study 1—mapping men's perceptions onto women's reported experiences of sexism and examining how sexist attitudes influence these perceptions. In Study 2, I extend Study 1 by testing whether women's disclosure of experiences of sexism to their partners is associated with men's greater accuracy and lower bias. I also explore whether men's reports of the extent to which they have had conversations about sexism in their relationships is associated with accuracy and bias in their perceptions. Finally, I also test whether men's greater accuracy and lower bias is associated with more awareness of gender inequality and allyship behaviours.

To ensure these associations are specific to sexism-related communication and awareness, reports of general perspective-taking (the extent to which participants engage in perspective-taking in everyday life) and general disclosure (the extent to which participants disclose/share experiences, thoughts, feelings with their partners) are tested as covariates in subsequent models. In past work, habitual perspective-taking has been associated with men's ability to perspective take with a specific woman's experience of sexism (Cross et al., 2025). Here, I also wanted to test whether any effects remained significant after accounting for general perspective-taking abilities. Including general disclosure and perspective-taking as covariates therefore helped test whether the associations between men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism and women's self-reported experiences remained significant above and beyond general tendencies to take a partner's perspective or engage in disclosure, rather than reflecting broader interpersonal communication patterns alone. I also controlled for relationship

length in a subsequent model to determine whether the focal effects are independent of how long couples have been in a relationship, as couples in longer relationships may have had more opportunities to discuss experiences of sexism and discrimination.

Methods

Procedure

I recruited a sample of man–woman romantic couples online on Prolific Academic. I first administered a brief (2-minute) pre-screening survey to assess eligibility and match partners. Using an internal screening feature on Prolific, the survey was sent to participants who: a) reported being from the United Kingdom, United States, Australia, Canada, or New Zealand, b) reported their gender as either "Man (including Trans Men)" or "Woman (including Trans Women)", c) reported the gender identity of their romantic partner, indicating either "I have a current partner, who is a man (including trans men)" or "I have a current partner, who is a woman (including trans women)", d) had a partner with a Prolific account and were willing to take part in a study as a couple, e) reported their relationship/marital status as either: "In a relationship", "Engaged", "Married", or "In a civil partnership/civil union or similar", f) with a relationship length between "7 months and 1 year (including 1 year)", "between 1 and 5 years (not including 1 year but including 5 years)", or "greater than 5 years", g) reported they were living with their spouse/partner, and h) identified their sexual orientation as "heterosexual", "bisexual", "asexual", "other", or "rather not say". A total of 1,628 participants participated in the pre-screening survey. Eligible participants were at least 18 years old, in a man–woman romantic relationship, living with their partner for at least one year, and had a partner who was also on Prolific and had completed the pre-screening survey.

In the pre-screen survey, I independently verified both partners' Prolific IDs and matched them with their partner. Only partners who were matched on their IDs and both consented to participate in a larger survey were invited to complete a longer (30-minute) survey about their gender-related experiences. Based on an a priori power analysis, using the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model power calculator (https://robert-a-ackerman.shinyapps.io/apimpower), I aimed to recruit approximately 300 couples to have over 80% power to detect a small to moderate partner effect for men (r = .194), however, recruitment concluded before reaching 300 couples due to slower-than-anticipated enrollment within the available thesis timeline. In total, 692 individuals entered the full survey. After restricting the dataset to dyads in which both partners completed the survey and excluding participants who did not provide initial consent (n = 2), did not provide debrief consent (n = 34), or failed two or more attention checks (n = 4), I had a final sample of n = 265 couples (N = 530 participants).

Participants

Couples in the present study were partnered for 17.98 years (SD = 10.88 years), on average, and 76.52% were married, 99.43% were in monogamous relationships, and all participants were living together. Participants lived in the UK, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Women were on average 43.48 years old (SD = 11.59 years). The majority of women identified their sexual orientation as straight/heterosexual (n = 248, 93.94%), with 5.3% (n = 14) of women identifying as bisexual, 1 woman identifying as asexual, and 1 as pansexual. Among women, 84.9% identified as White, 4.2% as Black, 4.2% as bi- or multi-ethnic/racial, 3.0% as East Asian, 1.9% as South Asian, 0.8% as South East Asian, and 0.8% as Latin American; 1 participant (0.4%) provided a write-in racial identity.

Men were on average 45.32 years old (*SD* = 11.73 years). Most men identified their sexual orientation as straight/heterosexual (*n* = 254, 96.2%), with 2.65% (*n* = 7) of men identifying as bisexual, 2 participants questioning their sexual orientation, and 1 man identifying as pansexual. Among men, 85.3% identified as White, 5.3% as Black, 3.0% as East Asian, 3.0% as bi- or multi-ethnic/racial, 1.5% as South Asian, 1.1% as Latin American, and 0.8% as South East Asian. See Table 7 for full list of demographic variable statistics.

Table 7
Study 2 Demographics Across Men and Women

	Men (*N* = 265)	Women (*N* = 265)
Age	*M* = 45.32 years *SD* = 11.73 years *Range* = 23–77 years	*M* = 43.48 years *SD* = 11.59 years *Range* = 21–76 years
Sexual Orientation		
Straight/Heterosexual	96.2% (*n* = 254)	93.9% (*n* = 248)
Bisexual	2.7% (*n* = 7)	5.3% (*n* = 14)
Questioning	0.8% (*n* = 2)	0.0% (*n* = 0)
Pansexual	0.4% (*n* = 1)	0.4% (*n* = 1)
Asexual	0.0% (*n* = 0)	0.4% (*n* = 1)
Relationship Length	*M* = 17.92 years *SD* = 10.82 years *Range* = 1.25–50 years	*M* = 18.05 years, *SD* = 10.96 years *Range* = 1.30–51 years
Relationship Status		
Cohabitating	100% (*n* = 264)	100% (*n* = 264)
Monogamous	100% (*n* = 265)	98.9% (*n* = 262)
Married	77.3% (*n* = 204)	75.8% (*n* = 200)
Seriously Dating	7.2% (*n* = 19)	9.1% (*n* = 24)
Casually Dating	0.0% (*n* = 0)	0.4% (*n* = 1)
Engaged	5.7% (*n* = 15)	6.1% (*n* = 16)
Common-Law	9.1% (*n* = 24)	8.0% (*n* = 21)
Other	0.8% (*n* = 2)	0.8% (*n* = 2)
Country of Residence		
United Kingdom	65.3% (*n* = 173)	65.3% (*n* = 173)
United States	27.2% (*n* = 72)	26.8% (*n* = 71)
Canada	4.9% (*n* = 13)	5.3% (*n* = 14)
Australia	2.3% (*n* = 6)	2.3% (*n* = 6)
New Zealand	0.4% (*n* = 1)	0.4% (*n* = 1)
Race/Ethnicity		
White: e.g., North American, European, etc.	85.3% (*n* = 226)	84.9% (*n* = 225)
Black: e.g., African, Caribbean, etc.	5.3% (*n* = 14)	4.2% (*n* = 11)

East Asian: e.g., Chinese, Korean, etc.	3.0% (*n* = 8)	3.0% (*n* = 8)
South Asian: e.g., Indian, Pakistani, etc.	1.5% (*n* = 4)	1.9% (*n* = 5)
South East Asian: e.g., Filipino, Vietnamese, etc.	0.8% (*n* = 2)	0.8% (*n* = 2)
Latin American: e.g., Mexican, Colombian, etc.	1.1% (*n* = 3)	0.8% (*n* = 2)
Bi- or multi-ethnic/racial	3.0% (*n* = 8)	4.2% (*n* = 11)
Other	0.0% (*n* = 0)	0.4% (*n* = 1)

Note. Percentages represent valid percentage values.

Measures

Experiences of Sexism. Participants completed the same scales as Study 1 (Becker & Swim, 2011; McDonald et al., 2016); however similarly to Study 1, men did not report on the 11-items from the Everyday Sexism Survey for items related to experiences of workplace sexism (McDonald et al., 2016), as these items reflect women's experiences of sexism. Alphas across subscales ranged from .73 to .90.

Perceptions of Partners' Experiences of Sexism. Participants completed the same scales as Study 1 (Becker & Swim, 2011; McDonald et al., 2016). As in Study 1, women did not report on their perceptions of their partners' experiences for the 11-items from the Everyday Sexism Survey (McDonald et al., 2016). Alphas across subscales ranged from .74 to .92.

Frequency of Experiences of Sexism. To have a more tangible assessment of how frequently participants experience sexism, they also completed two items assessing the frequency to which they experience or witness sexism: "How often do you directly experience sexism or gender discrimination?" and "How often do you witness sexism or gender discrimination?" Items were rated using an 11-point scale (1 = *Daily*, 2 = *Multiple times a week*, 3 = *Weekly*, 4 = *Multiple times a month*, 5 = *Once a month*, 6 = *Once every 2 months*, 7 = *A few times a year*, 8 = *Once a year*, 9 = *Less than once a year*, 10 = *Never*, 11 = *Other*). Items were reversed-coded and averaged together to create a mean frequency of sexism experiences score, with higher scores indicating more frequent experiences of sexism.

Perceptions of Frequency of Partners' Experiences of Sexism. Participants completed the same two items assessing the frequency to which they experience or witness sexism, now reworded for their perception of their partners' experiences. Items were reverse-coded and averaged together to create a mean frequency of perceptions of partner's experiences of sexism score, with higher scores indicating more frequent experiences of sexism.

Sexist Attitudes. Participants completed the same 12-item short-form of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory scale as in Study 1 (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Benevolent sexism items had a high reliability of $\alpha = .85$, and hostile sexism items had a high reliability of $\alpha = .88$.

Disclosing An Experience of Sexism or Gender Discrimination to Partner. I assessed women's reported disclosure using two items that I developed for this study: "How often do you discuss experiences of sexism or gender discrimination with your partner?" (1 = *Never*, 7 = *Very frequently*) and "How much have you shared these experiences with your current partner" (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *A great deal*).

I assessed men's perceived frequency of having discussions in the relationship about sexism using one item: "How often do you discuss experiences of sexism or gender discrimination with your partner?" (1 = *Never*, 7 = *Very frequently*).

Awareness of Sexism. Participants completed an adapted version of the Experiences of Sexism Scale (Becker & Swim, 2011), reworded to assess how frequently they believe *women in general* experience sexism. Items were assessed on a 5-point scale (1 = *Never*, 5 = *Happens very often*). I calculated a composite (mean) score, with higher scores indicating more frequent experiences of sexism[1]. The overall reliability for the full scale, including everyday experiences and workplace experiences of sexism was $\alpha = .98$.

[1] Participants also responded to a single-item measure of perceived gender discrimination: "How often do you think WOMEN IN GENERAL experience sexism or gender discrimination?", using an 11-point scale (1 = *Daily*, 10 =

Allyship Behaviour. To assess allyship, participants completed three items from the Ally Identity Measure (AIM; Jones et al., 2014). Items included: "If I see discrimination against a woman, I actively work to confront it", "I try to increase my knowledge of women's and gender issues", and "I think women face barriers in the workplace that are not faced by men". All items were rated on a 7-point scale (1= *Strongly disagree* to 7 = *Strongly agree;* $\alpha = .88$) and averaged to create a mean allyship score, where higher scores represent greater allyship behaviour.

General Disclosure. General disclosure tendencies were assessed as a control variable using three items adapted from Laurenceau and colleagues (1998). Participants indicated the extent to which they typically disclose (a) facts and information, (b) their thoughts, and (c) their feelings to their partner on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all*, 7 = *A great deal*). Items were averaged such that higher scores reflect greater general disclosure. The items had a reliability of $\alpha = .78$.

Perspective-Taking. To control for habitual perspective-taking, participants rated two items adapted from the Perspective-Taking subscale of the Perceived Responsiveness and Insensitivity scale (PRI; Crasta et al., 2021; e.g., "I try to see where my partner is coming from", "I really get my partner's point of view") on a 7-point scale (1 = *Not at all,* 7 = *Completely*). Items were averaged such that higher scores indicate greater perspective-taking, and the items had an overall reliability of $\alpha = .83$.

Data Analytic Strategy

To test my key predictions about how men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism align with their partners' reported experiences, I used the Truth and Bias model (West & Kenny, 2011), which allows me to simultaneously estimate the accuracy and bias in perceivers'

Never, 11 = *Other (open-ended response)*). The item was reverse-coded so that higher scores indicate more frequent experiences of sexism. Given the largely similar patterns across results, I report broader awareness using the Experiences of Sexism Scale rather than the single item measure.

judgements, while accounting for projection of the perceiver's own experiences. Because my focal hypotheses concerned men's perceptions of their women partners' experiences of sexism, and tests of measurement invariance across gender yielded mixed evidence (see Table S4 in the Supplemental Materials), I present partial Truth and Bias models focusing on men's judgements and women's self-reports in the main text for ease of interpretation. In these models, women's self-reported experiences served as the "truth" and were used to center the key variables. Centering the models on women's reports allows the intercept to be interpreted as men's directional bias (over or underperception) relative to women's actual experiences and the slope of the truth variable as accuracy in men's perceptions of their partners' experiences. This specification also avoids centering on a combined dyadic mean (i.e., averaging men's and women's reports), which could obscure estimates of bias and accuracy because men and women differ in their baseline levels of reported exposure to sexist incidents. Full distinguishable-dyad models including both partners, as well as parallel partial models focusing on women's perceptions of men's experiences, are reported in the Supplemental Materials (Tables S6 and S7).

In the models reported below, men's judgements of their partners' experiences of sexism served as the outcome variable. Following West and Kenny's (2011) guidelines, these judgements were centered on women's self-reported experiences of sexism. With this centering, the intercept represents ***directional bias****,* that is, the difference between the average level of women's reported experiences of sexism and men's average judgements of their partners' experiences. An intercept of zero indicates no discrepancy between men's judgements and women's reports. A negative coefficient indicates that men underestimate their partners' experiences of sexism, whereas a positive coefficient indicates overestimation. To estimate

accuracy, women's reported experiences of sexism were entered into the model as a predictor (grand-mean centered). This coefficient captures the association between women's reports and men's judgements of their partners' experiences. A positive coefficient indicates that men's judgements track their partners' actual experiences of sexism, with larger coefficients reflecting greater accuracy. To account for ***assumed similarity* (*projection*)**, men's own reported experiences of sexism (centered around women's self-reported experiences) were also included as a predictor. This coefficient represents the extent to which men rely on their own experiences when judging their partners' experiences, with larger coefficients reflecting stronger projection.

To examine whether men's sexist attitudes (benevolent and hostile sexism) were associated with accuracy and bias, I added grand-mean–centered sexist attitudes as simultaneous predictors in the model as well as their interaction with the accuracy and projection effects. In these models, there are two primary effects of interest. First, the main effects of benevolent and hostile sexism test whether the directional bias differs based on these attitudes; a significant main effect suggests that directional bias is moderated by sexist attitudes. Second, the interaction between sexist attitudes and accuracy tests whether accuracy differs based on men's sexist attitudes. I next tested whether women's reported disclosure of sexist experiences moderated men's accuracy and bias by adding woman-reported disclosure (grand-mean centered) and its interactions to the model. I tested a separate model with men's reports of these discussions as the moderator. Finally, in separate models, I examined whether men's greater awareness of sexism and gender discrimination and their allyship behaviours moderated accuracy and bias by including these variables (grand-mean centered) and their interactions. Significant interactions were probed at ±1 SD of the moderator.

Results

Table 8 displays correlations across variables for men (above diagonal) and women (below diagonal),[2] and Table 9 displays descriptive statistics across key measures. First, I compared mean scores of experiences of sexism across men and women using paired-samples t-tests. Consistent with Study 1 and prior work (e.g., Becker & Swim, 2011), women reported more experiences of sexism across subcategories than men (Table 9). Specifically, women reported a greater frequency of experiencing sexism, experiencing objectification, witnessing objectification, hearing undermining responses to claims of discrimination, and hearing hostility towards women, compared to men. However, there were no significant gender differences in the frequency of witnessing sexism or experiencing paternalism and complementary gender roles.

Next, I conducted exploratory analyses using paired t-tests to examine men's and women's perceptions of how often women in general experience sexism (i.e., awareness of sexism). Consistent with prior work showing men (compared to women) perceive women to experience less sexism in general (Becker & Swim, 2011), men perceived women in general to experience less sexism across all subcategories than women perceived (Table 10). Additionally, men perceived women in general to experience sexism more frequently than their partners experience sexism, a pattern that was also reflected in women's reports, such that women also perceived women in general to experience sexism more frequently than they reported experiencing it themselves (see Table S8 in Supplemental Materials).

Although in this study I test my key predictions using the Truth & Bias model, I also examine the mean-level comparisons between men's perceptions and women's reports using paired sample t-tests. Tests of mean differences revealed that men overperceived how frequently their partners had experienced sexism, witnessed sexism, and experienced career stereotyping. In

[2] Additional correlations among sexism subcategories are reported in Table S5 in the Supplemental Materials.

contrast, men significantly underperceived their partners' experiences of hearing hostility towards women and patrolling femininity. Men showed no differences in their perceptions of experiencing or witnessing objectification, hearing undermining responses to claims of discrimination, paternalism and complementary gender roles, and minimizing on basis of gender; all effects were small in magnitude (Table 9).

Table 8

Correlations Among Sexism Experience Scales and Moderation Variables by Gender

	Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Own Experiences	1. Experiences of Sexism Full Scale	—	.	.78***	.59***	.60***	.50***	.41***	.30***	.03	.09	.41***	.	.58***	.26***
	2. Everyday Sexism Survey Full Scale	.71***	—	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Perceptions of Partner's Experiences	3. Experiences of Sexism Full Scale	.72***	.57***	—	.72***	.68***	.57***	.44***	.40***	-.01	-.06	.41***	.	.66***	.29***
	4. Everyday Sexism Survey Full Scale	.	.	.	—	.56***	.61***	.40***	.55***	-.13*	-.11	.37***	.	.60***	.34***
Perceptions of Women in General's Experiences	5. Experiences of Sexism Full Scale	.69***	.56***	.56***	.	—	.86***	.39***	.35***	-.07	-.28***	.43***	.	.98***	.41***
	6. Everyday Sexism Survey Full Scale	.61***	.62***	.48***	.	.85***	—	.35***	.40***	-.14	-.36***	.42***	.	.94***	.46***
Partner's Reported Experiences	7. Experiences of Sexism Full Scale	.41***	.30***	.42***	.	.29***	.27***	—	.71***	.01	-.08	.25***	.	.39***	.25***
	8. Everyday Sexism Survey Full Scale	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	-.13*	-.12	.22***	.	.38***	.25***
Moderator Variables	9. Benevolent Sexism	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.39***	-.05	.	-.10	-.01
	10. Hostile Sexism	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	-.20***	.	-.32**	-.41***
	11. Discussion of Sexism (Men)	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.	.44***	.43***
	12. Sexism Disclosure (Women)	.25***	.27***	.24***		.18**	.21***	.13*	.	.	.	.	—	.40***	.43***
	13. Greater Awareness of Sexism	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—	.44***
	14. Allyship	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	—

Note. Correlations for men appear above the diagonal; correlations for women appear below the diagonal. Blank cells indicate correlations that were not examined or variables that were not included for that gender in the present analyses. Men do not report on their own experiences of sexism across the Everyday Sexism Survey subscales (McDonald et al., 2016), and women do not report on their perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism across the Everyday Sexism Survey subscales (McDonald et al., 2016). $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Table 9

Study 2 Descriptive Statistics

		Men				Women											
		Own		Perceptions of Partner		Own		Perception of Partner		Tests of Gender Differences in Self-Reported Measures				Men's Perceptions vs. Women's Reports			
Variables		*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*d*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*d*
Experiences of Sexism	Experiencing Sexism	2.79	2.07	4.28	2.27	3.70	2.16	2.24	1.57	-5.59	264	<.001***	-0.34	3.96	264	<.001***	0.24
	Witnessing Sexism	4.84	2.38	5.45	2.39	5.02	2.31	4.61	2.18	1.12	262	.263	0.07	2.78	262	.006**	0.17
	Experiencing Objectification	1.74	0.74	2.61	0.95	2.68	0.97	1.87	0.81	-14.57	264	<.001***	-0.89	-1.25	264	.214	-0.08
	Witnessing Objectification	2.22	0.79	2.64	0.92	2.73	0.95	2.14	0.87	-8.32	264	<.001***	-0.51	-1.58	264	.115	-0.10
	Undermining Claims of Discrimination	2.18	0.69	2.53	0.84	2.48	0.80	2.33	0.83	-6.12	264	<.001***	-0.38	0.89	264	.373	0.05
	Hearing Hostility Towards Women	3.02	0.76	3.06	0.81	3.25	0.82	3.15	0.91	-4.30	264	<.001***	-0.26	-3.42	264	<.001***	-0.21
	Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	3.11	0.81	3.09	0.83	3.17	0.85	2.98	0.93	-1.04	264	.300	-0.06	-1.25	264	.213	-0.08
	Career Stereotyping	–	–	2.15	0.90	2.02	0.91	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.36	264	.019*	0.15
	Minimizing on Basis of Gender	–	–	2.50	0.97	2.55	1.05	–	–	–	–	–	–	-0.81	264	.416	-0.05
	Patrolling Femininity	–	–	2.22	0.85	2.35	0.92	–	–	–	–	–	–	-2.24	264	.026*	-0.14
Sexism Disclosure	Sexism Disclosure Composite	3.90	1.77	–	–	4.13	1.68	–	–	-1.96	264	.051	-0.12	–	–	–	–
	Extent of Sexism Disclosure	4.10	1.92	–	–	4.48	1.85	–	–	-2.85	264	.005**	-0.18	–	–	–	–
	Frequency of Sexism Disclosure	3.71	1.84	–	–	3.77	1.78	–	–	-0.55	264	.586	-0.03	–	–	–	–
Sexist Attitudes	Benevolent Sexism	0.24	1.24	–	–	-0.28	1.37	–	–	6.27	264	<.001***	0.39	–	–	–	–
	Hostile Sexism	-0.80	1.30	–	–	-1.23	1.27	–	–	5.42	264	<.001***	0.33	–	–	–	–
Broader Awareness	Greater Awareness of Sexism	3.28	0.80	–	–	3.59	0.76	–	–	-6.20	264	<.001***	-0.38	–	–	–	–
	Allyship	4.99	1.23	–	–	4.98	1.20	–	–	0.18	264	.859	0.01	–	–	–	–

of Sexism and Allyship																	
Control Variables	General Disclosure	5.91	0.88	–	–	6.14	0.91	–	–	-3.82	264	<.001***	-0.23	–	–	–	–
	Perspective-Taking	6.01	0.88	–	–	5.89	0.90	–	–	1.97	264	.050	0.12	–	–	–	–

Note. All measures are rated from 1 to 5 except sexist attitudes which are rated from –3 to 3, experiencing and witnessing sexism which are rated from 1 to 10, and allyship and the control variables which are rated from 1 to 7. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Table 10

Men's and Women's Perceptions of Experiences of Sexism for Women in General

	Men		Women		Gender Differences					
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*LL*	*UL*	*p*	*d*
Experiencing Objectification	3.62	0.96	3.90	0.86	-4.71	264	-0.40	-0.16	<.001***	-0.29
Witnessing Objectification	3.42	0.97	3.76	0.88	-5.20	264	-0.46	-0.21	<.001***	-0.32
Undermining Claims of Discrimination	3.15	0.86	3.46	0.87	-5.15	264	-0.43	-0.19	<.001***	-0.32
Hearing Hostility Towards Women	3.45	0.86	3.78	0.80	-5.98	264	-0.44	-0.22	<.001***	-0.37
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	3.29	0.79	3.51	0.79	-3.87	264	-0.33	-0.11	<.001***	-0.24
Career Stereotyping	3.03	0.90	3.36	0.88	-5.87	264	-0.45	-0.22	<.001***	-0.36
Minimizing on Basis of Gender	3.14	0.93	3.49	0.93	-5.69	264	-0.48	-0.23	<.001***	-0.35
Patrolling Femininity	3.21	0.89	3.57	0.86	-6.09	264	-0.48	-0.25	<.001***	-0.37

Note. $^{***}p < .001$

How Do Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism Compare to Women Partners' Own Reported Experiences of Sexism?

As shown in Table 11, men's perceptions showed evidence of directional bias, accuracy, and projection in their judgements of their partners' experiences of sexism. With one exception, men were accurate in their judgements of their partners' experiences, suggesting that they are drawing on their women partners' actual experiences when forming their judgements. The one exception was for judgements of paternalism and complementary gender roles. Men also heavily relied on their own experiences when perceiving their partners' experiences of sexism, with significant projection effects across all subcategories of sexism for which men reported on their own experiences. Finally, in most cases, men overestimated their partners' experiences of sexism. Specifically, men overestimated their partners' reports of experiencing sexism, witnessing sexism, experiencing objectification, witnessing objectification, undermining claims of discrimination, and career stereotyping. In contrast, men underperceived their partners' experiences of patrolling femininity (i.e., being labelled as too emotional). For three types of experiences, men's judgements aligned with women's reports (no directional bias): hearing hostility towards women (i.e., sexism jokes, derogatory language), paternalism and complementary gender roles, and minimizing on basis of gender.

Because individuals often draw on their own experiences when judging the experiences of others (e.g., Nickerson, 1999), the preregistered models controlled for assumed similarity (projection). However, because the mean-level comparisons in Study 1 did not separate projection from perceptions, I also estimated parallel models that did not include projection as a predictor (see Table S9 in Supplemental Materials) to facilitate comparison across studies. In these models, men no longer showed consistent overperception of many of their partners'

experiences of sexism, suggesting that men's perceptions of their partners' experiences are strongly shaped by their own reported experiences of sexism.

Table 11

Partial Truth and Bias Models of Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism

	b	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.20	0.10	1.00	1.40	11.72	<.001***
Accuracy	0.31	0.04	0.22	0.39	6.91	<.001***
Projection	0.69	0.05	0.59	0.78	14.83	<.001***
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.59	0.08	0.44	0.74	7.59	<.001***
Accuracy	0.13	0.04	0.06	0.20	3.58	<.001***
Projection	0.80	0.03	0.73	0.87	23.15	<.001***
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.25	0.08	0.10	0.41	3.18	.002**
Accuracy	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.54	8.70	<.001***
Projection	0.34	0.07	0.21	0.48	5.12	<.001***
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.28	3.43	<.001***
Accuracy	0.30	0.05	0.20	0.39	6.09	<.001***
Projection	0.54	0.06	0.42	0.65	9.16	<.001***
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.26	0.04	0.17	0.34	5.95	<.001***
Accuracy	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.29	3.39	<.001***
Projection	0.69	0.06	0.57	0.81	11.08	<.001***
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.06	0.10	.919
Accuracy	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.18	2.62	.009**
Projection	0.82	0.04	0.74	0.90	19.82	<.001***
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.03	-0.86	.390
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.47	.143
Projection	0.80	0.04	0.72	0.88	19.82	<.001***
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.14	0.05	0.04	0.23	2.76	.006**
Accuracy	0.46	0.05	0.36	0.57	8.61	<.001***
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.96	.337
Accuracy	0.51	0.05	0.42	0.60	10.65	<.001***
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.12	0.05	-0.21	-0.03	-2.72	.007**
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.54	8.95	<.001***

Note. I also ran models testing bias, accuracy, and projection effects for the overall scales for the Becker and Swim (2011) Experiences of Sexism Scale, where men showed significant overperception, tracking accuracy, and projection in their judgements of their

partners' experiences, and for the McDonald (2016) Everyday Sexism Survey in which men showed significant accuracy, in their judgements, but no bias effects (see Table S7). $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$.

Are Men's Sexist Attitudes Associated with Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism?

To examine whether men's sexist attitudes were associated with their perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism, benevolent and hostile sexism were entered as moderators in the Truth and Bias models. Overall, the primary pattern of results remained largely unchanged when benevolent and hostile sexism were included as moderators and five effects were moderated (Table 12). Men's hostile sexism moderated directional bias for perceptions of their partners' frequency of experiencing sexism, directly witnessing sexism, and encountering undermining responses to claims of discrimination. Tests of simple slopes indicated that while men lower in hostile sexism overperceived their partners' experiences, this effect was attenuated among men higher in hostile sexism; they had a weaker overperception bias suggesting they perceived their partners as having fewer of these experiences. Men's benevolent sexism moderated how accurate men's perceptions were for hearing hostility towards women and patrolling femininity. Men lower in benevolent sexism accurately perceived their partners' experiences of both forms of sexism. In contrast, men higher in benevolent sexism showed no evidence of accuracy when judging their partners' experiences of hearing hostility towards women and were less accurate in their perceptions of their partners' experiences of patrolling femininity (e.g., labelled as too emotional or too bossy) compared to men lower in benevolent sexism.

Table 12

Moderations of Benevolent and Hostile Sexism on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism

	b	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.22	0.10	1.01	1.42	11.78	<.001***
Accuracy	0.27	0.05	0.18	0.36	5.91	<.001***
Projection	0.71	0.05	0.62	0.80	15.34	<.001***
BS	-0.11	0.09	-0.29	0.07	-1.20	.230
HS	-0.22	0.08	-0.39	-0.06	-2.70	.007**
Low HS	1.51	0.15	1.21	1.80	10.01	<.001***
High HS	0.93	0.15	0.63	1.22	6.26	<.001***
Accuracy*BS	-0.02	0.04	-0.09	0.06	-0.45	.650
Projection*BS	-0.06	0.04	-0.15	0.02	-1.42	.157
Accuracy*HS	-0.02	0.04	-0.09	0.06	-0.50	.618
Projection*HS	0.02	0.04	-0.05	0.09	0.46	.645
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.60	0.08	0.44	0.75	7.50	<.001***
Accuracy	0.11	0.04	0.04	0.18	2.97	.003**
Projection	0.80	0.03	0.73	0.86	23.31	<.001***
BS	-0.05	0.07	-0.19	0.09	-0.72	.472
HS	-0.15	0.07	-0.28	-0.01	-2.17	.031*
Low HS	0.77	0.12	0.54	1.00	6.63	<.001***
High HS	0.40	0.12	0.16	0.64	3.31	.001**
Accuracy*BS	-0.03	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.05	.295
Projection*BS	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	-0.57	.570
Accuracy*HS	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	-0.64	.520
Projection*HS	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.11	1.84	.068
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.26	0.08	0.10	0.42	3.17	.002**
Accuracy	0.42	0.05	0.32	0.52	8.11	<.001***
Projection	0.35	0.07	0.22	0.49	5.06	<.001***
BS	0.03	0.08	-0.13	0.18	0.33	.745
HS	-0.05	0.07	-0.18	0.08	-0.69	.488
Accuracy*BS	-0.06	0.04	-0.14	0.02	-1.48	.140
Projection*BS	-0.02	0.06	-0.15	0.10	-0.38	.707
Accuracy*HS	0.02	0.04	-0.06	0.11	0.56	.576
Projection*HS	0.03	0.06	-0.08	0.14	0.48	.631
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.18	0.05	0.07	0.28	3.35	<.001***
Accuracy	0.29	0.05	0.19	0.39	5.81	<.001***
Projection	0.53	0.06	0.41	0.64	8.90	<.001***
BS	-0.01	0.05	-0.10	0.08	-0.11	.910
HS	-0.03	0.04	-0.11	0.06	-0.59	.553
Accuracy*BS	-0.05	0.04	-0.14	0.03	-1.26	.209
Projection*BS	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.99	.324

Accuracy*HS	-0.02	0.04	-0.11	0.06	-0.52	.603
Projection*HS	0.08	0.05	-0.02	0.18	1.49	.138
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.27	0.04	0.18	0.36	6.13	<.001***
Accuracy	0.15	0.05	0.04	0.26	2.73	.007**
Projection	0.73	0.06	0.60	0.85	11.27	<.001***
BS	-0.03	0.04	-0.10	0.05	-0.69	.490
HS	-0.08	0.04	-0.15	-0.01	-2.20	.029*
Low HS	0.37	0.07	0.24	0.51	5.40	<.001***
High HS	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.29	2.92	.004**
Accuracy*BS	0.01	0.05	-0.08	0.11	0.26	.799
Projection*BS	-0.09	0.06	-0.20	0.02	-1.53	.126
Accuracy*HS	0.02	0.05	-0.07	0.12	0.47	.638
Projection*HS	0.00	0.05	-0.10	0.09	-0.10	.921
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.06	0.01	.993
Accuracy	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.16	2.30	.022*
Projection	0.83	0.04	0.74	0.91	20.14	<.001***
BS	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.10	1.91	.057
HS	-0.05	0.02	-0.10	0.00	-1.89	.060
Accuracy*BS	-0.07	0.03	-0.14	-0.01	-2.38	.018*
Low BS	0.18	0.06	0.07	0.29	3.24	.001**
High BS	0.00	0.05	-0.11	0.10	-0.08	.935
Projection*BS	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.12	.908
Accuracy*HS	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.10	.271
Projection*HS	0.05	0.03	-0.02	0.11	1.49	.138
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	-0.64	.524
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.14	1.52	.130
Projection	0.80	0.04	0.72	0.88	19.53	<.001***
BS	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.02	-1.22	.224
HS	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.04	-0.45	.653
Accuracy*BS	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.11	.269
Projection*BS	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.04	-0.75	.457
Accuracy*HS	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.15	.884
Projection*HS	0.02	0.03	-0.05	0.08	0.47	.642
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.12	0.05	0.03	0.22	2.55	.011*
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.56	8.40	<.001***
BS	-0.04	0.04	-0.13	0.04	-1.00	.319
HS	-0.01	0.04	-0.09	0.07	-0.23	.815
Accuracy*BS	-0.05	0.05	-0.14	0.04	-1.16	.247
Accuracy*HS	-0.05	0.04	-0.14	0.04	-1.13	.260
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.06	0.05	-0.16	0.04	-1.15	.253
Accuracy	0.49	0.05	0.39	0.59	9.96	<.001***

BS	-0.02	0.04	-0.11	0.07	-0.39	.694
HS	-0.03	0.04	-0.11	0.06	-0.63	.527
Accuracy*BS	-0.06	0.04	-0.14	0.02	-1.54	.124
Accuracy*HS	0.01	0.04	-0.06	0.09	0.33	.739
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.13	0.05	-0.22	-0.04	-2.93	.004**
Accuracy	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.53	8.72	<.001***
BS	-0.03	0.04	-0.11	0.05	-0.80	.425
HS	0.00	0.04	-0.07	0.08	0.03	.974
Accuracy*BS	-0.09	0.04	-0.17	-0.01	-2.29	.023*
Low BS	0.55	0.07	0.41	0.68	7.98	<.001***
High BS	0.32	0.07	0.19	0.46	4.60	<.001***
Accuracy*HS	0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.93	.355

Note. BS = Benevolent Sexism. HS = Hostile Sexism. Main effects of the moderator in these models represent the effect of the moderator on directional bias (whether the directional bias differs at levels of the moderator). When low and high levels of the moderator are presented, they represent simple effects at −1 SD and +1 SD of the moderator. The simple effects are reported only for significant interactions. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Is the Extent to Which Women Disclose Experiences of Sexism Associated with Men's Accuracy and Bias?

Next, I conducted moderated Truth and Bias models to test whether women sharing their experiences of sexism moderated men's accuracy and bias in their perceptions. I tested this in two ways: using women's reports of disclosing and discussing experiences of sexism with their partner, and using men's reports of having these conversations in their relationships.

Women's Reports of Disclosure. As shown in Table 13, women's reports of disclosing experiences of sexism moderated men's directional bias in perceptions of how frequently their partners experience sexism. Tests of simple slopes revealed that men overperceived the frequency of their partners' experiences when women reported low levels of disclosure, and this overperception was stronger when women reported high levels of disclosure. None of the other effects were moderated by women's reports of disclosure.

Men's Reports of Discussing Experiences of Sexism. Also shown in Table 13, men's reported discussions of sexism in the relationship moderated the directional bias effect for frequency of experiencing sexism, witnessing objectification, and encounters of undermining claims of discrimination, hearing hostility towards women, paternalism and complementary gender roles, minimizing on basis of gender, and patrolling femininity. When men reported having more discussions of sexism in the relationship, they overperceived the frequency of their partner experiencing sexism, witnessing objectification, encountering undermining responses to claims of discrimination, hearing hostility towards women, experiences of career stereotyping, and minimizing on basis of gender. When they reported fewer discussions of sexism, they still demonstrate an overperception bias for six of the domains, but it was attenuated compared to men who reported more discussions, and they underperceived a partner's experiences in the other two domains: paternalism and complementary gender roles and patrolling femininity.

Men's perceptions of discussions of sexism also moderated how accurate they were in perceiving the frequency of experiencing and witnessing sexism. When men reported having more discussions about sexism in the relationship, they were more accurate, whereas accuracy was attenuated for men's perceptions of the frequency of their partner experiencing sexism, and non-significant for perceptions of witnessing sexism, for men who reported fewer discussions. Lastly, men's reports of sexism discussions also moderated projection effects for witnessing sexism, whereby men who reported having fewer conversations about sexism in the relationship relied more on their own experiences when making judgements about their partners' experiences. This effect was attenuated for men who reported having more of these conversations, where they relied less on their own experiences when making these judgements.

Table 13

Moderations of Sexism Disclosure on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism

	Men's Perceptions Moderated by Women's Reported Disclosure						Men's Perceptions Moderated by Men's Reports of Having Discussions about Sexism					
	b	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism												
Directional Bias	-0.14	0.09	-0.30	0.03	-1.57	.116	1.18	0.11	0.97	1.38	11.18	<.001***
Accuracy	0.35	0.04	0.28	0.43	9.15	<.001***	0.28	0.04	0.19	0.36	6.30	<.001***
Projection	0.36	0.04	0.28	0.43	9.48	<.001***	0.66	0.05	0.57	0.75	14.13	<.001***
Disclosure	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.23	2.59	.010*	0.15	0.06	0.04	0.26	2.64	.009**
Low Disclosure	1.17	0.16	0.86	1.48	7.42	<.001***	0.91	0.16	0.59	1.22	5.68	<.001***
High Disclosure	1.25	0.15	0.97	1.54	8.63	<.001***	1.45	0.13	1.18	1.71	10.84	<.001***
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.07	1.13	.259	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.10	2.08	.039*
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.19	0.06	0.06	0.31	2.94	.004**
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.37	0.06	0.25	0.48	6.09	<.001***
Projection*Disclosure	0.04	0.02	0.00	0.08	1.81	.072	-0.04	0.02	-0.09	0.01	-1.62	.106
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism												
Directional Bias	0.58	0.08	0.43	0.74	7.31	<.001***	0.61	0.08	0.45	0.77	7.45	<.001***
Accuracy	0.12	0.04	0.04	0.19	3.13	.002**	0.13	0.04	0.06	0.20	3.80	<.001***
Projection	0.80	0.03	0.73	0.87	23.04	<.001***	0.77	0.04	0.70	0.84	21.32	<.001***
Disclosure	0.08	0.05	-0.01	0.18	1.70	.091	0.09	0.04	0.00	0.17	1.92	.056
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.32	.746	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.10	2.81	.005**
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.13	0.64	.524
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.24	0.05	0.13	0.35	4.41	<.001***
Projection*Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.36	.720	-0.05	0.02	-0.08	-0.01	-2.48	.014*
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.85	0.05	0.76	0.95	17.73	<.001***
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.68	0.05	0.58	0.78	13.35	<.001***
Experiencing Objectification												
Directional Bias	0.26	0.08	0.10	0.42	3.23	.001**	0.24	0.09	0.07	0.41	2.72	.007**
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.34	0.55	8.59	<.001***	0.43	0.05	0.33	0.53	8.33	<.001***
Projection	0.35	0.07	0.22	0.49	5.12	<.001***	0.32	0.07	0.18	0.46	4.40	<.001***
Disclosure	-0.03	0.05	-0.12	0.07	-0.52	.607	0.04	0.05	-0.06	0.13	0.77	.439

Accuracy*Disclosure	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.05	-0.22	.829	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.05	-0.20	.845
Projection*Disclosure	-0.02	0.04	-0.11	0.06	-0.54	.588	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.05	-0.56	.577
Witnessing Objectification												
Directional Bias	0.17	0.05	0.07	0.28	3.21	.001**	0.15	0.05	0.04	0.26	2.80	.005**
Accuracy	0.30	0.05	0.20	0.39	5.88	<.001***	0.28	0.05	0.19	0.38	5.91	<.001***
Projection	0.53	0.06	0.42	0.65	9.06	<.001***	0.48	0.06	0.36	0.60	8.18	<.001***
Disclosure	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.12	.907	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.14	2.46	.014*
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.01	0.09	-0.16	0.18	0.11	.915
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.29	0.07	0.16	0.43	4.25	<.001***
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.08	0.92	.358	0.04	0.02	-0.01	0.09	1.69	.091
Projection*Disclosure	0.00	0.03	-0.07	0.07	0.03	.974	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.04	-0.81	.416
Undermining Claims of Discrimination												
Directional Bias	0.25	0.05	0.16	0.33	5.49	<.001***	0.24	0.05	0.15	0.33	5.23	<.001***
Accuracy	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.28	3.11	.002**	0.16	0.05	0.06	0.27	3.06	.002**
Projection	0.68	0.06	0.55	0.80	10.73	<.001***	0.64	0.06	0.51	0.76	9.80	<.001***
Disclosure	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.07	0.53	.599	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.11	2.43	.016*
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.13	0.07	-0.01	0.27	1.86	.064
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.35	0.06	0.24	0.46	6.16	<.001***
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.25	.801	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.11	1.86	.064
Projection*Disclosure	0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.10	0.92	.359	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.02	-1.25	.212
Hearing Hostility Towards Women												
Directional Bias	-0.01	0.03	-0.07	0.06	-0.19	.853	0.00	0.03	-0.07	0.06	-0.06	.948
Accuracy	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.17	2.40	.017*	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.17	2.41	.017*
Projection	0.82	0.04	0.73	0.90	19.45	<.001***	0.78	0.04	0.69	0.86	18.05	<.001***
Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.05	0.68	.496	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.09	2.88	.004**
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	-0.10	0.05	-0.19	0.00	-1.93	.055
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.17	2.17	.031*
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.08	1.28	.200	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.45	.650
Projection*Disclosure	0.00	0.03	-0.05	0.05	-0.07	.947	-0.02	0.02	-0.06	0.03	-0.73	.464
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles												
Directional Bias	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.04	-0.83	.407	-0.02	0.03	-0.09	0.04	-0.72	.472
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.14	1.52	.129	0.05	0.04	-0.03	0.12	1.28	.203
Projection	0.80	0.04	0.72	0.88	19.49	<.001***	0.77	0.04	0.69	0.85	18.39	<.001***

Disclosure	-0.02	0.02	-0.05	0.02	-0.80	.422	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.08	2.27	.024*
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	-0.10	0.05	-0.19	-0.01	-2.13	.034*
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.05	0.05	-0.04	0.14	1.11	.266
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.04	0.05	0.26	.793	-0.04	0.02	-0.08	0.00	-1.76	.080
Projection*Disclosure	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.04	-0.35	.727	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.67	.503
Career Stereotyping												
Directional Bias	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.23	2.52	.012*	0.12	0.05	0.03	0.22	2.55	.011*
Accuracy	0.44	0.06	0.32	0.55	7.64	<.001***	0.40	0.05	0.30	0.51	7.62	<.001***
Disclosure	0.05	0.03	-0.01	0.11	1.62	.108	0.14	0.03	0.09	0.19	5.25	<.001***
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	-0.13	0.07	-0.26	0.00	-1.91	.057
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.37	0.07	0.24	0.50	5.53	<.001***
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.02	0.03	-0.05	0.08	0.57	.573	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.10	1.49	.138
Minimizing on Basis of Gender												
Directional Bias	-0.04	0.05	-0.14	0.06	-0.74	.463	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-1.05	.297
Accuracy	0.50	0.05	0.40	0.60	10.12	<.001***	0.46	0.05	0.36	0.55	9.50	<.001***
Disclosure	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.09	0.94	.350	0.12	0.03	0.07	0.18	4.59	<.001***
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	-0.28	0.07	-0.42	-0.14	-3.97	<.001***
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.18	0.07	0.04	0.31	2.53	.012*
Accuracy*Disclosure	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.03	-0.87	.385	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.06	0.33	.741
Patrolling Femininity												
Directional Bias	-0.13	0.05	-0.23	-0.04	-2.87	.004**	-0.14	0.04	-0.22	-0.05	-3.08	.002**
Accuracy	0.43	0.05	0.32	0.53	8.27	<.001***	0.40	0.05	0.30	0.49	8.11	<.001***
Disclosure	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.08	1.05	.296	0.11	0.02	0.07	0.16	4.69	<.001***
Low Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	-0.35	0.06	-0.47	-0.22	-5.49	<.001***
High Disclosure	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.07	0.06	-0.05	0.20	1.14	.254
Accuracy*Disclosure	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.09	1.09	.275	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.10	1.83	.068

Note. Main effects of the moderator in these models represent the effect of the moderator on directional bias (whether the directional bias differs at levels of the moderator). When low and high levels of the moderator are presented, they represent simple effects at −1 SD and +1 SD of the moderator. The simple effects are reported only for significant interactions. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Is Greater Accuracy and Less Bias in Men's Perceptions Associated with Greater Awareness of Sexism and Greater Allyship?

To address my final research question, I examined how patterns of men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism were associated with broader awareness of sexism[3] and allyship behaviours, which were modeled as moderators within the Truth and Bias framework.

Greater Awareness of Sexism. When men's perceptions of women's experiences in general were included in the model, the overall pattern of results remained consistent, with significant effects of directional bias, accuracy, and projection across multiple subcategories of sexism. However, patterns of perceptual bias were associated with men's broader awareness of sexism.

Across all subcategories, men's greater broader awareness of sexism moderated the directional bias effects (Table 14). Men who showed a greater overperception bias in perceiving their partners' experiences of sexism reported greater awareness of sexism. In contrast, men who showed less overperception—or who underperceived their partners' experiences—reported lower levels of awareness. In particular, men's underperception bias for experiences of witnessing objectification, hearing hostility towards women, paternalism and complementary gender roles, career stereotyping, minimizing on basis of gender, and patrolling femininity was associated with lower broader awareness.

Patterns of accuracy and projection further distinguished men's broader awareness of sexism. Greater accuracy in perceiving a partner's experiences—specifically for witnessing sexism, career stereotyping, and patrolling femininity—was associated with greater broader awareness. In contrast, lower accuracy in perceiving a partner's experiences was associated with

[3] Moderations using the single-item measure of men's awareness of sexism are shown in Table S10 in the Supplemental Materials.

less overperception of experiences of patrolling femininity. Additionally, weaker projection effects for witnessing sexism were associated with greater broader awareness, suggesting that men higher in awareness relied less on their own experiences when judging their partners' experiences, whereas stronger projection effects for witnessing sexism were associated with less awareness of sexism.

Table 14

Moderations of Greater Awareness of Sexism on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism

	b	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.10	0.10	0.90	1.30	10.82	<.001***
Accuracy	0.21	0.04	0.12	0.29	4.84	<.001***
Projection	0.62	0.04	0.54	0.71	13.88	<.001***
Awareness of Sexism	0.84	0.14	0.57	1.12	6.00	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	0.52	0.13	0.26	0.78	3.96	<.001***
Higher Awareness of Sexism	1.32	0.10	1.11	1.53	12.64	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.15	1.06	.289
Projection*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.03	0.06	-0.09	0.15	0.42	.674
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.63	0.08	0.47	0.79	7.61	<.001***
Accuracy	0.09	0.03	0.02	0.16	2.60	.010*
Projection	0.76	0.04	0.69	0.83	20.51	<.001***
Awareness of Sexism	0.36	0.11	0.14	0.58	3.26	.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	0.34	0.13	0.09	0.59	2.66	.008**
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.92	0.11	0.69	1.14	8.04	<.001***
Accuracy*Awareness of Sexism	0.13	0.05	0.04	0.22	2.84	.005**
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.01	0.05	-0.11	0.09	-0.23	.819
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.19	0.05	0.10	0.29	4.01	<.001***
Projection*Greater Awareness of Sexism	-0.13	0.04	-0.21	-0.04	-3.06	.002**
Lower Awareness of Sexism	0.86	0.05	0.76	0.97	16.09	<.001***
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.66	0.05	0.57	0.75	14.54	<.001***
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.19	0.08	0.04	0.35	2.49	.013*
Accuracy	0.34	0.05	0.24	0.45	6.72	<.001***
Projection	0.29	0.07	0.16	0.42	4.41	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.45	0.10	0.24	0.65	4.24	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.16	0.13	-0.42	0.09	-1.25	.213
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.55	0.10	0.36	0.74	5.68	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.00	0.06	-0.12	0.11	-0.07	.943
Projection*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.05	0.08	-0.11	0.21	0.62	.536
Witnessing Objectification						

Directional Bias	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.21	2.00	.047*
Accuracy	0.22	0.05	0.13	0.31	4.90	<.001***
Projection	0.40	0.06	0.29	0.52	7.01	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.36	0.07	0.22	0.51	4.99	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.18	0.09	-0.37	0.00	-1.99	.048*
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.40	0.06	0.27	0.52	6.28	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.10	0.05	-0.01	0.20	1.85	.066
Projection*Greater Awareness of Sexism	-0.07	0.07	-0.20	0.06	-1.07	.284
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.21	0.04	0.12	0.29	4.83	<.001***
Accuracy	0.11	0.05	0.01	0.21	2.26	.025*
Projection	0.56	0.06	0.44	0.68	9.22	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.35	0.06	0.24	0.46	6.37	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.08	0.07	-0.21	0.06	-1.12	.263
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.49	0.05	0.38	0.59	9.18	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.21	1.45	.147
Projection*Greater Awareness of Sexism	-0.02	0.07	-0.16	0.11	-0.36	.720
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.05	.297
Accuracy	0.05	0.04	-0.02	0.12	1.35	.177
Projection	0.67	0.05	0.57	0.77	13.54	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.34	4.92	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.23	0.06	-0.35	-0.11	-3.82	<.001***
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.16	0.04	0.08	0.24	3.74	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.07	0.04	-0.02	0.16	1.56	.120
Projection*Greater Awareness of Sexism	-0.04	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-0.88	.379
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.02	-1.22	.224
Accuracy	0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.93	.353
Projection	0.71	0.04	0.63	0.80	16.42	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.19	0.04	0.10	0.28	4.32	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.19	0.05	-0.29	-0.10	-3.90	<.001***
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.11	0.05	0.02	0.21	2.46	.014*
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.02	0.04	-0.07	0.10	0.39	.700
Projection*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.01	0.04	-0.06	0.09	0.36	.722
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.09	0.05	0.00	0.17	1.91	.058
Accuracy	0.28	0.05	0.18	0.39	5.47	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.48	0.06	0.36	0.59	8.33	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.30	0.07	-0.42	-0.17	-4.56	<.001***
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.47	0.06	0.34	0.59	7.35	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.21	0.06	0.10	0.32	3.73	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	0.12	0.08	-0.03	0.27	1.56	.120
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.45	0.06	0.33	0.57	7.54	<.001***
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.08	0.05	-0.17	0.01	-1.65	.099

Accuracy	0.32	0.05	0.23	0.42	7.00	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.56	0.06	0.44	0.67	9.41	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.52	0.07	-0.65	-0.39	-7.84	<.001***
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.37	0.07	0.24	0.50	5.63	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.08	0.05	-0.01	0.18	1.79	.075
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.15	0.04	-0.23	-0.06	-3.51	<.001***
Accuracy	0.32	0.05	0.22	0.41	6.67	<.001***
Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.56	8.48	<.001***
Lower Awareness of Sexism	-0.51	0.06	-0.63	-0.39	-8.36	<.001***
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.22	0.06	0.10	0.33	3.68	<.001***
Accuracy*Greater Awareness of Sexism	0.11	0.05	0.01	0.21	2.15	.032*
Lower Awareness of Sexism	0.23	0.07	0.09	0.36	3.25	.001**
Higher Awareness of Sexism	0.40	0.06	0.30	0.51	7.34	<.001***

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Allyship. When allyship was included in the model, the overall pattern of results remained consistent, with significant effects of directional bias, accuracy, and projection. However, patterns of perceptual bias were associated with men's allyship (Table 15). Men who showed stronger overperception of their partners' frequency of experiencing sexism, frequency of witnessing sexism, experiences of undermining claims of discrimination, career stereotyping, and minimizing on basis of gender reported greater allyship. In contrast, men showing weaker overperception of their partners' frequency of experiencing sexism, frequency of witnessing sexism, and experiences of undermining claims of discrimination, and showing underperception of their partners' experiences of minimizing on basis of gender and patrolling femininity, reported lower allyship.

Patterns of accuracy further distinguished men's allyship. Men's greater accuracy in perceiving a partner's experiences of objectification was associated with greater allyship, whereas men who were not accurate did not report greater allyship. Therefore, when men were more attuned to their partners' experiences of objectification, they also reported greater allyship

intentions and behaviours. Allyship did not moderate projection effects for any subcategories of sexism.

Table 15
Moderation of Allyship on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism

	b	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.13	0.11	0.92	1.34	10.78	<.001***
Accuracy	0.23	0.05	0.14	0.32	4.89	<.001***
Projection	0.66	0.05	0.57	0.75	14.28	<.001***
Allyship	0.36	0.09	0.18	0.53	3.95	<.001***
Low Allyship	0.69	0.17	0.36	1.02	4.10	<.001***
High Allyship	1.57	0.14	1.30	1.84	11.54	<.001***
Accuracy*Allyship	0.07	0.04	0.00	0.15	1.91	.057
Projection*Allyship	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.06	-0.51	.613
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.61	0.08	0.45	0.78	7.41	<.001***
Accuracy	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.18	2.80	.005**
Projection	0.77	0.04	0.70	0.84	21.65	<.001***
Allyship	0.19	0.07	0.06	0.33	2.74	.006**
Low Allyship	0.37	0.13	0.12	0.62	2.91	.004**
High Allyship	0.85	0.11	0.63	1.08	7.57	<.001***
Accuracy*Allyship	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.08	0.43	.666
Projection*Allyship	-0.02	0.03	-0.07	0.04	-0.68	.495
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.26	0.08	0.10	0.42	3.22	.001**
Accuracy	0.43	0.05	0.33	0.53	8.53	<.001***
Projection	0.33	0.07	0.19	0.46	4.83	<.001***
Allyship	0.03	0.07	-0.11	0.17	0.45	.650
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.09	0.04	-0.17	-0.01	-2.09	.038*
Low Allyship	0.22	0.13	-0.04	0.48	1.66	.099
High Allyship	0.30	0.10	0.09	0.50	2.85	.005**
Projection*Allyship	-0.04	0.06	-0.15	0.08	-0.61	.545
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.29	3.49	<.001***
Accuracy	0.28	0.05	0.18	0.37	5.72	<.001***
Projection	0.50	0.06	0.39	0.62	8.63	<.001***
Allyship	0.06	0.04	-0.03	0.14	1.36	.174
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.06	-0.46	.645
Projection*Allyship	-0.07	0.05	-0.16	0.02	-1.55	.123
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.27	0.04	0.18	0.35	6.14	<.001***
Accuracy	0.15	0.05	0.05	0.26	2.83	.005**
Projection	0.67	0.06	0.55	0.79	11.01	<.001***

Allyship	0.10	0.03	0.04	0.17	3.10	.002**
Low Allyship	0.14	0.06	0.02	0.26	2.28	.024*
High Allyship	0.39	0.06	0.28	0.50	6.82	<.001***
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.03	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-0.78	.439
Projection*Allyship	-0.04	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-0.90	.372
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.31	.758
Accuracy	0.08	0.04	0.01	0.16	2.10	.037*
Projection	0.81	0.04	0.73	0.89	19.39	<.001***
Allyship	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.09	1.73	.085
Accuracy*Allyship	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.06	0.01	.994
Projection*Allyship	-0.04	0.03	-0.11	0.02	-1.45	.148
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	-0.75	.455
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.46	.145
Projection	0.79	0.04	0.71	0.87	19.03	<.001***
Allyship	0.00	0.03	-0.05	0.05	0.09	.925
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.13	.260
Projection*Allyship	0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.22	.825
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.22	2.55	.011*
Accuracy	0.40	0.06	0.30	0.51	7.39	<.001***
Allyship	0.17	0.04	0.09	0.25	4.10	<.001***
Low Allyship	-0.08	0.07	-0.22	0.06	-1.12	.264
High Allyship	0.33	0.07	0.20	0.47	4.81	<.001***
Accuracy*Allyship	0.04	0.04	-0.05	0.12	0.84	.403
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.98	.329
Accuracy	0.46	0.05	0.36	0.55	9.50	<.001***
Allyship	0.18	0.04	0.10	0.26	4.47	<.001***
Low Allyship	-0.27	0.07	-0.42	-0.13	-3.82	<.001***
High Allyship	0.18	0.07	0.04	0.31	2.53	.012*
Accuracy*Allyship	0.00	0.04	-0.07	0.07	0.05	.959
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.12	0.05	-0.21	-0.03	-2.70	.007**
Accuracy	0.43	0.05	0.33	0.52	8.62	<.001***
Allyship	0.12	0.04	0.05	0.19	3.26	.001**
Low Allyship	-0.27	0.06	-0.40	-0.14	-4.21	<.001***
High Allyship	0.03	0.06	-0.10	0.15	0.40	.687
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.01	0.04	-0.09	0.06	-0.36	.718

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Additional Analyses

Overall, the pattern of results was unchanged when controlling for relationship length, general perspective-taking, and general disclosure (see Tables S11–S15 in the Supplemental Materials). Although general disclosure was positively associated with women's reported disclosure of sexism ($r = .32$, $p < .001$) and men's perceived frequency of having discussions in the relationship about sexism ($r = .32$, $p < .001$), these associations were modest in magnitude, suggesting that sexism-related disclosure overlaps with, but remains distinct from, broader interpersonal disclosure tendencies. Men continued to show a tendency to overperceive their partners' experiences of sexism, alongside significant effects of accuracy and projection across many domains, indicating that these patterns were not explained by relationship duration or broader interpersonal tendencies. Similarly, the limited effects of sexist attitudes, the stronger role of men's reports of discussions about sexism (relative to women's reports of disclosure), and the associations between men's perceptions and their broader awareness of sexism and allyship all remained consistent. These findings suggest that the observed effects may be more specifically tied to sexism-related communication and awareness, rather than broader interpersonal functioning or relationship processes.

Study 2 Discussion

Building on Study 1, which provided initial evidence that men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism align with women's reports, Study 2 extended these findings using dyadic data from man–woman couples and a more precise analytic approach. By applying the Truth and Bias Model, Study 2 allowed for a more nuanced examination of men's perceptions by simultaneously estimating accuracy, directional bias, and projection in perceiving their partners' experiences of sexism.

Consistent with Study 1, men's perceptions significantly tracked their partners' self-reported experiences across many domains of sexism, demonstrating meaningful accuracy in how men perceived their partners' experiences of sexism. However, Study 2 also revealed that men tended to overperceive, rather than underperceive, their partners' experiences of sexism across many subcategories, indicating a directional bias toward *over*estimation. In addition, men's perceptions were strongly shaped by projection, such that men who reported more experiences of sexism themselves also perceived their partners as experiencing more sexism. This suggests that men relied not only on their partners' actual experiences, but also on their own experiences as a reference point when forming judgements about their partner.

Similar to Study 1, sexist attitudes showed relatively limited and inconsistent effects. Hostile sexism was associated with reduced overperception in some domains, whereas benevolent sexism showed few effects overall, but for certain types of sexism, men lower in benevolent sexism were more accurate. In contrast, relational and interpersonal factors emerged as more consistent predictors of men's perceptions. Women's reports of disclosure had limited effects, but men's own reports of discussions about sexism with their partner were more strongly associated with their perceptions. Men who reported more frequent discussions about sexism tended to show reduced underperception and, in many cases, greater overperception of their partners' experiences, suggesting that how men engage with these conversations may be more important than disclosure alone.

Finally, Study 2 extended beyond perceptual accuracy to examine broader associations with awareness and allyship. Men who showed greater accuracy, less underperception, and greater overperception of their partners' experiences of sexism tended to report greater general awareness of sexism and more allyship behaviours. In contrast, when men underperceived their

partners' experiences across several domains, they also reported lower awareness of sexism and lower engagement in allyship behaviours. Together, these findings suggest that accurately perceiving (or overperceiving) a partner's experiences of sexism may contribute to broader awareness of gender inequality and greater motivation to challenge it.

General Discussion

The present thesis provides novel insight into how men perceive their women partners' experiences of sexism. Across two studies—one comparing men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism to an independent sample of women's reports, and one using a dyadic design comparing men's perceptions to their partners' self-reports—men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism were meaningfully aligned with women's reports. In Study 2, men also tended to overperceive their partners' experiences of sexism and relied in part on their own experiences of sexism when forming these perceptions. This pattern contrasts with prior work suggesting that men tend to have difficulty recognizing sexism (Becker & Swim, 2011) and highlights the importance of the relational context in shaping men's perceptions.

Despite past work suggesting that sexist attitudes shape how men perceive women's experiences (Becker & Wright, 2011; Glick & Fiske, 1996), hostile and benevolent sexism were not consistently associated with men's perceptions of their partners' experiences across either study. Instead, interpersonal broader awareness factors appeared to show more consistent associations with men's perceptions. Although women's reports of disclosing their experiences of sexism were only associated with men's perceptions of their partners' overall frequency of experiencing sexism, men's own reports of having conversations in their relationship about sexism were more consistently associated with their perceptions. Men who perceived more frequent conversations about sexism generally showed greater overperception of their partners'

experiences, whereas men reporting fewer such conversations were more likely to underperceive certain forms of sexism. Further, less bias and greater accuracy in perceiving a partner's experiences were generally associated with greater broader awareness of sexism and greater allyship.

Romantic Relationships as a Novel Context for Men's Awareness of Sexism

The present findings highlight romantic relationships as a novel context in which men are more attuned to a partner's experiences of sexism, even overperceiving these experiences, in contrast to prior research showing that for perceptions of women in general, men tend to perceive less frequent experiences of sexism, compared to women (Becker & Swim, 2011). In Study 1, men's perceptions were largely aligned with women's self-reported experiences, suggesting that men's perceptions correspond meaningfully with women's reported experiences, although in this study, their perceptions were evaluated against a sample of women rather than their own partners' reports. Extending these findings in a sample of couples, Study 2 showed that men were not only accurate in their perceptions of their partners' experiences but also tended to overperceive them. Together, these results diverge from previous research showing that men typically have difficulty recognizing sexism, particularly when evaluating the experiences of unfamiliar women or hypothetical situations (Becker & Swim, 2011; Cundiff et al., 2014; Saunders & Senn, 2009; Smith, 1992; Swim et al., 2001). One explanation for this difference is that perspective-taking and empathy, which are key processes that help men recognize and confront sexism (Becker & Swim, 2011; Cundiff et al., 2014; Good et al., 2018; Gervais et al., 2010; Zawadzki et al., 2014), are inherent in interdependent romantic relationships (Rusbult & van Lange, 2003). This explanation is consistent with recent work showing that men rate a sexist

scenario as more sexist and discriminatory when it affects their romantic partner (vs. a stranger or friend; Cross et al., 2025).

Accordingly, I expected that the relational context would reduce men's tendency to underperceive sexism, such that men would be less likely to underperceive their partners' experiences, compared to prior research examining men's perceptions of unknown women or women in general in hypothetical scenarios (Blodorn et al., 2012; Rothgerber et al., 2021; Smith, 1992), and women's experiences of sexism observed in daily life (Becker & Swim, 2011). However, rather than simply attenuating underperception, the present findings revealed a tendency toward overperception. One possible explanation for the current pattern of results is that romantic relationships are contexts in which motivations to understand and to respond to a partner's experiences in a supportive way are heightened. High quality relationships are typically marked by closeness, emotional security, and support provision (Canevello & Crocker, 2010; Chow & Ruhl, 2018; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2010), and perceived support is linked to greater relationship satisfaction (Chow & Ruhl, 2018; Julien et al., 2003; Maimon & Sanchez, 2022; Sarrafian, 2020). In this context, men may be especially motivated to detect and respond to their partners' experiences of sexism and offer them support, leading men to err on the side of over-detection, rather than under-recognition. This pattern is also consistent with error management theory (Haselton & Buss, 2000), which posits that psychological processes are biased in predictable ways when false-positives and false-negative errors carry different costs. According to this theory, when individuals lack direct information to guide their judgements, they are more likely to err in the direction that minimizes these costs. In the present context, it may be less costly for men to overestimate their partners' experiences of sexism than underestimate them. Underperception may lead men to miss opportunities to support their partner, or to provide

invalidating or unsupportive responses, which prior work has shown to be associated with worse outcomes for women (Cross et al., 2026). In contrast, overperceiving these experiences may be less costly, as it reflects heightened responsiveness and sensitivity. As a result, men may be biased toward over-detecting sexism in their partners' experiences.

Outside of romantic relationships, the costs and motivations are different. When evaluating women's experiences more generally, men are not directly responsible for responding to or supporting a specific individual. In these contexts, men may instead be motivated to maintain a positive view of their social group, which can lead to minimizing or distancing themselves from sexism. This motivation to protect a positive ingroup image is evident in broader public discourse. For example, movements aimed at increasing awareness of the harmful consequences of sexism, such as #MeToo and #TimesUp, have been met with defensiveness and reactance from men (Ayanian et al., 2024; Barron et al., 2024), including denying the prevalence of gender-based violence, suggesting that such movements have gone too far, or engaging in countermovements (e.g., #HimToo; Boyle & Rathnayake, 2020; de Maricourt & Burrell, 2022; Fileborn & Phillips, 2019; Flood, 2019). Similarly, viral discussions such as the "man versus bear" scenario where women overwhelmingly said they would rather be alone in the woods with a bear than an unknown man promoted defensive reactions from men, who emphasized that harmful behaviour is not representative of men as a group (i.e., "not all men"; Bird, 2026). Although anecdotal, such responses illustrate how threats to group image can prompt efforts to distance the ingroup from sexism, which may contribute to the underrecognition of sexism in non-relational contexts.

In addition to accurately tracking and, on average, overperceiving their partners' experiences of sexism, men's perceptions were also strongly shaped by their own reported

experiences of sexism. This pattern is consistent with research on egocentric anchoring (Epley & Kardas, 2020), as well as research on interpersonal perception showing that projection effects are often substantial when individuals judge romantic partners' experiences (e.g., Muise et al., 2016). In this context, men's own experiences or observations of sexism may serve as a reference point, leading them to use that as an anchor for their judgements of their partners' experiences. Therefore, men's perceptions appear to be driven by sensitivity to their partners' experiences, a grounding in their own experiences, and biases driven by interpersonal, perceptual or motivational processes.

Importantly, these findings must also be understood in the context of broader patterns in how people perceive sexism. At the group level, consistent with prior work (e.g., Becker & Swim, 2011), men perceived that women in general experience sexism less frequently than women perceived. Thus, if I were to consider only men's perceptions of women in general, like much of the past research has done, men would appear to underestimate the prevalence of sexism relative to women's reports. Additionally, mean-level comparisons revealed that men perceived that women in general experience more sexism than their own partner, and this pattern was not unique to men, women also reported experiencing less sexism themselves than they believed women in general experience. As such, men may acknowledge that sexism is relatively prevalent among women in general while still demonstrating difficulty recognizing specific experiences as sexism. The finding that women report fewer personal experiences than they attribute to women in general is also consistent with the personal–group discrimination discrepancy (Ruggiero & Taylor, 1997), whereby group-level judgements are often higher than individual reports. Consistent with this, research has shown that women tend to perceive that they experience less personal discrimination compared to their reports of group-based

discrimination (Lindsey et al., 2015). However, men were accurate and showed a tendency to overestimate their partners' experiences of sexism, relative to women's self-reported experiences. These findings suggest a key distinction: men underestimate sexism at a group level but show greater sensitivity—and even overperceive—when judging a romantic partner's experiences of sexism.

Together, these findings suggest that men's perceptions of sexism differ across levels, such that women in general are perceived through more abstract, prevalence-based judgements, whereas perceptions of a romantic partner's experiences may be shaped by interpersonal and motivational processes that are associated with both accuracy and overperception. In this way, romantic relationships may represent a distinct interpersonal context in which men's perceptions are more closely aligned with women's experiences, even if it results in overperceiving such experiences.

Ideological Beliefs and Perceptions of Sexism

Prior work suggests that sexist attitudes should meaningfully shape how men interpret sexism. Men who more strongly endorse sexist beliefs, particularly hostile sexism, are generally less likely to recognize sexism, more likely to minimize discrimination against women, and more likely to dismiss women's claims of gender bias as exaggerated or illegitimate (see Barreto & Doyle, 2022 for a review). However, while hostile and benevolent sexism were associated with some differences in perceptions across studies, these effects were selective and domain-specific rather than broad or consistent. In Study 1, men higher in hostile sexism perceived that their partner had heard less hostility towards women, whereas men higher in benevolent sexism perceived their partner as experiencing more paternalism and complementary gender roles. In Study 2, higher hostile sexism was associated with less overperception, such that men perceived

their partners as experiencing fewer instances of sexism overall, particularly fewer experiences of hearing undermining responses to claims of discrimination. In addition, unlike men lower in benevolent sexism, men higher in benevolent sexism were not accurate in their perceptions of their partners' experiences of hearing hostility towards women and patrolling femininity.

Although these findings suggest that sexist attitudes shaped men's perceptions in theoretically meaningful ways, these effects were domain-specific rather than broad or consistent across studies. One possibility for this weaker pattern, relative to past work, is that men in the present research were judging the experiences of a close other, and may draw more heavily on relational information, reducing reliance on generalized beliefs about women and sexism. From this perspective, sexist attitudes may still shape men's perceptions, but their influence may be attenuated when men are evaluating the experiences of someone whom they know well and whose experiences are embedded within an ongoing relational context. This pattern suggests that men's perceptions of a romantic partner's experiences may be less strongly shaped by ideological beliefs than by aspects of the interpersonal context.

Discussions in Romantic Relationships as a Context for Understanding Sexism

The present findings highlight the importance of how men perceive and engage with discussions of sexism in romantic relationships. Contrary to my initial prediction, women's reports of disclosing experiences of sexism were not associated with men's perceptions (with one exception). Instead, men who reported more frequent discussions with their partner about sexism or gender discrimination tended to overperceive their partners' experiences, whereas men who reported fewer such discussions showed attenuated overperception or, in some cases, underperception. This pattern suggests that disclosure alone may not be sufficient to shape men's

awareness; rather, it is how men attend to, interpret, and encode these discussions that influences their perceptions.

This distinction is particularly important given that disclosures of sexism are common in romantic relationships, yet not all experiences are explicitly labeled or recognized as sexism when they are shared (Cross et al., 2025; Cross et al., 2026). As a result, even when women disclose their experiences, the extent to which these disclosures influence men's perceptions may depend on whether they are labelled as sexism, and whether men interpret these experiences as sexism. Research has not yet examined how these disclosures unfold in everyday interactions, leaving open the question of how partners communicate about and make meaning of these experiences in real time.

One possible explanation for the present findings is that men who report more frequent discussions of sexism may be more engaged, attentive and responsive during these conversations. Consistent with this idea, work on high-quality listening—defined as active, nonjudgemental attention to a partner—shows that high-quality listening during difficult conversations promotes perceptions of responsiveness and autonomy support (Itzchakov et al., 2022, 2023), reduces defensiveness (Weinstein et al., 2022), and facilitates both attitude change (Itzchakov et al., 2017) and prejudice reduction (Itzchakov & Weinstein, 2021; Itzchakov et al., 2020). Although I did not examine listening behaviours in the current studies, these findings suggest that variability in how disclosures are received and interpreted may underlie differences in men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism and highlight an important direction for future research. For example, dyadic interaction studies could test whether high-quality listening during couples' discussions of sexism promotes greater understanding,

validation, and accuracy in men's perceptions of their partners' experiences, while also increasing men's broader awareness of sexism.

At the same time, the measure of "discussions of sexism" was broad, and it is unclear what men were referencing when reporting these conversations. Men may have been reporting on discussions of their own experiences, general conversations about sexism (including witnessing sexism towards women), or conversations centered on their partners' experiences. Future research should disentangle these possibilities by more clearly specifying the referent of "discussions of sexism" (e.g., self-experienced vs. partner-experienced vs. general discussions) and by examining how these conversations unfold in real time within romantic relationships, including how partners communicate about, interpret, and respond to experiences of sexism.

Awareness and Allyship Shape Bias in Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism

Lastly, this research contributes to the broader literature by showing that men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism were associated with greater awareness of sexism and allyship. Men who underperceived their partners' experiences of sexism tended to report lower awareness of sexism, whereas men who showed less underperception—and in many cases overperception—reported greater broader awareness of sexism. A similar pattern emerged for men's allyship behaviours: men who underperceived their partners' experiences of sexism reported lower allyship behaviours, whereas men who showed less underperception—and particularly greater overperception—reported higher levels of allyship. This suggests that men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism are meaningfully associated with how they understand and respond to gender inequality more broadly. These findings align with recent work showing that recognizing a partner's experiences of sexism is associated with broader

awareness of gender inequality (Cross et al., 2025). More broadly, past work by Becker and Swim (2011) also suggests that perspective-taking and greater engagement with women's experiences are linked to greater recognition of sexism. The present findings build on this work to show that these associations also emerge within close romantic relationships, such that men who were more attuned to their partners' experiences also reported greater broader awareness of sexism and allyship.

At the same time, the present studies cannot determine the direction of these associations. Greater recognition of a partner's experiences may contribute to broader awareness of sexism and greater allyship, consistent with prior work (e.g., Cross et al., 2025). However, the reverse is also possible: men who are already more broadly aware of sexism and more likely to engage in allyship may also be more likely to apply these broader beliefs to their perceptions of their partners' experiences. Future research using longitudinal or experimental designs is needed to clarify the direction of these effects and determine whether improving men's recognition of a partner's experiences of sexism leads to broader changes in awareness and behaviour over time. Nevertheless, these findings highlight romantic relationships as a meaningful interpersonal context in which men's perceptions of their partners' experiences are associated with broader awareness of sexism and allyship. Because these relationships involve emotional closeness, repeated interaction, and opportunities for direct disclosure, they may make sexism more personally relevant and less easily dismissed than abstract or generalized discussions of gender inequality. Given that men's perceptions appear to be associated with how they interpret their partners' experiences, interventions that leverage close relationships may be more effective in promoting men's awareness and allyship than approaches that rely solely on broad, group-level messaging or hypothetical scenarios.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

The present research is, to my knowledge, the first to examine men's perceptions of a romantic partner's experiences of sexism within ongoing romantic relationships, an important but relatively unexplored context for understanding how men recognize sexism. By focusing on partner-specific perceptions, this work extends prior research that has largely examined judgements of women in general or hypothetical scenarios (Cundiff et al., 2014; Saunders & Senn, 2009; Smith, 1992; Swim et al., 2001; Becker & Swim, 2011) and suggests men may be more attuned to sexism when evaluating the experiences of a romantic partner. This represents a meaningful shift in our understanding of men's perceptions of sexism, indicating that men's perceptions of sexism are shaped by relational dynamics. A key strength in this research is the dyadic design in Study 2, which allowed for the direct comparison of men's perceptions with their partners' self-reported experiences. The use of the Truth and Bias model (West & Kenny, 2011) in Study 2 allows for the simultaneous examination of multiple processes that contribute to men's perceptions of their partners' experiences, including accuracy, directional bias, and projection, providing a more nuanced understanding of how men form these perceptions within close relationships.

Despite these contributions, several limitations should be noted. First, this research relies on self-report measures, which capture individuals' subjective interpretations of their own experiences rather than providing an objective account of the frequency or occurrence of sexist experiences. This is particularly relevant in the context of sexism, where experiences can be subtle, ambiguous, and not always be labelled as sexism. In the present application of the Truth and Bias model, women's self-reports of their experiences of sexism were treated as the best available proxy for the truth as it is not possible to objectively determine how frequently each

woman experiences sexism. Although this approach is consistent with past work using the Truth and Bias model for other judgements in romantic relationships in which the person's own experiences are the benchmark of the truth (Muise et al., 2016; Waddell et al., 2023), it relies on the assumption that women's reports reasonably reflect their lived experiences. This also means that men's apparent overperception bias could, in part, reflect women's underreporting of their own experiences rather than true overestimation by men. Future work could build on this by using methods that capture experiences closer to when they occur, such as daily-diary designs, to better understand how experiences are interpreted, labeled, and reported in real time.

Second, the key measure of experiences of sexism used in the present research is the Experiences of Sexism Scale (Becker & Swim, 2011), which assesses the frequency of a range of sexist behaviours, including more subtle forms of sexism. For men and women to complete the items, many are written about exposure to sexism rather than about being the direct target. This wording means that the measure conflates direct experiences of sexism with indirect exposure to sexism. For example, some items refer to having heard sexist behaviour (e.g., "heard people say that women push themselves where they are not wanted", "heard catcalls"), whereas others assess more direct experiences (e.g., "experienced staring, ogling, unwanted touching"). Similarly, it is unclear whether men's reports of their own experiences reflect direct experiences of sexism or exposure to sexism directed towards women. As a result, the present findings are limited in their ability to determine to what extent differences in reported experiences—and the observed projection effects—reflect differences in being the target of sexism or differences in exposure to sexist incidents. It is possible that men's experiences of sexism involve hearing sexist comments about women from other men (e.g., "locker room talk") or through male-dominated work environments, which may contribute to higher reported levels of sexism. Future

work should develop measures that more clearly distinguish between direct and indirect experiences of sexism to improve interpretability, while still allowing all genders to respond and capturing the broader ways in which individuals encounter sexism in everyday life.

Third, the sample consisted of man–woman couples recruited through an online platform who selectively participated in a study framed as examining gender-related experiences in romantic relationships. As such, participants may have been more willing to engage with questions about gender and relationships than the broader population, which may limit generalizability. In addition, participants were recruited exclusively from Western cultural contexts (i.e., the United Kingdom, United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand), which have relatively higher scores on gender equality than other non-Western countries (World Population Review, 2026) and may further constrain the generalizability of these findings. Gender norms, relationship dynamics, and the meaning, expression, and recognition of sexism are shaped by broader cultural contexts, and these processes may operate differently in non-Western cultures. Although sexist attitudes have slowly declined (Hammond et al., 2025; Huang et al., 2019), previous work has shown that sexist attitudes vary across countries, and these attitudes tend to be linked to greater gender inequality (Brandt, 2011; Hammond et al., 2025). It is possible that in countries where more people endorse sexist attitudes, perceptions of experiences of sexism may differ, in that they may not be seen as sexist or may be overlooked. Accordingly, the present findings may not generalize to couples in other cultural contexts or to relationships outside of Western societies. Future work should examine whether these patterns replicate in more diverse cultural contexts. In particular, future research would benefit from recruiting couples from non-Western cultural contexts, where gender norms, relationship roles,

and the expression and interpretation of sexism may differ meaningfully from those observed in Western samples.

Future work should also extend beyond man–woman romantic relationships to examine whether similar perceptual processes emerge across different relational contexts. However, such work requires careful consideration of measurement. Much of the existing measures of sexist attitudes—including the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory—were developed within explicitly heterosexual relational frameworks and may not translate cleanly across diverse relationship contexts. Recent work suggests that these measures can be exclusionary and, in some cases, harmful for queer participants, as their heteronormative assumptions may produce confusion, distress, and reduced interpretability among gender and sexually diverse respondents (e.g., Bravestone et al., 2024; Cross et al., 2021). Accordingly, future research should also consider how sexism is conceptualized and measured across diverse identities and relational contexts. Developing measures that more accurately capture gendered power, inequality, and bias across a wider range of relationship structures will be essential for understanding whether the perceptual processes observed here reflect broader interpersonal dynamics or are more specific to man–woman relationship contexts.

Fifth, the present research focuses on women's experiences of sexism more broadly and covers a range of experiences from paternalism and complementary gender roles to hearing hostility towards women. However, I did not explicitly ask whether these experiences occurred within the romantic relationship where their partner was the perpetrator of sexism, or outside of their romantic relationship. This distinction is important because sexism is often embedded within man–woman romantic relationships themselves, shaping power dynamics, emotional labour, caregiving expectations, and relationship roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Hammond &

Overall, 2016). As a result, sexism that occurs within the relationship may represent a meaningfully different interpersonal context than sexism experienced outside the relationship, with distinct implications for how it is perceived, interpreted, and responded to by both partners. For example, men higher in hostile sexism tend to underestimate the amount of relational power they hold relative to their women partners' reports, and these biased perceptions are associated with greater partner aggression (Cross et al., 2019). Similarly, partners show systematic biases in perceiving one another's sexist attitudes, suggesting that sexism within relationships may be interpreted and negotiated differently than sexism occurring outside the relationship (Waddell & Overall, 2023). As a result, the present findings cannot distinguish between experiences of sexism perpetrated by others and sexism occurring within the relationship itself. Future research should examine these contexts separately, including how women confront partner-perpetrated sexism and how couples discuss and negotiate gender-based inequities within their own relationships.

Finally, the present research utilizes a cross-sectional design, and therefore, causality cannot be inferred. Although perceptions of partners' experiences of sexism were associated with broader awareness of sexism and allyship, future longitudinal and experimental research is needed to clarify the direction of these effects and examine how interpersonal processes such as disclosure and perspective-taking (Cross et al., 2025; Davis et al., 2021) may shape these perceptions over time within close relationships.

Implications for Sexism Reduction

Interventions aimed at increasing men's allyship in gender equality efforts are critically important. Recent research spanning 29 countries indicates that 55% of men (compared to 44% of women) believe that gender equality efforts have gone far enough, and over half of men report

that efforts are causing discrimination against men (53% of men compared to 35% of women), and that men are being expected to do too much to support equality (54% of men compared to 36% of women; Ipsos, 2026). These beliefs are particularly pronounced among young generations of men (Ipsos, 2026), highlighting the need for interventions that both increase awareness of gender inequality and reduce defensiveness and reactance.

Prior work suggests that men may respond defensively to gender inequality when it is framed at an abstract, group level that implicates men as a social group (Barron et al., 2024; Lizzio-Wilson et al., 2025). The present findings offer a more nuanced perspective on this pattern. Despite evidence of broader resistance in prior research, men in the current set of studies demonstrated sensitivity to their romantic partners' experiences of sexism, showing both accuracy and a tendency to overestimate these experiences. Moreover, men reported relatively high perceptions of sexism experienced by women in general, suggesting that engagement with a close other's experiences of sexism may extend beyond the relationship to shape greater awareness of sexism. Together, these findings suggest that the context in which men encounter information about sexism may be critical. Whereas abstract, group-level messaging may evoke defensiveness (Barron et al., 2024; Lizzio-Wilson et al., 2025), interpersonal contexts, such as romantic relationships, may reduce resistance by shifting attention toward understanding the experiences of a close other (Mikołajczak et al., 2025). As a result, interventions may be more effective when grounded in personally meaningful, relational contexts that foster empathy and engagement. Romantic relationships, in particular, may represent a powerful context for increasing men's awareness of sexism and promoting allyship, as they appear to shift men from minimizing inequality to engaging with it more directly and meaningfully.

Conclusion

The present research offers novel contributions to sexism and relationship research. Across two studies, this work provides new insight into how men perceive women's experiences of sexism. Men's perceptions of their romantic partners' experiences were largely aligned with women's reports (Study 1), and even overperceived (Study 2), contrasting past work showing that men often underrecognize sexism. I found limited evidence that sexist attitudes shaped men's perceptions. Instead, men's perceptions in this context were more consistently associated with relational and interpersonal factors, such as discussions of sexism in the relationship. In addition, men who showed greater overperception of their partners' experiences of sexism also reported greater broader awareness of sexism and greater allyship, whereas men who underperceived their partners' experiences tended to report lower awareness and lower allyship. This pattern raises the possibility that men who are more attuned to sexism in their partners' lives may also be more likely to recognize sexism as a broader social issue and report greater willingness to respond as allies against sexism. More broadly, the present research contributes to a growing body of work emphasizing the importance of relational context in shaping how sexism is recognized, interpreted, and responded to in everyday life. These findings highlight romantic relationships as a potentially meaningful context for men's awareness of sexism and promoting allyship. I hope this research encourages future work to develop approaches that increase men's awareness of sexism and promote allyship by leveraging relational contexts, while also being mindful not to overburden women, who are often expected to initiate such discussions and explain these experiences.

References

Ahrens, C. E., & Aldana, E. (2012). The ties that bind: Understanding the impact of sexual assault disclosure on survivors' relationships with friends, family, and partners. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *13*(2), 226–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2012.642738

Alba, B., Cross, E. J., & Hammond, M. D. (2024). Women's experiences of benevolent sexism in intimate relationships with men are associated with costs and benefits for personal and relationship wellbeing. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *15*(7), 802–811. https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506241256695

Anisman-Razin, M., Kark, R., & Saguy, T. (2018). "Putting gender on the table": Understanding reactions to women who discuss gender inequality. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(5), 690–706. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217744648

Archer, A. M., & Kam, C. D. (2020). Modern sexism in modern times public opinion in the #MeToo era. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 84(4), 813–837. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfaa058

Ayanian, A. H., Uluğ, Ö. M., Radke, H. R., & Zick, A. (2024). The social psychological predictors of men's backlash responses to the #MeToo movement. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations,* 27(7), 1680–1711. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302231210492

Barreto, M., & Doyle, D. M. (2023). Benevolent and hostile sexism in a shifting global context. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *2*(2), 98–111. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00136-x

Barron, A. C., Thomas, E. F., & Woodyatt, L. (2024). #MeToo, #MenToo: How men's progressive and reactionary actions are shaped by defensiveness. *Frontiers in Social Psychology*, 2, 1356998.

Becker, J. C., & Swim, J. K. (2011). Seeing the unseen: Attention to daily experiences of sexism as way to reduce sexist beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(2), 227–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684310397509

Becker, J. C., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(1), 62–77. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022615.

Becker, J. C., Glick, P., Ilic, M., & Bohner, G. (2011). Damned if she does, damned if she doesn't? Social consequences of accepting versus rejecting benevolent sexist offers for the target and perpetrator. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 761–773. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.823.

Becker, J. C., Zawadzki, M. J., & Shields, S. A. (2014). Confronting and reducing sexism: A call for research on intervention. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 603–614. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12081

Bird, A. (2026) "I would choose the bear": To what extent does this online debate reflect women's perceptions of men?. *Journal of Criminology, Sociology and Legal Studies.* 1–38.

Blodorn, A., O'Brien, L. T., & Kordys, J. (2012). Responding to sex-based discrimination: Gender differences in perceived discrimination and implications for legal decision making. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *15*(3), 409–424. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430211427172

Boyle, K., & Rathnayake, C. (2020). #HimToo and the networking of misogyny in the age of #MeToo. *Feminist Media Studies. 20*, 1259–1277. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2019.1661868

Bravestone, L., Hammond, M. D., Muise, A., & Cross, E. J. (2024). "It wasn't meant for gays": Lesbian women's and gay men's reactions to the ambivalent sexism inventory. *Sex Roles*, *90*(11), 1585–1598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-024-01528-4

Calder-Dawe, O., & Gavey, N. (2016). Making sense of everyday sexism: Young people and the gendered contours of sexism. In *Women's Studies International Forum* (Vol. 55, pp. 1–9). Pergamon. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2015.11.004

Campbell, K. N. (2023). *Experiencing allyship: Exploring expectations, reactions, and outcomes of male allyship* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati).

Canevello, A., & Crocker, J. (2010). Creating good relationships: Responsiveness, relationship quality, and interpersonal goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*(1), 78–106. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018186

Carter, E. R., & Murphy, M. C. (2017). Consensus and consistency: Exposure to multiple discrimination claims shapes Whites' intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *73*, 24–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.06.001

Chow, C. M., & Ruhl, H. (2018). Congruity of observed social support behaviors and couple relationship quality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*(1), 62–71. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2302

Cihangir, S., Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2014). Men as allies against sexism: The positive effects of a suggestion of sexism by male (vs. female) sources. *Sage Open*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014539168

Crasta, D., Rogge, R. D., Maniaci, M. R., & Reis, H. T. (2021). Toward an optimized measure of perceived partner responsiveness: Development and validation of the perceived responsiveness and insensitivity scale. *Psychological Assessment, 33*(4), 338–355. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000986

Cross, E. J., DeBlaere, A., Muise, A. (2025) Leveraging man-woman romantic relationships to promote men's awareness of sexism and gender discrimination. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 17(3), 326–338. https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506251345111

Cross, E. J., DeBlaere, A., Virk, T., Sharma, A., Muise, A. (2026). Women disclosing experiences of sexism to men partners: prevalence, predictors, and responses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672261442993

Cross, E. J., Muise, A., & Hammond, M. D. (2021). Do scales measuring sexist attitudes have equivalent meaning for sexual minorities and majorities?. *Sex Roles*, *85*(11), 707–720. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-021-01248-z

Cross, E. J., Overall, N. C., Low, R. S. T., & McNulty, J. K. (2019). An interdependence account of sexism and power: Men's hostile sexism, biased perceptions of low power, and relationship aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 117*(2), 338–363. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000167

Cundiff, J. L., Zawadzki, M. J., Danube, C. L., & Shields, S. A. (2014). Using experiential learning to increase the recognition of everyday sexism as harmful: The WAGES intervention. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 703–721. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12087

Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2003). Confronting prejudice (literally): Reactions to confrontations of racial and gender bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*(4), 532–544. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202250923

Davis, C. H., Krafft, J., Hicks, E. T., & Levin, M. E. (2021). The role of psychological inflexibility and perspective taking in anti-racism and anti-sexism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *175*, 110724. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110724

de la Torre-Pérez, L., Oliver-Parra, A., Torres, X. et al. How do we measure gender discrimination? Proposing a construct of gender discrimination through a systematic scoping review. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 21*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-021-01581-5

de Maricourt, C. D., and Burrell, S. R. (2022). #MeToo or #MenToo? Expressions of backlash and masculinity politics in the #MeToo era. *Journal of Men's Studies*, *30*(1), 49–69. https://doi.org/10.1177/10608265211035794

DiMauro, J., & Renshaw, K. D. (2021). Trauma-related disclosure in sexual assault survivors' intimate relationships: Associations with PTSD, shame, and partners' responses. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(3-4). https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518756117

Dodd, E. H., Giuliano, T. A., Boutell, J. M., & Moran, B. E. (2001). Respected or rejected: Perceptions of women who confront sexist remarks. *Sex Roles, 45*(7-8), 567–577. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014866915741

Drury, B. J., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Allies against sexism: The role of men in confronting sexism. *Journal of Social Issues*, *70*(4), 637–652. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12083

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*(3), 573–598. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.109.3.573

Epley, N., & Kardas, M. (2021). Understanding the minds of others: Activation, application, and accuracy of mind perception. In P. A. M. Van Lange, E. T. Higgins, & A. W. Kruglanski

(Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles* (3rd ed., pp. 163–180). The Guilford Press.

Fileborn, B., & Phillips, N. (2019). From "me too" to "too far"? Contesting the boundaries of sexual violence in contemporary activism. In B. Fileborn & R. Loney-Howes (Eds.), #MeToo and the politics of social change (pp. 99–117). *Palgrave Macmillan*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15213-0_17

Flood, M. (2019). Men and #MeToo: Mapping men's responses to anti-violence advocacy. In B. Fileborn & R. Loney-Howes (Eds.), #MeToo and the politics of social change (pp. 285–300). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15213-0_18

Flood, M., & Pease, B. (2009). Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *10*(2), 125–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838009334131

Gervais, S. J., Hillard, A. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2010). Confronting sexism: The role of relationship orientation and gender. *Sex Roles, 63*(7), 463–474. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9838-7

Glick, P. (2014). Commentary: Encouraging confrontation. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 779–791. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12091

Glick, P. & Fiske, S.T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 491–512. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.70.3.491

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*(1), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x

Good, J. J., Sanchez, D. T., & Moss-Racusin, C. A. (2018). A paternalistic duty to protect? Predicting men's decisions to confront sexism. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *19*(1), 14–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000077

Gurin, P., Miller, A. H., & Gurin, G. (1980). Stratum identification and consciousness. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 30–47. https://doi.org/10.2307/3033746

Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2015). Benevolent sexism and support of romantic partner's goals: Undermining women's competence while fulfilling men's intimacy needs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(9), 1180–1194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215593492

Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2016). Sexism in Intimate Contexts: How Romantic Relationships Help Explain the Origins, Functions, and Consequences of Sexist Attitudes. In C. G. Sibley & F. K. Barlow (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of the Psychology of Prejudice* (pp. 321–343). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hammond, M. D., Singh, N., & Karl, J. A. (2025). The global decline in sexism: A multilevel meta-analytic review of trends in countries' hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and gender inequality over time. *Psychological Bulletin*, 151(8), 941–985. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000485

Haselton, M. G., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Error management theory: A new perspective on biases in cross-sex mind reading. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(1), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.1.81

Heise L. L. (2011). *What works to prevent partner violence? An evidence overview*. STRIVE Research Consortium, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London. https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/id/eprint/21062/

Holland, E., Koval, P., Stratemeyer, M., Thomson, F., & Haslam, N. (2017). Sexual objectification in women's daily lives: A smartphone ecological momentary assessment study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *56*(2), 314–333. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12152

Huang, Y., Osborne, D., & Sibley, C. G. (2019). The gradual move toward gender equality: A 7-year latent growth model of ambivalent sexism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *10*(3), 335–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617752472

Ilies, R., Hauserman, N., Schwochau, S., & Stibal, J. (2003). Reported incidence rates of work-related sexual harassment in the United States: Using meta-analysis to explain reported rate disparities. *Personnel Psychology, 56*(3), 607–631. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00752.x

Ipsos (2026). International women's day: Global report 2026: Available at https://www.ipsos.com/en-ca/international-womens-day-2026#:~:text=The%20latest%20Ipsos%20International%20Women's,efforts%20have%20gone%20far%20enough.

Itzchakov, G., & Weinstein, N. (2021). High-quality listening supports speakers' autonomy and self-esteem when discussing prejudice. *Human Communication Research*, *47*(3), 248–283. https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqab003

Itzchakov, G., Kluger, A. N., & Castro, D. R. (2017). I am aware of my inconsistencies but can tolerate them: The effect of high quality listening on speakers' attitude ambivalence.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, *43*(1), 105–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216675339

Itzchakov, G., Reis, H. T., & Weinstein, N. (2022). How to foster perceived partner responsiveness: High-quality listening is key. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *16*(1), e12648. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12648

Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., Legate, N., & Amar, M. (2020). Can high quality listening predict lower speakers' prejudiced attitudes?. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *91*, 104022. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2020.104022

Itzchakov, G., Weinstein, N., Vinokur, E., & Yomtovian, A. (2023). Communicating for workplace connection: A longitudinal study of the outcomes of listening training on teachers' autonomy, psychological safety, and relational climate. *Psychology in the Schools*, *60*(4), 1279–1298. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22835

Iyer, A., & Ryan, M. K. (2009). Why do men and women challenge gender discrimination in the workplace? The role of group status and in-group identification in predicting pathways to collective action. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*(4), 791–814. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01625.x

Jones, K. N., Brewster, M. E., & Jones, J. A. (2014). The creation and validation of the LGBT Ally Identity Measure. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *1*(2), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000033

Julien, D., Chartrand, E., Simard, M. C., Bouthillier, D., & Bégin, J. (2003). Conflict, social support and relationship quality: An observational study of heterosexual, gay male and lesbian couples' communication. *Journal of Family Psychology, 17*(3), 419–428. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.17.3.419

Kabat-Farr, D., & Cortina, L. M. (2014). Sex-based harassment in employment: New insights into gender and context. *Law and Human Behavior, 38*(1), 58–72. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000045

Kaiser, C.R., & Miller, C.T. (2001). Stop complaining! The social costs of making attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 27, 254-263. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201272010

Kehn, A., & Ruthig, J. C. (2013). Perceptions of gender discrimination across six decades: The moderating roles of gender and age. *Sex Roles*, *69*, 289–296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0303-2

Klonoff, E. A., & Landrine, H. (1995). The Schedule of Sexist Events: A measure of lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *19*(4), 439–470. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1995.tb00086.x

Lawson, K. M. (2020). An examination of daily experiences of sexism and reactivity among women in US male-dominated academic majors using experience sampling methodology. *Sex Roles*, *83*(9), 552–565. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01135-z

Lindsey, A., King, E., Cheung, H., Hebl, M., Lynch, S., & Mancini, V. (2015). When do women respond against discrimination? Exploring factors of subtlety, form, and focus. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *45*(12), 649–661. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12326

Lizzio-Wilson, M., Thai, M., Hersey, M., & Batchelor, D. (2025). Stuck in the middle: Men experience countervailing reactions to discussions about misogyny and violence against women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 26*(4), 565–582. https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000514

Lorenz, K., Ullman, S. E., Kirkner, A., Mandala, R., Vasquez, A. L., & Sigurvinsdottir, R. (2018). Social reactions to sexual assault disclosure: A qualitative study of informal support dyads. *Violence Against Women*, *24*(12), 1497–1520. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801217732428

Lukacena, K. M., & Mark, K. P. (2022). Communicating a history of sexual trauma: Partner responses to women's disclosure. *Violence Against Women*, *28*(10), 2521–2539. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012211034217

Maimon, M. R., & Sanchez, D. T. (2022). Women's sexism-related coping support from male romantic partners. *Gender Issues*, *39*(4), 478–506. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-022-09301-1

Martínez-Bacaicoa, J., Real-Brioso, N., Mateos-Pérez, E., & Gámez-Guadix, M. (2024). The role of gender and sexism in the moral disengagement mechanisms of technology-facilitated sexual violence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *152*, 108060. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.108060

Mazzuca, S., Moscatelli, S., Menegatti, M., & Rubini, M. (2022). Men's reactions to gender inequality in the workplace: From relative deprivation on behalf of women to collective action. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 999750. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.999750

McDonald, P., Mayes, R., & Laundon, M. (2016). Everyday sexism survey: Report to Victoria's Male Champions of Change (MCC) Group. QUT Business School, Australia.

Mikołajczak, G., Fisher, A. N., & Ryan, M. K. (2025). Intergroup contact in the context of gender. A critical review of the literature and opportunities for future research. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *28*(4), 723–751. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302241311544

Muise, A., Stanton, S. C. E., Kim, J. J., & Impett, E. A. (2016). Not in the mood? Men under-(not over-) perceive their partner's sexual desire in established intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*(5), 725–742. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000046

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine.* The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/24994

Nickerson, R. S. (1999). How we know—and sometimes misjudge—what others know: Imputing one's own knowledge to others. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 737–759. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.737.

Page, T. E., Pina, A., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2016). "It was only harmless banter!" The development and preliminary validation of the moral disengagement in sexual harassment scale. *Aggressive Behavior*, *42*(3), 254–273. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21621

Pietri, E. S., Moser, C. E., Derricks, V., & Johnson, I. R. (2024). A framework for understanding effective allyship. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *3*(10), 686–700. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-024-00359-0

Rothgerber, H., Kaufling, K., Incorvati, C., Andrew, C. B., & Farmer, A. (2021). Is a reasonable woman different from a reasonable person? Gender differences in perceived sexual harassment. *Sex Roles 84,* 208–220. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01156-8

Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D. H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(5), 914–922. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.914

Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1997). Why minority group members perceive or do not perceive the discrimination that confronts them: The role of self-esteem and perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(2), 373–389. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.373

Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54(*1), 351–375. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145059

Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles*, *50*, 565–573. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000023075.32252.fd

Sarrafian, N. (2020). Social support in intimate relationships and its link to relationship and life satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne).

Saunders, B. A., Scaturro, C., Guarino, C., & Kelly, E. (2017). Contending with catcalling: The role of system-justifying beliefs and ambivalent sexism in predicting women's coping experiences with (and men's attributions for) stranger harassment. *Current Psychology*, *36*(2), 324–338. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9421-7

Saunders, K. A., & Senn, C. Y. (2009). Should I confront him? Men's reactions to hypothetical confrontations of peer sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 61*(5), 399–415. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9638-0

Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2010). New directions in attachment theory and research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *27*(2), 163–172. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407509360899

Smith, E. R. (1992). Differential perceptions of sexism. *Women & Therapy*, *12*(1-2), 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1300/J015V12N01_15

Stangor, C., Sechrist, G. B., & Swim, J. K. (1999). Sensitivity to sexism and perceptions of reports about sexist events. *Swiss Journal of Psychology. 58*(4), 251–256. https://doi.org/10.1024/1421-0185.58.4.251

Stewart, R., Wright, B., Smith, L., Roberts, S., & Russell, N. (2021). Gendered stereotypes and norms: A systematic review of interventions designed to shift attitudes and behaviour. *Heliyon*, 7(4) e06660. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06660

Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(1), 31–53. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00200

United Nations (2024). The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024. Accessible at thesustainabledevelopmentgoalsreport2024.pdf

Van Laar, C., Van Rossum, A., Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Bongiorno, R., & Block, K. (2024). MANdatory-why men need (and are needed for) gender equality progress. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, 1263313. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1263313

Waddell, N., & Overall, N. C. (2023). Bias, accuracy and assumed similarity in judging intimate partners' sexist attitudes. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *40*(2), 506–527. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075221118546

Washington, J., & Evans, N. J. (1991). Becoming an ally. In N. J. Evans & V. A. Wall (Eds.), *Beyond tolerance: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus* (pp. 195–204). American College Personnel Association.

Weinstein, N., Itzchakov, G., & Legate, N. (2022). The motivational value of listening during intimate and difficult conversations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *16*(2), e12651. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12651

West, T. V., & Kenny, D. A. (2011). The truth and bias model of judgment. *Psychological Review*, *118*(2), 357–378. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022936

Wiley, S., Srinivasan, R., Finke, E., Firnhaber, J., & Shilinsky, J. (2021). Positive contact with feminist women predicts men's greater awareness of male privilege and support for feminist collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 24*(4), 581–602. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220946930

Women and Gender Equity Canada (2020) "Calling Men and Boys In" What we heard: Report from the roundtables on engaging men and boys to advance gender equality. Available Online. https://www.canada.ca/en/women-gender-equality/transparency/calling-men-boys.html

World Economic Forum. (2022, July 13). *Global gender gap report 2022*. https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-gender-gap-report-2022/

World Population Review. (2026, May 1). Gender equality by country 2026. World Population Review. https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/gender-equality-by-country

Yang, C., Zhang, T. H., Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Du, H., & Chi, P. (2025). Bridging awareness and action: The roles of gender inequality, power distance, and individualism in shaping collective action intentions for gender equality across 61 societies. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 19485506251388699. https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506251388699

Zawadzki, M. J., Shields, S. A., Danube, C. L., & Swim, J. K. (2014). Reducing the endorsement of sexism using experiential learning: The Workshop Activity for Gender Equity Simulation (WAGES). *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 38*(1), 75–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684313498573

Zawisza, M., Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Glick, P., Olech, M., Besta, T., Jurek, P., Sobiecki, J., Best, D. L., Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Safdar, S., Włodarczyk, A., & Żadkowska, M. (2025). Worse for women, bad for all: A 62-nation study confirms and extends ambivalent sexism principles to reveal greater social dysfunction in sexist nations. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *16*(8), 866–883. https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506241302882

Zhou, Y., Nguyen, H.-H. D., Revier, M. S., Krueger, K. R., & Sackett, P. R. (2024). An updated examination of gender differences in sexual harassment perception: A meta-analysis and a survey study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 29*(6), 373–408. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000391

Supplemental Materials

Table of Contents

Study 1 Supplemental Analyses 90
Measurement Invariance Tests 90
Exploratory Factor Analysis 91
Men's Own Reported Experiences of Sexism Compared to Their Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences 95
Study 2 Supplemental Analyses 97
Measurement Invariance Tests 97
Correlations Between Experiences of Sexism Subcategories 99
Dyadic Truth and Bias Models of Men's and Women's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism 102
Men's and Women's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences of Sexism 106
Men's and Women's Perceptions of Women in General's Experiences of Sexism 109
The Role of Projection in the Models 111
Moderation of Broader Awareness 113
Control Variables 115
Moderations of Sexist Attitudes Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure 118
Moderation of Sexism Disclosure Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure 122
Moderation of Greater Awareness of Sexism Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure 125
Moderation of Allyship Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure 127

Study 1 Supplemental Analyses

The preregistration for Study 1 included a broader set of planned analyses than are presented in the current thesis and the accompanying supplemental materials. For the purposes of the present thesis, I focus only on the primary preregistered analyses most directly relevant to the central aims of this project: whether men's perceptions of their women partners' experiences of sexism align with women's self-reported experiences, and whether men's sexist attitudes are associated with these perceptions. Additional preregistered analyses beyond the scope of these core questions are not reported here but remain documented in the original preregistration materials on OSF and will be pursued in another project.

Measurement Invariance Tests

In Study 1, I tested measurement invariance of experiences of sexism, and moderator variables, by gender (Table S1). Specifically, I tested measurement invariance for the full Becker and Swim (2011) scale and the accompanying subscales, where I separated the objectification subscale into two categories: *experiencing* and *witnessing*, as this subscale had items that related to both being the direct target of objectification and witnessing objectification. Tests of measurement invariance across gender revealed metric invariance across the full scale and all subscales, indicating that the items loaded similarly onto the underlying constructs for men and women and suggesting that these constructs were conceptualized similarly across men and women. However, tests of scalar invariance only passed for the experiencing objectification subscale, whereas the full scale and remaining subscales failed to meet scalar invariance criteria, indicating that item intercepts differed by gender and mean-level comparisons between men and women should be interpreted with caution. However, the primary comparison is between men's perceptions of their partners' experiences and women's self-reported experiences.

Table S1

Test of Measurement Invariance Across Key Variables

Measure	χ^2	df	RMSEA	CFI	ΔCFI	TLI	SRMR	PASS/FAIL
Becker & Swim Full Scale								
Configural	4888.88	378	0.15	0.67		0.63	0.11	
Metric	4967.39	398	0.15	0.66	-0.00	0.65	0.11	**Pass**
Scalar	5513.53	418	0.15	0.62	-0.04	0.62	0.13	Fail
All Objectification Items								
Configural	93.32	18	0.09	0.99		0.98	0.02	
Metric	96.84	23	0.08	0.99	0.00	0.98	0.02	**Pass**
Scalar	175.33	28	0.10	0.97	-0.02	0.97	0.05	Fail
Experiencing Objectification								
Configural	0.00	0	0.00	1.00		1.00	0.00	
Metric	0.91	2	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	**Pass**
Scalar	17.06	4	0.08	0.99	-0.01	0.99	0.02	**Pass**
Witnessing Objectification								
Configural	0.00	0	0.00	1.00		1.00	0.00	
Metric	2.76	2	0.03	1.00	-0.00	1.00	0.02	**Pass**
Scalar	74.94	4	0.18	0.95	-0.05	0.92	0.06	Fail
Undermining Claims of Discrimination								
Configural	100.75	18	0.09	0.97		0.95	0.03	
Metric	106.51	23	0.08	0.97	0.00	0.96	0.03	**Pass**
Scalar	162.13	28	0.10	0.96	-0.02	0.95	0.04	Fail
Hearing Hostility Towards Women								
Configural	485.39	18	0.22	0.83		0.72	0.07	
Metric	489.80	23	0.20	0.83	0.00	0.78	0.07	**Pass**
Scalar	556.42	28	0.19	0.81	-0.02	0.80	0.08	Fail
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles								
Configural	0.00	0	0.00	1.00		1.00	0.00	
Metric	3.06	2	0.03	1.00	-0.00	1.00	0.02	**Pass**
Scalar	30.88	4	0.11	0.96	-0.04	0.94	0.04	Fail

Note. Tests of measurement invariance across gender indicated partial support for invariance. All 7 of 7 scales met criteria for metric invariance, indicating comparable factor loadings across men and women. However, only 1 of 7 scales met criteria for scalar invariance.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Because participants in Study 2 completed the experiences of sexism measures three times (i.e., reporting on their own experiences, their perceptions of their partners' experiences,

and their perceptions of women's experiences in general), I used the Study 1 data to conduct an exploratory factor analysis (Table S2). This analysis was used to assess whether the item set could be reduced and whether the underlying factor structure aligned with prior work before applying the revised structure in Study 2. Although the resulting structure was broadly consistent with previous research, several deviations emerged. Accordingly, a small number of items were removed based on weak or inconsistent loadings, and some factors were relabeled to improve conceptual clarity and better reflect the constructs captured by the retained items.

Table S2

Factor Analysis on Experiences of Sexism Items

		1	2	3	4
Becker and Swim (2011) Experiences of Sexism Items					
Objectification	Experienced staring, ogling, unwanted touching.	**.905**	.026	-.042	.020
	Received unwanted sexual attention.	**.878**	-.013	.005	.010
	Unwanted flirting.	**.878**	.017	.036	-.052
	Heard catcalls.	**.848**	.036	-.068	.030
	Heard comments about parts of your or someone's body or clothing.	**.731**	-.033	.157	.026
	Heard comments about sexual behavior someone would like to engage in with you or another person.	**.704**	.036	.108	.038
Undermining Claims of Discrimination	Heard that women are not able to have a fair competition because when they lose, they typically complain about being discriminated against.	.019	**.912**	-.224	.046
	Heard that women interpret innocent remarks as sexist.	.052	**.709**	.107	-.082
	Heard people say that discrimination is a thing of the past and women should stop complaining.	-.021	**.705**	.087	-.046
	Heard people say that women push themselves where they are not wanted.	.039	**.683**	-.110	.146
	Heard negative attitudes about gender equality.	-.051	**.611**	.325	-.089
	Not being taken seriously when making a complaint about a sexist incident.	.078	**.586**	.146	-.025
Hearing Hostility Towards Women	Heard sexist jokes.	.112	.046	**.747**	-.124
	Use of derogatory terms to refer to women or men (e.g., bitch, chick, bastard, faggot).	.286	-.142	**.669**	-.039
	Use of sexist language (e.g., referring to all people as ''men,'' a person of an unknown gender as ''he,'' or using nonparallel structure such as refer to women as ''girls'' while not calling men ''boys'').	.048	.041	**.663**	-.048
	Heard traditional negative beliefs that women were not able to do things as well as men (e.g., low ability with math, sports, cars, or leadership).	-.064	.097	**.551**	.222
	Heard hostile beliefs about women (e.g., women are too easily offended or exaggerate problems at work).	-.052	.22	**.470**	.224
	Heard negative things about feminists.	-.087	.393	**.406**	.002
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	Heard traditional beliefs about relationships (e.g., men are incomplete without women and that every man ought to have a woman whom he adores).	.061	.130	-.198	**.826**
	Heard paternalistic stereotypes about women (e.g., women should be cherished and protected by men).	.002	-.057	.078	**.807**
	Heard complementary beliefs about women and men (e.g., men and women are different but complement each other).	.005	-.056	.033	**.650**
	Heard traditional positive stereotypes about women (e.g., women are better at certain things than men like cooking, shopping, and childcare).	-.036	-.051	.423	**.437**

McDonald et al, (2016) Experiences of Sexism Items

		1	2	3
Minimizing on Basis of Gender	Your views not being listened to until they are re-stated by a man.	**.875**	-.015	.077
	Someone not trusting information you provide until a man confirms it.	**.799**	.041	.026
	A man interrupting or talking over you in meetings.	**.756**	.136	-.095
	A man explaining something to you that you already have skills or knowledge about.	**.729**	-.027	.071

Career Stereotyping	Being excluded from important tasks or decision making because you are a woman.	.039	**.836**	.005
	Being greeted or introduced on the basis of being a woman (e.g. in terms of personal/family role such as mother) rather than your work role.	-.063	**.710**	.076
	Someone assuming that you do not want a particular career opportunity or role (e.g. an operational or factory role) because you are a woman.	.130	**.700**	.027
	Someone assuming you do not hold a senior role at work or that you are in a subordinate role to a male colleague.	.176	**.645**	-.091
Body Policing	*Being told you were employed for the way you look rather than your skills, knowledge, or abilities.*	*-.110*	***.419***	***.405***
Patrolling Femininity	Being criticized for not behaving "like a woman should".	-.086	.118	**.794**
	Being called too emotional.	.115	-.095	**.719**
	Being accused of being too bossy or not assertive enough.	.264	.009	**.525**

Note. Italicized item was removed from the final scale.

Men's Own Reported Experiences of Sexism Compared to Their Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences

In Study 1, I tested whether men perceived that their partner experienced more sexism than they themselves reported experiencing using paired-samples t-tests. As shown in Table S3, men generally perceived that their partner experienced more sexism than they themselves did across most domains, with the exception of hearing undermining responses to claims of discrimination. This pattern suggests that men recognized sexism as something their women partners encounter more frequently than they do themselves.

Table S3

Comparison between Men's Own Experiences and Men's Perceptions of Their Partners Experiences

	Men's Own			Men's Perception of Partner			Differences Between Men's Own and Men's Perception of Their Partner					
	M	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*LL*	*UL*	*d*
Experiencing Objectification	2.23	1.04	553	2.85	0.99	558	-13.31	551	<.001***	-0.71	-0.53	-0.57
Witnessing Objectification	2.18	0.97	553	2.70	0.93	558	-12.33	551	<.001***	-0.60	-0.43	-0.52
Undermining Claims of Discrimination	2.73	0.88	553	2.78	0.83	555	-1.30	548	.194	-0.10	0.02	-0.06
Hearing Hostility Towards Women	3.04	0.81	553	3.11	0.77	559	-2.75	552	.006**	-0.13	-0.02	-0.12
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	3.15	0.87	553	3.30	0.78	558	-4.76	551	<.001***	-0.21	-0.09	-0.20

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$.

Study 2 Supplemental Analyses

Measurement Invariance Tests

In Study 2, I tested measurement invariance of experiences of sexism and moderator variables by gender. Specifically, I tested measurement invariance for the full Becker and Swim (2011) scale and the accompanying subscales, where I separated the objectification subscale into two categories: *experiencing* and *witnessing*, as this subscale had items that related to both being the direct target of objectification and witnessing objectification. I also included moderator variables, including benevolent and hostile sexism entered together as well as separately, greater awareness of sexism, and allyship. Tests of measurement invariance across gender revealed mixed evidence for equivalence across men and women (Table S4). While configural invariance was generally supported, several measures failed to meet criteria for metric and, more consistently, scalar invariance, indicating that some constructs may not be measured equivalently across gender. As scalar invariance is required for valid mean comparisons, these results suggest that mean-level differences between men and women should be interpreted with caution. Notably, because the research in Study 2 focuses on within-dyad perceptual processes rather than between-gender comparisons, these limitations do not compromise the primary analyses.

Table S4
Study 2 Measurement Invariance Tests

Measure	χ^2	*df*	RMSEA	CFI	ΔCFI	TLI	SRMR	PASS/FAIL
Becker & Swim Full Scale								
Configural	2153.35	418	0.13	0.70	–	0.67	0.10	–
Metric	2291.20	439	0.13	0.68	-0.02	0.66	0.12	Fail
Scalar	2653.69	460	0.13	0.62	-0.06	0.62	0.13	Fail
All Objectification Items								
Configural	122.49	18	0.15	0.93	–	0.89	0.06	–
Metric	142.32	23	0.14	0.92	-0.01	0.90	0.07	Fail
Scalar	183.21	28	0.15	0.90	-0.02	0.89	0.10	Fail
Experiencing Objectification Items								
Configural	0.00	0	0.00	1.00	–	1.00	0.00	–
Metric	2.81	2	0.04	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.02	**Pass**

Scalar	4.50	4	0.02	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.02	**Pass**
Witnessing Objectification Items								
Configural	0.00	0	0.00	1.00	–	1.00	0.00	–
Metric	10.34	2	0.13	0.98	-0.02	0.93	0.04	Fail
Scalar	29.95	4	0.16	0.93	-0.05	0.89	0.07	Fail
Undermining Claims of Discrimination								
Configural	28.00	18	0.05	0.99	–	0.98	0.03	–
Metric	47.13	23	0.06	0.97	-0.02	0.96	0.06	Fail
Scalar	76.82	28	0.08	0.94	-0.03	0.94	0.08	Fail
Hearing Hostility Towards Women								
Configural	64.19	18	0.10	0.96	–	0.94	0.03	–
Metric	68.54	23	0.09	0.96	0.00	0.95	0.04	**Pass**
Scalar	73.83	28	0.08	0.96	0.00	0.96	0.04	**Pass**
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles								
Configural	5.79	4	0.04	1.00	–	0.99	0.01	–
Metric	7.98	7	0.02	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.02	**Pass**
Scalar	25.50	10	0.08	0.98	-0.02	0.98	0.05	Fail
Benevolent and Hostile Sexism								
Configural	1016.01	108	0.18	0.69	–	0.62	0.12	–
Metric	1065.81	119	0.17	0.68	-0.01	0.64	0.13	Fail
Scalar	1094.66	130	0.17	0.67	-0.01	0.67	0.13	**Pass**
Benevolent Sexism								
Configural	140.16	18	0.16	0.90	–	0.84	0.05	–
Metric	142.73	23	0.14	0.91	0.00	0.88	0.06	**Pass**
Scalar	164.26	28	0.14	0.89	-0.01	0.89	0.06	Fail
Hostile Sexism								
Configural	64.91	18	0.10	0.97	–	0.95	0.03	–
Metric	73.37	23	0.09	0.97	0.00	0.96	0.05	**Pass**
Scalar	80.39	28	0.08	0.96	0.00	0.96	0.05	**Pass**
Allyship								
Configural	0.00	0	0.00	1.00	–	1.00	0.00	–
Metric	13.41	2	0.15	0.98	-0.02	0.93	0.06	Fail
Scalar	33.90	4	0.17	0.94	-0.04	0.91	0.08	Fail
Awareness of Women in General - All Experiences								
Configural	4268.53	990	0.11	0.82	–	0.81	0.06	–
Metric	4301.84	1,022	0.11	0.82	0.00	0.81	0.06	**Pass**
Scalar	4353.48	1,054	0.11	0.82	0.00	0.82	0.06	**Pass**

Note. Tests of measurement invariance across gender revealed that for many of the outcomes strong measurement invariance was not achieved. Comparisons of means across men and women require item loadings and intercepts to be equivalent across gender. Among the 10 focal outcome measures (excluding the full Becker and Swim scale and the combined benevolent and hostile sexism measure), four failed to demonstrate metric invariance and six failed to demonstrate scalar invariance.

Correlations Between Experiences of Sexism Subcategories

As shown in Table S5, men's and women's own experiences of sexism, perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism, perceptions of women in general's experiences of sexism, and partners' self-reported experiences of sexism were all positively and significantly associated across measures and subscales. These findings suggest that sexist experiences and perceptions were consistently associated across measures and perspectives.

Table S5
Study 2 Correlations Between Experiences of Sexism Subcategories by Gender

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Own Experiences	1. Experiencing Sexism	–	.59***	.33***	.36***	.25***	.33***	.27***	.	.	.	.69***	.55***	.35***	.29***	.35***	.32***	.27***	.27***	.26***	.25***	.41***	.21***	.22***	.20**	.23***	.25***	.25***	.22***	.24***
	2. Witnessing Sexism	.76***	–	.28***	.46***	.32***	.55***	.36***	.	.	.	.69***	.84***	.39***	.46***	.43***	.47***	.32***	.36***	.40***	.35***	.68***	.45***	.47***	.41***	.49***	.36***	.46***	.43***	.42***
	3. Experiencing Objectification	.47***	.40***	–	.46***	.36***	.33***	.17**	.	.	.	.32***	.29***	.39***	.31***	.29***	.29***	.22***	.25***	.26***	.27***	.22***	.21***	.20**	.13*	.18**	.12*	.18**	.17**	.17**
	4. Witnessing Objectification	.53***	.48***	.81***	–	.42***	.54***	.30***	.	.	.	.44***	.46***	.49***	.57***	.46***	.54***	.38***	.38***	.41***	.39***	.40***	.43***	.45***	.32***	.42***	.31***	.35***	.34***	.35***
	5. Undermining Claims of Discrimination	.42***	.46***	.54***	.62***	–	.68***	.50***	.	.	.	.34***	.30***	.37***	.39***	.64***	.56***	.47***	.49***	.47***	.48***	.27***	.27***	.30***	.41***	.37***	.33***	.32***	.29***	.34***
	6. Hearing Hostility Towards Women	.50***	.57***	.56***	.68***	.75***	–	.70***	.	.	.	.47***	.51***	.47***	.57***	.66***	.80***	.68***	.49***	.54***	.47***	.48***	.55***	.61***	.58***	.70***	.57***	.51***	.49***	.55***
	7. Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	.22***	.30***	.28***	.31***	.48***	.60***	–	.	.	.	.35***	.35***	.28***	.35***	.50***	.59***	.80***	.35***	.38***	.32***	.33***	.37***	.43***	.45***	.51***	.60***	.36***	.36***	.42***
	8. Career Stereotyping	.58***	.52***	.47***	.54***	.62***	.57***	.36***	–	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	9. Minimizing on Basis of Gender	.62***	.57***	.51***	.58***	.63***	.64***	.34***	.80***	–	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	10. 10. Patrolling Femininity	.48***	.44***	.49***	.52***	.58***	.51***	.32***	.65***	.67***	–	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Perceptions of Partner	11. Experiencing Sexism	.46***	.40***	.22***	.24***	.27***	.23***	.14*	.29***	.23***	.21***	–	.81***	.54***	.56***	.53***	.55***	.38***	.49***	.54***	.47***	.61***	.45***	.49***	.43***	.45***	.39***	.48***	.46***	.45***
	12. Witnessing Sexism	.50***	.72***	.17**	.23***	.31***	.36***	.18**	.23***	.30***	.24***	.53***	–	.48***	.55***	.51***	.57***	.39***	.42***	.50***	.42***	.70***	.49***	.54***	.46***	.52***	.38***	.49***	.47***	.48***
	13. Experiencing Objectification	.19**	.19**	.38***	.30***	.34***	.26***	.27***	.31***	.30***	.38***	.38***	.27***	–	.85***	.65***	.64***	.43***	.49***	.56***	.57***	.36***	.52***	.52***	.43***	.48***	.37***	.40***	.38***	.46***
	14. Witnessing Objectification	.24***	.24***	.37***	.46***	.41***	.43***	.27***	.31***	.33***	.31***	.37***	.36***	.60***	–	.73***	.75***	.52***	.52***	.60***	.60***	.43***	.56***	.62***	.51***	.56***	.44***	.47***	.46***	.53***
	15. Undermining Claims of Discrimination	.42***	.42***	.40***	.52***	.72***	.64***	.41***	.51***	.59***	.51***	.32***	.39***	.46***	.60***	–	.80***	.60***	.63***	.66***	.60***	.36***	.42***	.48***	.57***	.53***	.48***	.47***	.44***	.50***
	16. Hearing Hostility Towards Women	.38***	.43***	.39***	.48***	.57***	.74***	.48***	.42***	.53***	.45***	.24***	.40***	.36***	.53***	.77***	–	.76***	.61***	.68***	.59***	.47***	.57***	.64***	.63***	.71***	.60***	.53***	.52***	.59***
	17. Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	.24***	.31***	.19**	.27***	.40***	.50***	.70***	.30***	.33***	.35***	.24***	.31***	.34***	.41***	.58***	.69***	–	.41***	.48***	.41***	.35***	.44***	.51***	.49***	.57***	.63***	.37***	.37***	.47***
	18. Career Stereotyping	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	–	.82***	.73***	.38***	.37***	.42***	.50***	.47***	.39***	.56***	.52***	.49***
	19. Minimizing on Basis of Gender	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	–	.71***	.45***	.51***	.55***	.54***	.55***	.42***	.57***	.62***	.55***
	20. Patrolling Femininity	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	–	.37***	.41***	.44***	.50***	.48***	.41***	.48***	.45***	.53***

	21.	Experiencing Sexism	.51***	.57***	.36***	.42***	.33***	.46***	.24***	.36***	.42***	.34***	.31***	.43***	.18**	.30***	.30***	.34***	.23***	.	.	.	–	.70***	.68***	.62***	.68***	.53***	.66***	.65***	.63***
	22.	Experiencing Objectification	.41***	.39***	.52***	.52***	.40***	.60***	.37***	.34***	.44***	.40***	.14*	.29***	.19**	.30***	.40***	.49***	.30***	.	.	.	.59***	–	.88***	.77***	.84***	.66***	.71***	.73***	.77***
	23.	Witnessing Objectification	.45***	.44***	.50***	.58***	.46***	.66***	.42***	.42***	.51***	.47***	.14***	.30***	.19**	.35***	.46***	.53***	.32***	.	.	.	.59***	.89***	–	.82***	.87***	.71***	.74***	.76***	.78***
	24.	Undermining Claims of Discrimination	.39***	.40***	.37***	.49***	.56***	.63***	.46***	.46***	.54***	.48***	.17***	.31***	.19**	.33***	.54***	.53***	.36***	.	.	.	.53***	.77***	.83***	–	.86***	.77***	.80***	.78***	.80***
Perceptions of Women in General	25.	Hearing Hostility Towards Women	.46***	.46***	.40***	.50***	.53***	.73***	.48***	.46***	.56***	.48***	.21***	.34***	.18**	.32***	.51***	.62***	.41***	.	.	.	.56***	.81***	.83***	.85***	–	.81***	.77***	.77***	.82***
	26.	Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	.30***	.35***	.25***	.31***	.41***	.52***	.62***	.33***	.40***	.36***	.14*	.25***	.17**	.23***	.38***	.42***	.52***	.	.	.	.38***	.57***	.61***	.70***	.72***	–	.66***	.65***	.74***
	27.	Career Stereotyping	.44***	.46***	.35***	.44***	.47***	.60***	.40***	.51***	.59***	.47***	.19**	.30***	.14*	.26***	.43***	.45***	.34***	.	.	.	.56***	.65***	.70***	.76***	.78***	.67***	–	.90***	.84***
	28.	Minimizing on Basis of Gender	.47***	.49***	.36***	.46***	.47***	.63***	.36***	.51***	.66***	.49***	.18**	.31***	.13*	.27***	.47***	.50***	.33***	.	.	.	.57***	.66***	.71***	.75***	.79***	.63***	.89***	–	.83***
	29.	Patrolling Femininity	.41***	.43***	.36***	.44***	.46***	.59***	.42***	.42***	.50***	.57***	.14*	.29***	.14*	.24***	.43***	.48***	.38***	.	.	.	.54***	.67***	.72***	.74***	.80***	.66***	.82***	.80***	–

Note. Correlations for men appear above the diagonal; correlations for women appear below the diagonal. Men do not report on their own experiences of sexism across the Everyday Sexism Survey subscales (McDonald et al., 2016), and women do not report on their perceptions of partners' experiences of sexism across the Everyday Sexism Survey subscales (McDonald et al., 2016). ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05.

Dyadic Truth and Bias Models of Men's and Women's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism

Although I pre-registered that I would test Truth and Bias models using a nested structure, with partners' reports (Level 1) nested within the dyad (Level 2), where the perceiver's judgements of their partner's experiences of sexism (men in most models for most of my focal predictions) would be centered around the partner's reported experiences of sexism (women's self-reports for most of my focal predictions), allowing the intercept to represent the difference between the average partner's (i.e. women's) reported experiences of sexism and the average perceiver's judgements of their partner's (i.e. men's) experiences of sexism, I realized that the benchmark ("truth") would represent both men's and women's actual experiences. Since my central questions focused on men, and whether men's perceptions of their women partners' experiences of sexism were accurate (i.e., aligned with their partners' self-reports) or systematically biased (i.e., over- or underestimating those experiences), whether these perceptions were shaped by men's sexist attitudes, whether women's disclosure and couples' discussions of sexism were associated with men's perceptual accuracy and bias, and whether greater accuracy and reduced bias in men's perceptions were associated with greater awareness of sexism and stronger allyship, I ran a series of partial Truth and Bias models to test these questions with men as the perceivers and women's reports as the "truth" criterion.

In the dyadic models, the pattern of results is largely the same as in the partial models (Table S6). When examining men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of sexism using dyadic Truth and Bias models, there is an average overperception bias for men, where men overperceive nearly all of their romantic partners' experiences of sexism, with the exception of hearing hostility towards women and paternalism and complementary gender roles. In contrast,

women's perceptions of their men partners' experiences of sexism largely showed an underperception bias, underperceiving all of their partners' experiences of sexism with the exception of hearing hostility towards women. Both men and women were accurate across all experiences of sexism, with one exception of men's perceptions of paternalism and complementary gender roles. Both men's and women's perceptions showed projection effects, in which they relied on their own experiences when perceiving the experiences of their partner, across scales and subscales of sexism.

Tests of gender differences revealed significant gender differences in directional bias, such that men demonstrated greater overestimation of their partners' experiences of sexism, whereas women demonstrated greater underestimation across most subcategories, with the exception of hearing hostility towards women (Table S6). In contrast, only one significant gender difference emerged for accuracy for frequency of experiencing sexism, suggesting that men's and women's perceptions tracked their partners' self-reported experiences to a comparable extent. However, significant gender differences were observed for projection, with men exhibiting stronger projection effects than women, indicating that men relied more heavily on their own experiences when forming judgements about their women partners' experiences of sexism.

Table S6

Dyadic Models of Men's and Women's Perceptions of Their Partners' Experiences of Sexism

	Dyadic Models						Gender Difference Tests						
Subcategories of Sexism	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*		*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism													
Directional Bias (Man)	1.20	0.09	1.02	1.39	12.85	<.001***	Directional Bias	2.26	0.14	1.99	2.52	16.52	<.001***
Directional Bias (Woman)	-1.05	0.09	-1.24	-0.87	-11.22	<.001***	Accuracy	0.15	0.06	0.03	0.26	2.41	.016*
Accuracy*Man	0.31	0.04	0.23	0.39	7.33	<.001***	Projection	0.38	0.06	0.26	0.50	6.25	<.001***
Accuracy*Woman	0.16	0.04	0.08	0.25	3.67	<.001***							
Projection*Man	0.68	0.04	0.60	0.77	15.62	<.001***							
Projection*Woman	0.31	0.04	0.22	0.39	7.22	<.001***							
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism													
Directional Bias (Man)	0.59	0.09	0.42	0.76	6.96	<.001***	Directional Bias	0.96	0.13	0.71	1.21	7.67	<.001***
Directional Bias (Woman)	-0.37	0.09	-0.54	-0.20	-4.30	<.001***	Accuracy	0.02	0.05	-0.09	0.13	0.40	.693
Accuracy*Man	0.13	0.04	0.05	0.20	3.19	.002**	Projection	0.15	0.05	0.04	0.26	2.79	.005**
Accuracy*Woman	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.18	2.70	.007**							
Projection*Man	0.80	0.04	0.72	0.87	21.06	<.001***							
Projection*Woman	0.65	0.04	0.57	0.72	16.37	<.001***							
Experiencing Objectification													
Directional Bias (Man)	0.36	0.06	0.23	0.48	5.75	<.001***	Directional Bias	0.62	0.09	0.44	0.80	6.83	<.001***
Directional Bias (Woman)	-0.26	0.06	-0.39	-0.14	-4.31	<.001***	Accuracy	0.04	0.08	-0.12	0.20	0.51	.611
Accuracy*Man	0.44	0.05	0.35	0.54	9.06	<.001***	Projection	0.12	0.08	-0.03	0.28	1.59	.113
Accuracy*Woman	0.40	0.06	0.28	0.53	6.28	<.001***							
Projection*Man	0.36	0.06	0.23	0.48	5.59	<.001***							
Projection*Woman	0.23	0.05	0.14	0.32	4.80	<.001***							
Witnessing Objectification													
Directional Bias (Man)	0.22	0.05	0.12	0.32	4.40	<.001***	Directional Bias	0.62	0.08	0.47	0.77	8.09	<.001***
Directional Bias (Woman)	-0.39	0.05	-0.49	-0.29	-7.73	<.001***	Accuracy	0.15	0.08	0.00	0.30	1.93	.055

Accuracy*Man	0.30	0.05	0.20	0.40	5.82	<.001***	Projection	0.16	0.08	0.01	0.31	2.04	.042*
Accuracy*Woman	0.15	0.06	0.03	0.27	2.42	.016*							
Projection*Man	0.54	0.06	0.42	0.66	8.83	<.001***							
Projection*Woman	0.38	0.05	0.28	0.48	7.46	<.001***							
Undermining Claims of Discrimination													
Directional Bias (Man)	0.28	0.04	0.20	0.36	7.03	<.001***	Directional Bias	0.36	0.06	0.26	0.47	6.57	<.001***
Directional Bias (Woman)	-0.09	0.04	-0.16	-0.01	-2.23	.026*	Accuracy	0.05	0.08	-0.10	0.20	0.63	.532
Accuracy*Man	0.19	0.05	0.09	0.29	3.67	<.001***	Projection	-0.01	0.08	-0.16	0.15	-0.09	.928
Accuracy*Woman	0.14	0.06	0.02	0.25	2.38	.018*							
Projection*Man	0.69	0.06	0.57	0.81	11.56	<.001***							
Projection*Woman	0.70	0.05	0.60	0.80	13.68	<.001***							
Hearing Hostility Towards Women													
Directional Bias (Man)	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.08	0.42	.674	Directional Bias	0.07	0.05	-0.03	0.17	1.29	.196
Directional Bias (Woman)	-0.05	0.03	-0.12	0.02	-1.52	.128	Accuracy	-0.07	0.06	-0.19	0.06	-1.07	.286
Accuracy*Man	0.10	0.04	0.01	0.19	2.28	.023*	Projection	0.05	0.06	-0.08	0.17	0.75	.454
Accuracy*Woman	0.17	0.05	0.08	0.26	3.60	<.001***							
Projection*Man	0.82	0.05	0.73	0.91	17.26	<.001***							
Projection*Woman	0.77	0.04	0.69	0.86	17.95	<.001***							
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles													
Directional Bias (Man)	-0.02	0.04	-0.09	0.05	-0.69	.488	Directional Bias	0.15	0.05	0.05	0.25	2.95	.003**
Directional Bias (Woman)	-0.17	0.04	-0.25	-0.10	-4.89	<.001***	Accuracy	-0.11	0.06	-0.23	0.02	-1.66	.098
Accuracy*Man	0.06	0.04	-0.03	0.14	1.27	.206	Projection	0.09	0.06	-0.04	0.21	1.35	.177
Accuracy*Woman	0.16	0.05	0.07	0.26	3.47	<.001***							
Projection*Man	0.80	0.05	0.71	0.89	17.09	<.001***							
Projection*Woman	0.71	0.04	0.62	0.80	15.86	<.001***							

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Men's and Women's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences of Sexism

I also ran partial Truth and Bias models examining women's perceptions of their men partners' experiences of sexism; these results are presented alongside men's perceptions in Table S7. The men's models reproduce the primary analyses reported in Table 11 of the thesis, whereas the novel contribution in Table S7 is the inclusion of women's perceptions of their men partners' experiences of sexism. As reported in the main paper, men generally overestimated their women partners' experiences of sexism. Specifically, men showed significant overestimation bias for their partners' reports of directly experiencing sexism, witnessing sexism, directly experiencing objectification, witnessing objectification, undermining claims of discrimination, and career stereotyping, and underperceived only their partners' experiences of patrolling femininity. Running corresponding analyses for women showed that women's perceptions of their men partners' experiences were more variable. Women underperceived their partners' reports of directly experiencing sexism, witnessing objectification, and paternalism and complementary gender roles, while directional bias was less consistent across the remaining domains. Despite these differences in bias, both men and women showed strong evidence of accuracy and projection across most subcategories, indicating that perceivers' judgements were shaped by both their partners' reported experiences and their own experiences. The only exception was women's accuracy in judging men's experiences of paternalism and complementary gender roles, which was not significant.

Table S7

Men's and Women's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences of Sexism

Subcategories of Sexism	Men's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences						Women's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences					
	b	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism												
Directional Bias	1.20	0.10	1.00	1.40	11.72	<.001***	-0.82	0.09	-0.99	-0.64	-8.97	<.001***
Accuracy	0.31	0.04	0.22	0.39	6.91	<.001***	0.16	0.04	0.08	0.24	3.81	<.001***
Projection	0.69	0.05	0.59	0.78	14.83	<.001***	0.31	0.04	0.23	0.38	7.67	<.001***
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism												
Directional Bias	0.59	0.08	0.44	0.74	7.59	<.001***	-0.35	0.09	-0.53	-0.16	-3.71	<.001***
Accuracy	0.13	0.04	0.06	0.20	3.58	<.001***	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.18	2.38	.018*
Projection	0.80	0.03	0.73	0.87	23.15	<.001***	0.65	0.04	0.56	0.73	15.05	<.001***
Becker & Swim Full Scale												
Directional Bias	0.25	0.03	0.18	0.32	7.41	<.001***	-0.18	0.03	-0.24	-0.11	-5.19	<.001***
Accuracy	0.15	0.04	0.06	0.23	3.31	.001**	0.18	0.06	0.07	0.30	3.26	.001**
Projection	0.92	0.05	0.81	1.02	17.24	<.001***	0.67	0.05	0.58	0.76	14.26	<.001***
Experiencing Objectification												
Directional Bias	0.25	0.08	0.10	0.41	3.18	.002**	-0.10	0.06	-0.22	0.02	-1.63	.104
Accuracy	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.54	8.70	<.001***	0.39	0.06	0.28	0.51	6.55	<.001***
Projection	0.34	0.07	0.21	0.48	5.12	<.001***	0.24	0.05	0.15	0.33	5.24	<.001***
Witnessing Objectification												
Directional Bias	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.28	3.43	<.001***	-0.27	0.05	-0.38	-0.17	-5.03	<.001***
Accuracy	0.30	0.05	0.20	0.39	6.09	<.001***	0.15	0.06	0.02	0.27	2.33	.021*
Projection	0.54	0.06	0.42	0.65	9.16	<.001***	0.38	0.05	0.28	0.49	7.19	<.001***
Undermining Claims of Discrimination												
Directional Bias	0.26	0.04	0.17	0.34	5.95	<.001***	-0.06	0.04	-0.13	0.01	-1.58	.115
Accuracy	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.29	3.39	<.001***	0.15	0.06	0.04	0.26	2.66	.008**
Projection	0.69	0.06	0.57	0.81	11.08	<.001***	0.69	0.05	0.59	0.79	14.19	<.001***
Hearing Hostility Towards Women												

Directional Bias	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.06	0.10	.919	-0.05	0.04	-0.13	0.03	-1.25	.212
Accuracy	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.18	2.62	.009**	0.17	0.05	0.06	0.27	3.17	.002**
Projection	0.82	0.04	0.74	0.90	19.82	<.001***	0.78	0.05	0.68	0.87	16.02	<.001***
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles												
Directional Bias	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.03	-0.86	.390	-0.17	0.04	-0.25	-0.09	-4.28	<.001***
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.47	.143	0.17	0.05	0.06	0.27	3.13	.002**
Projection	0.80	0.04	0.72	0.88	19.82	<.001***	0.71	0.05	0.61	0.81	14.12	<.001***
McDonald et al. (2016) Full Scale												
Directional Bias	0.00	0.04	-0.09	0.08	-0.06	.952	–	–	–	–	–	–
Accuracy	0.53	0.05	0.43	0.63	10.66	<.001	–	–	–	–	–	–
Career Stereotyping												
Directional Bias	0.14	0.05	0.04	0.23	2.76	.006**	–	–	–	–	–	–
Accuracy	0.46	0.05	0.36	0.57	8.61	<.001***	–	–	–	–	–	–
Minimizing on Basis of Gender												
Directional Bias	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.96	.337	–	–	–	–	–	–
Accuracy	0.51	0.05	0.42	0.60	10.65	<.001***	–	–	–	–	–	–
Patrolling Femininity												
Directional Bias	-0.12	0.05	-0.21	-0.03	-2.72	.007**	–	–	–	–	–	–
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.54	8.95	<.001***	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Men's and Women's Perceptions of Women in General's Experiences of Sexism

I conducted exploratory analyses to examine men's and women's perceptions of women in general's experiences of sexism. As shown on the left side of Table S8, compared to women, men perceived women in general to experience *less* sexism across all subcategories. As shown in the middle of Table S8, men perceive that women in general experience *more* sexism than they perceived their women partners to experience across all subcategories. This pattern was consistent with women's own reports, shown in the right panel of Table S8, in which women likewise reported that women in general experience more sexism than they personally experience.

Table S8

Men's and Women's Perceptions of Women in General's Experiences of Sexism

	Men's Perceptions of Women in General		Men's Perceptions of Partner		Differences in Perceptions						Women's Perceptions of Women in General		Women's Own Experiences		Differences in Perceptions and Experiences					
Subcategories of Sexism	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*LL*	*UL*	*p*	*d*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*LL*	*UL*	*p*	*d*
Experiencing Objectification	3.62	0.96	2.85	0.99	17.63	264	0.90	1.13	<.001***	1.08	3.90	0.86	2.92	0.99	21.99	264	1.12	1.33	<.001***	1.35
Witnessing Objectification	3.42	0.97	2.70	0.93	15.51	264	0.69	0.89	<.001***	0.95	3.76	0.88	2.78	0.95	19.84	264	0.92	1.13	<.001***	1.22
Undermining Claims of Discrimination	3.15	0.86	2.78	0.83	12.80	264	0.52	0.71	<.001***	0.79	3.46	0.87	2.74	0.85	20.13	264	0.88	1.07	<.001***	1.24
Hearing Hostility Towards Women	3.45	0.86	3.11	0.77	10.03	264	0.31	0.47	<.001***	0.62	3.78	0.80	3.23	0.80	14.48	264	0.46	0.60	<.001***	0.89
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles	3.29	0.79	3.30	0.78	4.62	264	0.11	0.28	<.001***	0.28	3.51	0.79	3.30	0.80	7.73	264	0.26	0.43	<.001***	0.47
Career Stereotyping	3.03	0.90	2.38	0.94	16.84	264	0.77	0.98	<.001***	1.03	3.36	0.88	2.24	0.94	24.88	264	1.24	1.45	<.001***	1.53
Minimizing on Basis of Gender	3.14	0.93	2.56	0.94	12.45	264	0.54	0.74	<.001***	0.76	3.49	0.93	2.66	1.04	18.75	264	0.84	1.04	<.001***	1.15
Patrolling Femininity	3.21	0.89	2.50	0.96	19.02	264	0.88	1.09	<.001***	1.17	3.57	0.86	2.52	1.01	24.02	264	1.12	1.33	<.001***	1.48

Note. $^{***}p < .001$.

The Role of Projection in the Models

Table S9 presents partial Truth and Bias models in which projection was excluded, allowing comparison with the full models reported in Table S8. Relative to the full models, removing projection changed the pattern of directional bias for both men and women. For men, overperception remained for the frequency of directly experiencing sexism, witnessing sexism, and minimizing on basis of gender. However, in the reduced models, men also showed significant underperception of their partners' experiences of hearing hostility towards women and patrolling femininity, effects that were not evident in the full models. Accuracy effects remained consistently significant across subcategories and were often larger than in the full models. For women, excluding projection also altered the pattern of bias: women's judgements of their partners' frequency of directly experiencing sexism shifted from underperception in the full models to overperception in the reduced models. Across subcategories, both men's and women's judgements continued to show robust truth effects, indicating that perceivers were still generally tracking their partners' reported experiences even when projection was not included in the model.

Table S9

Men's and Women's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences of Sexism without Projection Effects

Subcategories of Sexism	Men's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences						Women's Perceptions of Partners' Experiences					
	b	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism												
Directional Bias	0.58	0.13	0.33	0.83	4.57	<.001***	-0.54	0.09	-0.72	-0.36	-5.87	<.001***
Accuracy	0.45	0.06	0.34	0.57	7.69	<.001***	0.22	0.05	0.13	0.31	4.94	<.001***
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism												
Directional Bias	0.44	0.14	0.17	0.71	3.26	.001**	-0.22	0.13	-0.47	0.03	-1.74	.084
Accuracy	0.41	0.06	0.30	0.53	7.03	<.001***	0.31	0.05	0.21	0.42	5.88	<.001***
Experience Objectification												
Directional Bias	-0.07	0.05	-0.17	0.03	-1.44	.151	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.21	2.82	.005**
Accuracy	0.51	0.05	0.41	0.61	9.98	<.001***	0.48	0.06	0.36	0.60	7.87	<.001***
Witness Objectification												
Directional Bias	-0.09	0.05	-0.19	0.00	-1.87	.062	-0.08	0.05	-0.18	0.02	-1.52	.129
Accuracy	0.46	0.05	0.35	0.56	8.67	<.001***	0.31	0.06	0.18	0.43	4.74	<.001***
Undermining Claims of Discrimination												
Directional Bias	0.05	0.05	-0.04	0.14	1.03	.302	0.15	0.05	0.06	0.24	3.18	.002**
Accuracy	0.44	0.06	0.32	0.55	7.41	<.001***	0.49	0.07	0.36	0.62	7.25	<.001***
Hearing Hostility Towards Women												
Directional Bias	-0.19	0.05	-0.28	-0.10	-4.17	<.001***	0.14	0.05	0.03	0.24	2.63	.009**
Accuracy	0.36	0.06	0.24	0.47	6.28	<.001***	0.45	0.07	0.31	0.58	6.50	<.001***
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles												
Directional Bias	-0.07	0.05	-0.17	0.02	-1.55	.123	-0.13	0.05	-0.23	-0.02	-2.44	.016*
Accuracy	0.33	0.06	0.22	0.44	5.81	<.001***	0.43	0.07	0.30	0.56	6.61	<.001***
Career Stereotyping												
Directional Bias	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.96	.337	–	–	–	–	–	–
Accuracy	0.51	0.05	0.42	0.60	10.65	<.001***	–	–	–	–	–	–
Minimizing on Basis of Gender												
Directional Bias	0.14	0.05	0.04	0.23	2.76	.006**	–	–	–	–	–	–
Accuracy	0.46	0.05	0.36	0.57	8.61	<.001***	–	–	–	–	–	–
Patrolling Femininity												
Directional Bias	-0.12	0.05	-0.21	-0.03	-2.72	.007**	–	–	–	–	–	–
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.54	8.95	<.001***	–	–	–	–	–	–

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Moderation of Broader Awareness

Overall, when using the single-item measure of men's broader awareness of sexism, the effects for bias, accuracy, and projection remained largely unchanged, with two exceptions: men overperceived their partners' experiences of career stereotyping and were more accurate in perceiving their partners' experiences of hearing hostility towards women (Table S10). Moderations of broader awareness also showed a largely similar pattern of results. However, broader awareness no longer significantly moderated bias for men's perceptions of hearing hostility towards women or accuracy effects for men's perceptions of their partners' experiences of patrolling femininity. In contrast, men's broader awareness did moderate projection effects for frequency of experiencing sexism, with men who reported greater broader awareness relying more heavily on their own experiences when judging their partners' frequency of experiencing sexism.

Table S10
Moderations of Greater Awareness Frequency Women's Experiences of Sexism (Single Item Measure) on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Experiences of Sexism

Experiences of Sexism	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.97	0.11	0.75	1.19	8.66	<.001***
Accuracy	0.17	0.04	0.09	0.25	4.03	<.001***
Projection	0.56	0.05	0.46	0.66	11.08	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.34	0.05	0.24	0.44	6.69	<.001***
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.10	3.77	<.001***
Projection*Broader Awareness	0.00	0.02	-0.04	0.04	-0.04	.972
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.66	0.09	0.48	0.85	7.17	<.001***
Accuracy	0.09	0.03	0.02	0.15	2.49	.013*
Projection	0.69	0.04	0.60	0.78	15.57	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.19	0.05	0.10	0.28	4.19	<.001***
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.06	2.02	.045*

Projection*Broader Awareness	-0.04	0.01	-0.07	-0.01	-2.61	.010*
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.22	0.08	0.06	0.38	2.66	.008**
Accuracy	0.41	0.05	0.31	0.51	8.05	<.001***
Projection	0.30	0.07	0.17	0.43	4.41	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.15	2.63	.009**
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	-0.02	0.02	-0.06	0.03	-0.77	.443
Projection*Broader Awareness	0.00	0.03	-0.05	0.06	0.14	.890
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.17	0.06	0.05	0.28	2.91	.004**
Accuracy	0.27	0.05	0.17	0.36	5.56	<.001***
Projection	0.47	0.06	0.35	0.59	7.61	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.11	2.43	.016*
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.00	0.02	-0.04	0.04	0.13	.893
Projection*Broader Awareness	-0.03	0.02	-0.08	0.02	-1.20	.232
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.25	0.04	0.16	0.33	5.70	<.001***
Accuracy	0.18	0.05	0.07	0.28	3.39	<.001***
Projection	0.63	0.06	0.51	0.75	10.08	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.09	3.02	.003**
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.06	0.70	.483
Projection*Broader Awareness	-0.03	0.02	-0.08	0.02	-1.23	.218
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	0.00	0.03	-0.07	0.07	-0.03	.976
Accuracy	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.16	2.23	.027*
Projection	0.78	0.05	0.69	0.87	16.92	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.06	1.89	.059
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.04	0.71	.477
Projection*Broader Awareness	-0.01	0.02	-0.05	0.02	-0.80	.425
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.02	-1.19	.237
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.55	.123
Projection	0.78	0.04	0.70	0.86	18.37	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.06	2.07	.040*
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.05	1.09	.276
Projection*Broader Awareness	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.04	0.49	.628
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.11	0.05	0.02	0.20	2.35	.019*
Accuracy	0.39	0.05	0.28	0.49	7.36	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.12	0.02	0.08	0.16	5.73	<.001***

Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.09	2.48	.014*
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.07	0.05	-0.16	0.03	-1.44	.152
Accuracy	0.42	0.05	0.33	0.51	9.05	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.14	0.02	0.10	0.18	6.60	<.001***
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.07	1.67	.096
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.13	0.04	-0.21	-0.04	-2.96	.003**
Accuracy	0.40	0.05	0.31	0.50	8.56	<.001***
Broader Awareness	0.11	0.02	0.08	0.15	6.00	<.001***
Accuracy*Broader Awareness	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.05	0.71	.478

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Control Variables

Overall, the pattern of results was unchanged when controlling for relationship length, general perspective-taking, and general disclosure. All accuracy, bias, and projection effects remained significant in the main models (see Table S11), and all effects of sexism, sexism disclosure/discussion, broader awareness of sexism, and allyship remained in the subsequent models (see Tables S12–15). The results suggest that the observed patterns of bias, accuracy, and projection were not explained by relationship duration, men's dispositional perspective-taking, or general tendencies toward disclosure within the relationship. Similarly, the limited effects of sexist attitudes, the stronger role of men's reports of discussions about sexism (relative to women's reports of disclosure), and the associations between men's perceptions and their broader awareness of sexism and allyship all remained consistent.

Table S11

Partial Truth and Bias Models of Men's Perceptions of Their Partners' Encounters with Sexism Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Subcategories of Sexism	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency of Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.19	0.10	0.99	1.40	11.66	<.001***
Accuracy	0.30	0.04	0.22	0.39	6.85	<.001***

Projection	0.68	0.05	0.59	0.77	14.59	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-1.62	.107
\	-0.10	0.14	-0.38	0.17	-0.74	.462
General Disclosure	0.15	0.14	-0.13	0.42	1.07	.285
Frequency of Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.59	0.08	0.44	0.74	7.64	<.001***
Accuracy	0.13	0.04	0.06	0.20	3.54	<.001***
Projection	0.79	0.03	0.72	0.86	22.96	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-2.78	.006**
Perspective-Taking	-0.09	0.12	-0.31	0.14	-0.74	.460
General Disclosure	0.00	0.11	-0.22	0.23	0.03	.977
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.24	0.08	0.09	0.40	3.09	.002**
Accuracy	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.54	8.73	<.001***
Projection	0.34	0.07	0.20	0.47	4.97	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.75	.452
Perspective-Taking	-0.13	0.07	-0.27	0.01	-1.86	.064
General Disclosure	0.20	0.07	0.06	0.34	2.82	.005**
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.18	0.05	0.07	0.28	3.35	<.001***
Accuracy	0.29	0.05	0.20	0.39	5.96	<.001***
Projection	0.53	0.06	0.41	0.64	8.99	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.09	.279
Perspective-Taking	-0.09	0.06	-0.21	0.04	-1.35	.178
General Disclosure	0.13	0.06	0.00	0.26	2.01	.045*
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.26	0.04	0.17	0.34	5.94	<.001***
Accuracy	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.29	3.37	<.001***
Projection	0.69	0.06	0.57	0.81	11.04	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.91	.361
Perspective-Taking	-0.05	0.06	-0.17	0.06	-0.89	.376
General Disclosure	0.05	0.06	-0.07	0.16	0.84	.402
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.06	0.09	.925
Accuracy	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.17	2.49	.013*
Projection	0.82	0.04	0.74	0.90	19.63	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.38	.170
Perspective-Taking	-0.01	0.04	-0.10	0.07	-0.30	.761
General Disclosure	0.03	0.04	-0.05	0.12	0.75	.456

Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.03	-0.88	.381
Accuracy	0.05	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.40	.162
Projection	0.79	0.04	0.71	0.87	19.67	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.82	.070
Perspective-Taking	-0.05	0.05	-0.14	0.04	-1.19	.235
General Disclosure	0.02	0.05	-0.07	0.11	0.41	.680
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.14	0.05	0.04	0.23	2.77	.006**
Accuracy	0.46	0.05	0.36	0.57	8.61	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.57	.566
Perspective-Taking	-0.11	0.07	-0.25	0.04	-1.47	.142
General Disclosure	0.12	0.07	-0.02	0.26	1.63	.103
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.97	.335
Accuracy	0.51	0.05	0.42	0.61	10.70	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.12	.906
Perspective-Taking	-0.17	0.07	-0.32	-0.03	-2.34	.020*
General Disclosure	0.11	0.07	-0.04	0.26	1.48	.141
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.12	0.04	-0.21	-0.04	-2.77	.006**
Accuracy	0.43	0.05	0.33	0.53	8.49	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.31	.192
Perspective-Taking	-0.22	0.07	-0.35	-0.09	-3.23	.001**
General Disclosure	0.17	0.07	0.04	0.30	2.53	.012*

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Moderations of Sexist Attitudes Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Table S12

Moderations of Benevolent and Hostile Sexism on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Encounters with Sexism Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Subcategories of Sexism	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.23	0.10	1.03	1.42	12.44	<.001***
Accuracy	0.26	0.05	0.17	0.35	5.76	<.001***
Projection	0.70	0.05	0.61	0.79	15.10	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	-0.06	0.09	-0.25	0.12	-0.67	.506
Hostile Sexism	-0.25	0.09	-0.41	-0.08	-2.89	.004**
Low Hostile Sexism	1.53	0.2	1.23	1.84	9.96	<.001***
High Hostile Sexism	0.89	0.2	0.58	1.19	5.78	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-1.86	.064
Perspective-Taking	-0.12	0.14	-0.41	0.16	-0.85	.395
General Disclosure	0.07	0.14	-0.20	0.34	0.50	.618
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.01	0.04	-0.08	0.07	-0.19	.852
Projection*Benevolent Sexism	-0.07	0.04	-0.15	0.02	-1.49	.138
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.05	-0.55	.583
Projection*Hostile Sexism	0.01	0.04	-0.06	0.09	0.41	.685
Frequency Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.59	0.08	0.43	0.74	7.49	<.001***
Accuracy	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.17	2.75	.006**
Projection	0.79	0.03	0.72	0.85	23.10	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	-0.03	0.07	-0.18	0.11	-0.44	.661
Hostile Sexism	-0.19	0.07	-0.33	-0.05	-2.67	.008**
Low Hostile Sexism	0.82	0.10	0.59	1.05	6.95	<.001***
High Hostile Sexism	0.34	0.10	0.09	0.58	2.70	.007**
Relationship Length	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-2.91	.004**
Perspective-Taking	-0.09	0.12	-0.32	0.15	-0.71	.481
General Disclosure	-0.03	0.11	-0.26	0.19	-0.28	.776
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.02	0.03	-0.09	0.05	-0.60	.550
Projection*Benevolent Sexism	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	-0.57	.566
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.03	-0.85	.398
Projection*Hostile Sexism	0.05	0.03	-0.01	0.11	1.62	.107
Experiencing Objectification						

Directional Bias	0.36	0.07	0.23	0.49	5.40	<.001***
Accuracy	0.42	0.05	0.32	0.53	8.15	<.001***
Projection	0.34	0.07	0.20	0.48	4.87	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	0.08	0.06	-0.05	0.21	1.26	.208
Hostile Sexism	-0.07	0.05	-0.17	0.04	-1.23	.221
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.76	.446
Perspective-Taking	-0.16	0.07	-0.31	-0.02	-2.18	.030*
General Disclosure	0.20	0.07	0.06	0.34	2.76	.006**
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.06	0.04	-0.14	0.02	-1.42	.156
Projection*Benevolent Sexism	-0.02	0.06	-0.15	0.10	-0.35	.726
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	0.03	0.04	-0.06	0.11	0.61	.545
Projection*Hostile Sexism	0.04	0.06	-0.08	0.15	0.64	.523
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.22	0.05	0.13	0.32	4.55	<.001***
Accuracy	0.28	0.05	0.18	0.38	5.66	<.001***
Projection	0.52	0.06	0.40	0.63	8.71	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.12	0.61	.541
Hostile Sexism	-0.04	0.04	-0.12	0.04	-0.95	.341
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.98	.326
Perspective-Taking	-0.09	0.07	-0.23	0.04	-1.38	.170
General Disclosure	0.11	0.06	-0.01	0.24	1.74	.083
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.05	0.04	-0.13	0.04	-1.10	.272
Projection*Benevolent Sexism	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.90	.371
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	-0.02	0.04	-0.11	0.06	-0.55	.581
Projection*Hostile Sexism	0.08	0.05	-0.02	0.18	1.50	.134
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.29	0.04	0.21	0.37	6.85	<.001***
Accuracy	0.15	0.06	0.04	0.26	2.67	.008**
Projection	0.73	0.06	0.60	0.86	11.28	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	0.00	0.04	-0.08	0.07	-0.12	.901
Hostile Sexism	-0.09	0.04	-0.16	-0.02	-2.46	.014*
Low Hostile Sexism	0.39	0.10	0.25	0.53	5.51	<.001***
High Hostile Sexism	0.16	0.10	0.04	0.28	2.63	.009**
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.09	.275
Perspective-Taking	-0.06	0.06	-0.18	0.06	-0.94	.348
General Disclosure	0.02	0.06	-0.10	0.14	0.34	.736
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	0.02	0.05	-0.08	0.11	0.36	.720
Projection*Benevolent Sexism	-0.09	0.06	-0.20	0.02	-1.53	.126
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	0.02	0.05	-0.08	0.12	0.43	.667

Projection*Hostile Sexism	0.00	0.05	-0.10	0.09	-0.08	.939
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.36	.721
Accuracy	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.16	2.22	.027
Projection	0.82	0.04	0.74	0.90	19.89	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.12	2.23	.026*
Low Benevolent Sexism	-0.10	0.10	-0.20	0.02	-1.52	.129
High Benevolent Sexism	0.07	0.10	-0.00	0.16	1.50	.135
Hostile Sexism	-0.05	0.03	-0.10	0.00	-2.00	.046*
Low Hostile Sexism	0.07	0.10	-0.00	0.16	1.44	.151
High Hostile Sexism	-0.10	0.10	-0.20	0.02	-1.47	.143
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.36	.176
Perspective-Taking	-0.04	0.05	-0.13	0.05	-0.87	.385
General Disclosure	0.03	0.04	-0.05	0.12	0.78	.439
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.07	0.03	-0.14	-0.01	-2.38	.018*
Low Benevolent Sexism	0.18	0.10	0.07	0.29	3.18	.002**
High Benevolent Sexism	-0.00	0.10	-0.10	0.10	-0.14	.887
Projection*Benevolent Sexism	0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.21	.833
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	-0.03	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.04	.300
Projection*Hostile Sexism	0.05	0.03	-0.02	0.11	1.46	.146
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.05	-0.50	.621
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.41	.159
Projection	0.79	0.04	0.71	0.87	19.32	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	-0.69	.488
Hostile Sexism	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.03	-0.86	.389
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.80	.073
Perspective-Taking	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.04	-1.12	.263
General Disclosure	0.02	0.05	-0.07	0.11	0.39	.695
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.14	.256
Projection*Benevolent Sexism	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.04	-0.77	.441
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.08	0.34	.737
Projection*Hostile Sexism	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.08	0.38	.706
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.22	2.56	.011*
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.56	8.38	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	-0.03	0.05	-0.12	0.06	-0.66	.512
Hostile Sexism	-0.01	0.04	-0.10	0.07	-0.29	.770
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.43	.668

Perspective-Taking	-0.11	0.08	-0.26	0.05	-1.38	.169
General Disclosure	0.11	0.07	-0.04	0.26	1.50	.136
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.06	0.05	-0.15	0.03	-1.31	.192
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	-0.04	0.04	-0.13	0.04	-1.00	.319
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.06	0.05	-0.16	0.04	-1.19	.237
Accuracy	0.49	0.05	0.40	0.59	10.04	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	0.02	0.05	-0.07	0.11	0.42	.676
Hostile Sexism	-0.05	0.04	-0.14	0.04	-1.11	.270
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.08	.939
Perspective-Taking	-0.19	0.08	-0.35	-0.04	-2.48	.014*
General Disclosure	0.11	0.08	-0.04	0.26	1.43	.153
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.07	0.04	-0.14	0.01	-1.72	.087
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	0.01	0.04	-0.06	0.08	0.29	.769
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.13	0.05	-0.22	-0.05	-2.98	.003**
Accuracy	0.42	0.05	0.32	0.52	8.36	<.001***
Benevolent Sexism	0.00	0.04	-0.08	0.08	-0.01	.990
Hostile Sexism	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.06	-0.43	.668
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.15	.251
Perspective-Taking	-0.22	0.07	-0.36	-0.08	-3.06	.002**
General Disclosure	0.17	0.07	0.03	0.30	2.45	.015*
Accuracy*Benevolent Sexism	-0.09	0.04	-0.16	-0.01	-2.26	.025*
Low Benevolent Sexism	0.53	0.10	0.39	0.67	7.67	<.001***
High Benevolent Sexism	0.31	0.10	0.18	0.45	4.50	<.001***
Accuracy*Hostile Sexism	0.03	0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.85	.396

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Moderation of Sexism Disclosure Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Table S13

Moderation of Women's Reported and Men's Discussions About Sexism with Their Partner on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Encounters with Sexism Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure.

	Women's Reported Sexism Disclosure to Partner						Men's Sexism Discussions with Partner					
Subcategories of Sexism	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency Experiencing Sexism												
Directional Bias	1.20	0.11	0.99	1.41	11.40	<.001***	1.16	0.11	0.96	1.37	11.00	<.001***
Accuracy	0.30	0.05	0.21	0.39	6.53	<.001***	0.28	0.04	0.19	0.36	6.28	<.001 ***
Projection	0.68	0.05	0.58	0.77	14.45	<.001***	0.65	0.05	0.56	0.74	13.74	<.001 ***
Sexism Disclosure	0.02	0.07	-0.11	0.16	0.36	.722	0.15	0.06	0.03	0.27	2.50	.013*
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-1.68	.095	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.01	-1.04	.300
Perspective-Taking	-0.10	0.14	-0.38	0.18	-0.71	.480	-0.17	0.14	-0.44	0.10	-1.21	.226
General Disclosure	0.12	0.14	-0.16	0.40	0.84	.402	0.08	0.14	-0.20	0.35	0.56	.575
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.05	-0.20	.844	0.05	0.02	0.00	0.10	2.14	.034*
Projection*Sexism Disclosure	-0.02	0.03	-0.07	0.04	-0.66	.511	-0.04	0.02	-0.09	0.01	-1.53	.128
Frequency Witnessing Sexism												
Directional Bias	0.58	0.08	0.42	0.73	7.34	<.001***	0.59	0.08	0.43	0.75	7.33	<.001***
Accuracy	0.11	0.04	0.04	0.18	2.97	.003**	0.13	0.04	0.06	0.20	3.77	<.001***
Projection	0.79	0.03	0.72	0.86	22.94	<.001***	0.76	0.04	0.69	0.83	21.02	<.001***
Sexism Disclosure	0.12	0.05	0.02	0.22	2.27	.024*	0.09	0.05	0.00	0.19	1.95	.052
Relationship Length	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-2.92	.004**	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-2.37	.019*
Perspective-Taking	-0.12	0.12	-0.35	0.11	-1.02	.307	-0.12	0.12	-0.34	0.11	-1.00	.318
General Disclosure	-0.05	0.12	-0.28	0.18	-0.41	.685	-0.04	0.11	-0.26	0.19	-0.31	.755
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.49	.627	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.10	2.90	.004**
Projection*Sexism Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.53	.600	-0.04	0.02	-0.08	0.00	-2.12	.035*
Experiencing Objectification												
Directional Bias	0.25	0.08	0.10	0.41	3.15	.002**	0.24	0.09	0.07	0.42	2.72	.007**
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.55	8.68	<.001***	0.44	0.05	0.33	0.54	8.42	<.001 ***
Projection	0.34	0.07	0.21	0.48	5.01	<.001***	0.32	0.07	0.18	0.47	4.35	<.001***
Sexism Disclosure	-0.04	0.05	-0.14	0.06	-0.84	.402	0.02	0.05	-0.08	0.12	0.42	.677
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.67	.505	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.52	.600
Perspective-Taking	-0.12	0.07	-0.27	0.02	-1.74	.084	-0.14	0.07	-0.28	0.00	-1.96	.051
General Disclosure	0.21	0.07	0.07	0.35	2.89	.004**	0.18	0.07	0.03	0.32	2.45	.015*
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.05	-0.18	.860	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.05	-0.15	.881

Projection*Sexism Disclosure	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.06	-0.51	.614	-0.03	0.04	-0.10	0.05	-0.65	.515
Witnessing Objectification												
Directional Bias	0.17	0.05	0.06	0.27	3.11	.002**	0.14	0.05	0.04	0.25	2.69	.008 **
Accuracy	0.29	0.05	0.19	0.39	5.79	<.001***	0.28	0.05	0.19	0.38	5.82	<.001***
Projection	0.52	0.06	0.41	0.64	8.87	<.001***	0.47	0.06	0.35	0.59	7.96	<.001 ***
Sexism Disclosure	0.00	0.04	-0.07	0.07	-0.06	.956	0.08	0.03	0.01	0.14	2.35	.019 *
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.03	.306	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.56	.573
Perspective-Taking	-0.10	0.07	-0.23	0.03	-1.46	.144	-0.13	0.06	-0.25	0.00	-1.97	.050
General Disclosure	0.14	0.07	0.01	0.27	2.05	.041*	0.09	0.06	-0.04	0.21	1.38	.169
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.08	0.92	.357	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.10	1.90	.059
Projection*Sexism Disclosure	0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.07	0.16	.872	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.03	-0.88	.379
Undermining Claims of Discrimination												
Directional Bias	0.24	0.05	0.16	0.33	5.44	<.001***	0.23	0.05	0.14	0.32	5.07	<.001***
Accuracy	0.17	0.06	0.06	0.28	3.06	.002**	0.17	0.05	0.06	0.27	3.07	.002**
Projection	0.68	0.06	0.55	0.80	10.64	<.001***	0.62	0.07	0.49	0.75	9.37	<.001***
Sexism Disclosure	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.07	0.54	.592	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.12	2.58	.010*
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.96	.336	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.28	.777
Perspective-Taking	-0.06	0.06	-0.17	0.06	-0.96	.340	-0.07	0.06	-0.19	0.04	-1.26	.207
General Disclosure	0.05	0.06	-0.07	0.17	0.78	.434	0.00	0.06	-0.11	0.12	0.07	.947
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.28	.779	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.11	1.95	.052
Projection*Sexism Disclosure	0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.98	.326	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.02	-1.22	.223
Hearing Hostility Towards Women												
Directional Bias	-0.01	0.03	-0.07	0.06	-0.19	.848	0.00	0.03	-0.07	0.06	-0.12	.905
Accuracy	0.09	0.04	0.01	0.17	2.32	.021**	0.09	0.04	0.02	0.17	2.37	.019*
Projection	0.81	0.04	0.73	0.90	19.11	<.001***	0.77	0.04	0.68	0.86	17.33	<.001***
Sexism Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.61	.541	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.09	2.67	.008**
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.26	.207	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.86	.390
Perspective-Taking	-0.02	0.05	-0.11	0.07	-0.53	.600	-0.03	0.04	-0.12	0.06	-0.71	.481
General Disclosure	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.12	0.68	.499	0.01	0.04	-0.08	0.10	0.18	.855
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.07	1.14	.257	0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.47	.636
Projection*Sexism Disclosure	0.00	0.03	-0.05	0.05	0.04	.965	-0.01	0.02	-0.06	0.03	-0.69	.488
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles												
Directional Bias	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.03	-0.86	.389	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	0.04	-0.79	.433
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.40	.162	0.05	0.04	-0.03	0.13	1.29	.198
Projection	0.79	0.04	0.71	0.88	19.28	<.001***	0.76	0.04	0.68	0.84	18.08	<.001***
Sexism Disclosure	-0.01	0.02	-0.05	0.03	-0.49	.621	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.08	2.41	.017*
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.75	.081	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.38	.169

Perspective-Taking	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.04	-1.16	.245	-0.06	0.05	-0.15	0.03	-1.34	.180
General Disclosure	0.02	0.05	-0.07	0.12	0.51	.610	-0.01	0.05	-0.10	0.09	-0.12	.905
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	0.01	0.02	-0.04	0.05	0.31	.756	-0.03	0.02	-0.08	0.01	-1.66	.099
Projection*Sexism Disclosure	-0.01	0.03	-0.06	0.04	-0.31	.757	0.02	0.02	-0.03	0.06	0.73	.463
Career Stereotyping												
Directional Bias	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.23	2.49	.013*	0.12	0.05	0.02	0.21	2.49	.013*
Accuracy	0.43	0.06	0.32	0.54	7.46	<.001***	0.39	0.05	0.28	0.49	7.35	<.001***
Sexism Disclosure	0.05	0.03	-0.01	0.12	1.57	.119	0.15	0.03	0.10	0.21	5.46	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.58	.566	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.48	.635
Perspective-Taking	-0.12	0.07	-0.27	0.02	-1.66	.097	-0.16	0.07	-0.30	-0.02	-2.23	.027**
General Disclosure	0.09	0.08	-0.05	0.24	1.25	.213	0.05	0.07	-0.09	0.18	0.64	.525
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	0.02	0.03	-0.04	0.08	0.64	.522	0.05	0.03	0.00	0.11	1.80	.073
Minimizing on Basis of Gender												
Directional Bias	-0.04	0.05	-0.14	0.06	-0.79	.428	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.04	-1.11	.266
Accuracy	0.50	0.05	0.40	0.59	9.97	<.001***	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.54	9.37	<.001***
Sexism Disclosure	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.11	1.23	.221	0.15	0.03	0.10	0.21	5.28	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.25	.800	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.79	.432
Perspective-Taking	-0.18	0.08	-0.33	-0.03	-2.37	.018*	-0.21	0.07	-0.35	-0.07	-2.91	.004**
General Disclosure	0.09	0.08	-0.06	0.24	1.15	.251	0.03	0.07	-0.11	0.17	0.40	.687
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	-0.02	0.03	-0.07	0.04	-0.63	.531	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.06	0.56	.574
Patrolling Femininity												
Directional Bias	-0.14	0.05	-0.23	-0.05	-2.98	.003**	-0.14	0.04	-0.22	-0.05	-3.24	.001**
Accuracy	0.40	0.05	0.29	0.50	7.49	<.001***	0.36	0.05	0.27	0.46	7.40	<.001 ***
Sexism Disclosure	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.10	1.40	.163	0.13	0.03	0.08	0.18	5.18	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.37	.173	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.61	.545
Perspective-Taking	-0.24	0.07	-0.37	-0.10	-3.47	<.001***	-0.26	0.06	-0.39	-0.13	-4.05	<.001***
General Disclosure	0.15	0.07	0.01	0.28	2.14	.033*	0.10	0.07	-0.03	0.22	1.48	.141
Accuracy*Sexism Disclosure	0.04	0.03	-0.02	0.10	1.39	.166	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.11	2.29	.023*

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Moderation of Greater Awareness of Sexism Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Table S14

Moderation of Greater Awareness of Sexism on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Encounters with Sexism Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Subcategories of Sexism	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.10	0.10	0.90	1.30	10.68	<.001***
Accuracy	0.21	0.04	0.13	0.30	4.85	<.001***
Projection	0.62	0.05	0.53	0.71	13.60	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.83	0.14	0.55	1.11	5.80	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.80	.424
Perspective-Taking	-0.10	0.13	-0.36	0.16	-0.75	.455
General Disclosure	0.08	0.13	-0.17	0.34	0.64	.522
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.05	0.05	-0.05	0.15	1.04	.299
Projection*Greater Awareness	0.03	0.06	-0.09	0.15	0.47	.636
Frequency Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.62	0.08	0.46	0.78	7.53	<.001***
Accuracy	0.09	0.03	0.02	0.16	2.61	.009**
Projection	0.76	0.04	0.68	0.83	20.42	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.34	0.11	0.12	0.55	3.01	.003**
Relationship Length	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-2.31	.021*
Perspective-Taking	-0.08	0.11	-0.30	0.14	-0.75	.455
General Disclosure	0.00	0.11	-0.22	0.22	0.02	.986
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.13	0.05	0.04	0.22	2.88	.004**
Projection*Greater Awareness	-0.12	0.04	-0.20	-0.04	-2.87	.004**
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.20	0.08	0.05	0.36	2.55	.011*
Accuracy	0.35	0.05	0.25	0.46	6.90	<.001***
Projection	0.29	0.07	0.16	0.42	4.38	<.001***
Awareness	0.41	0.11	0.20	0.62	3.89	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.20	.839
Perspective-Taking	-0.12	0.07	-0.25	0.01	-1.78	.076
General Disclosure	0.16	0.07	0.03	0.29	2.40	.017*
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	-0.02	0.06	-0.13	0.10	-0.29	.775
Projection*Greater Awareness	0.04	0.08	-0.12	0.19	0.43	.664
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.22	2.05	.042*
Accuracy	0.22	0.05	0.13	0.31	4.89	<.001***
Projection	0.40	0.06	0.29	0.51	6.96	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.35	0.07	0.20	0.50	4.71	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.36	.720
Perspective-Taking	-0.08	0.06	-0.20	0.03	-1.40	.163

General Disclosure	0.10	0.06	-0.01	0.22	1.76	.080
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.09	0.05	-0.01	0.20	1.72	.086
Projection*Greater Awareness	-0.08	0.07	-0.21	0.05	-1.19	.234
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.20	0.04	0.12	0.29	4.73	<.001***
Accuracy	0.12	0.05	0.02	0.22	2.27	.024*
Projection	0.55	0.06	0.43	0.67	9.01	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.36	0.06	0.24	0.47	6.22	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.08	.939
Perspective-Taking	-0.03	0.05	-0.14	0.07	-0.58	.560
General Disclosure	0.00	0.05	-0.11	0.10	-0.03	.975
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.21	1.46	.144
Projection*Greater Awareness	-0.02	0.07	-0.16	0.11	-0.31	.755
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.03	-1.04	.300
Accuracy	0.05	0.04	-0.02	0.12	1.35	.178
Projection	0.67	0.05	0.57	0.77	13.18	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.24	0.05	0.14	0.34	4.70	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.54	.593
Perspective-Taking	-0.02	0.04	-0.11	0.06	-0.53	.595
General Disclosure	0.01	0.04	-0.07	0.10	0.33	.744
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.07	0.05	-0.02	0.16	1.54	.126
Projection*Greater Awareness	-0.04	0.04	-0.12	0.05	-0.86	.393
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.02	-1.24	.216
Accuracy	0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.11	0.93	.352
Projection	0.71	0.04	0.63	0.80	16.36	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.19	0.04	0.10	0.27	4.14	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.37	.172
Perspective-Taking	-0.04	0.04	-0.13	0.04	-0.97	.333
General Disclosure	0.00	0.04	-0.09	0.09	-0.03	.972
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.02	0.04	-0.07	0.10	0.39	.697
Projection*Greater Awareness	0.02	0.04	-0.06	0.10	0.40	.693
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.09	0.05	0.00	0.18	1.92	.057
Accuracy	0.28	0.05	0.18	0.38	5.39	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.48	0.06	0.37	0.60	8.25	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.70	.487
Perspective-Taking	-0.08	0.06	-0.21	0.05	-1.21	.227
General Disclosure	0.04	0.07	-0.09	0.17	0.65	.517
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.20	0.06	0.09	0.31	3.62	<.001***
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.08	0.05	-0.17	0.01	-1.67	.096
Accuracy	0.32	0.05	0.23	0.41	7.02	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.57	0.06	0.45	0.69	9.56	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	1.33	.183

Perspective-Taking	-0.14	0.06	-0.27	-0.02	-2.20	.029*
General Disclosure	0.04	0.07	-0.09	0.17	0.58	.563
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.08	0.05	-0.01	0.18	1.78	.076
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.15	0.04	-0.23	-0.07	-3.54	<.001***
Accuracy	0.30	0.05	0.21	0.40	6.29	<.001***
Greater Awareness	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.56	8.43	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.49	.624
Perspective-Taking	-0.20	0.06	-0.32	-0.09	-3.40	<.001***
General Disclosure	0.10	0.06	-0.02	0.22	1.67	.095
Accuracy*Greater Awareness	0.11	0.05	0.00	0.21	2.06	.041*

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.

Moderation of Allyship Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Table S15

Moderation of Allyship on Men's Perceptions of Their Women Partners' Encounters with Sexism Controlling for Relationship Length, Perspective-Taking and General Disclosure

Subcategories of Sexism	*b*	*SE*	*LL*	*UL*	*t*	*p*
Frequency Experiencing Sexism						
Directional Bias	1.11	0.10	0.91	1.32	10.60	<.001***
Accuracy	0.22	0.05	0.13	0.32	4.76	<.001***
Projection	0.65	0.05	0.55	0.74	13.95	<.001***
Allyship	0.38	0.09	0.19	0.56	4.01	<.001***
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.01	-0.03	0.00	-1.53	.128
Perspective-Taking	-0.19	0.14	-0.46	0.08	-1.41	.160
General Disclosure	0.07	0.14	-0.19	0.34	0.54	.588
Accuracy*Allyship	0.08	0.04	0.00	0.16	2.09	.038
Projection*Allyship	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.06	-0.49	.623
Frequency Witnessing Sexism						
Directional Bias	0.60	0.08	0.44	0.76	7.29	<.001***
Accuracy	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.17	2.68	.008**
Projection	0.76	0.04	0.69	0.83	21.39	<.001***
Allyship	0.22	0.07	0.08	0.37	3.03	.003**
Relationship Length	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-2.71	.007**
Perspective-Taking	-0.13	0.12	-0.36	0.10	-1.12	.263
General Disclosure	-0.02	0.11	-0.24	0.21	-0.17	.867
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.01	0.03	-0.07	0.05	-0.22	.827
Projection*Allyship	-0.01	0.03	-0.07	0.04	-0.47	.637
Experiencing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.25	0.08	0.09	0.41	3.13	.002**

Accuracy	0.43	0.05	0.33	0.53	8.57	<.001***
Projection	0.32	0.07	0.19	0.45	4.70	<.001***
Allyship	0.02	0.07	-0.12	0.16	0.32	.746
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.75	.453
Perspective-Taking	-0.13	0.07	-0.27	0.01	-1.82	.070
General Disclosure	0.18	0.07	0.04	0.32	2.58	.011*
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.09	0.04	-0.17	0.00	-2.07	.039*
Projection*Allyship	-0.03	0.06	-0.15	0.08	-0.57	.570
Witnessing Objectification						
Directional Bias	0.18	0.05	0.08	0.28	3.40	<.001***
Accuracy	0.27	0.05	0.18	0.37	5.60	<.001***
Projection	0.49	0.06	0.38	0.61	8.46	<.001***
Allyship	0.05	0.04	-0.03	0.14	1.22	.223
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.01	.316
Perspective-Taking	-0.10	0.06	-0.23	0.02	-1.59	.113
General Disclosure	0.11	0.06	-0.01	0.24	1.80	.074
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.02	0.04	-0.10	0.07	-0.38	.708
Projection*Allyship	-0.07	0.05	-0.16	0.02	-1.61	.109
Undermining Claims of Discrimination						
Directional Bias	0.26	0.04	0.18	0.35	6.07	<.001***
Accuracy	0.15	0.05	0.05	0.26	2.80	.005**
Projection	0.67	0.06	0.55	0.79	10.87	<.001***
Allyship	0.11	0.03	0.04	0.17	3.09	.002**
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.82	.412
Perspective-Taking	-0.07	0.06	-0.18	0.05	-1.15	.252
General Disclosure	0.03	0.06	-0.09	0.14	0.44	.659
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.03	0.04	-0.12	0.06	-0.66	.509
Projection*Allyship	-0.04	0.04	-0.13	0.04	-0.97	.331
Hearing Hostility Towards Women						
Directional Bias	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.33	.744
Accuracy	0.08	0.04	0.00	0.16	2.04	.042*
Projection	0.81	0.04	0.72	0.89	19.07	<.001***
Allyship	0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.09	1.50	.135
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.28	.202
Perspective-Taking	-0.02	0.04	-0.11	0.07	-0.42	.678
General Disclosure	0.03	0.04	-0.06	0.11	0.62	.537
Accuracy*Allyship	0.00	0.03	-0.07	0.06	-0.14	.891
Projection*Allyship	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.02	-1.41	.159
Paternalism and Complementary Gender Roles						
Directional Bias	-0.02	0.03	-0.08	0.04	-0.75	.455
Accuracy	0.06	0.04	-0.02	0.13	1.41	.159
Projection	0.78	0.04	0.70	0.86	18.80	<.001***
Allyship	0.00	0.03	-0.05	0.06	0.19	.849
Relationship Length	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.89	.059
Perspective-Taking	-0.06	0.05	-0.16	0.03	-1.38	.168
General Disclosure	0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.12	0.57	.566

Accuracy*Allyship	-0.04	0.03	-0.11	0.02	-1.41	.158
Projection*Allyship	0.01	0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.33	.744
Career Stereotyping						
Directional Bias	0.13	0.05	0.03	0.22	2.55	.011*
Accuracy	0.40	0.06	0.29	0.51	7.22	<.001***
Allyship	0.18	0.04	0.09	0.26	4.13	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.23	.822
Perspective-Taking	-0.14	0.07	-0.28	0.00	-1.92	.056
General Disclosure	0.08	0.07	-0.07	0.22	1.06	.292
Accuracy*Allyship	0.03	0.04	-0.05	0.12	0.82	.413
Minimizing on Basis of Gender						
Directional Bias	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-1.05	.294
Accuracy	0.45	0.05	0.35	0.54	9.43	<.001***
Allyship	0.21	0.04	0.13	0.29	4.95	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.19	.847
Perspective-Taking	-0.21	0.07	-0.35	-0.07	-2.90	.004**
General Disclosure	0.06	0.07	-0.08	0.21	0.88	.377
Accuracy*Allyship	0.01	0.04	-0.06	0.08	0.30	.761
Patrolling Femininity						
Directional Bias	-0.12	0.04	-0.21	-0.04	-2.79	.006**
Accuracy	0.40	0.05	0.30	0.50	8.02	<.001***
Allyship	0.13	0.04	0.06	0.21	3.56	<.001***
Relationship Length	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-1.18	.238
Perspective-Taking	-0.24	0.07	-0.37	-0.11	-3.63	<.001***
General Disclosure	0.14	0.07	0.01	0.27	2.13	.035*
Accuracy*Allyship	-0.01	0.04	-0.08	0.07	-0.15	.883

Note. $^{***}p < .001$, $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$.