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ABSTRACT
This article introduces the concept of consumer sexism and develops a measurement scale for the construct. Through 4 different studies, internal, nomological, and face validities of the scale are established and various effects are explored. Findings suggest that consumer sexism affects attitudes toward products advertised as originating from women. They also suggest that while sexism does not affect online review credibility, it interacts with a perceived product gender type in negatively influencing attitudes toward masculine products favorably evaluated by female reviewers, and also directly and negatively affects purchase intentions for such products, no matter the perceived product gender.

INTRODUCTION
According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2006), Women owned 6.5 million non-farm U.S. businesses in 2002—up 19.8% from 1997—, employing 7.1 million people and generating $940.8 billion in business revenues. These women-owned firms accounted for 28.2 percent of all non-farm businesses in the United States. Not only do they own their businesses, women also manage big corporations these days—think of eBay’s Meg Whitman, Martha Stewart, or former HP CEO Carly Fiorina. As women take an increasingly important role in the marketplace, nowadays providing, endorsing as spokespersons, and/or offering reviews for products and services in essentially all categories, this may represent a new reality for consumers. Consider the following scenario:

As Robert browses through the web site of his favorite online business magazine, he notices an online advertisement for XLT, a new brand of laptop computers he did not know until then. The ad depicts the (female) president of the XLT corporation, smiling with pride as she presents her new XLT laptop to the world. Wanting to learn more about this brand, Robert then visits an online forum that pertains to consumer evaluations of computer equipment. Finding a page filled with comments from customers of XLT, he notices a posting from Margareth, who seems delighted with her XLT laptop.

Of course, many factors will influence the beliefs, attitudes, and eventually purchase intentions Robert develops about the XLT brand of laptops, from the looks of the XLT president to even the background of the online recommendation web page (Petrosbishi and Crocker 1989; Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar 2000). Yet previous psychological research suggests that Robert’s decision may be grounded—at least partially—in Robert’s level of sexism. The literature in psychology indeed shows that sexism may result in the condoning of unequal treatment of women and men, even today (Swim, et al. 1995; Tougas et al. 1995). Because he has been faced with a ad depicting a woman providing the XLT computer, and since the review he read on the web had been posted by a woman, it may be that Robert could develop negative attitudes and purchase intentions about this brand.

Considering the growing number of women-owned businesses in the U.S. as well as the active role women play on the markets, understanding consumers’ responses toward the idea of buying from women should hold significant importance for stakeholders, including businesses, governments, and consumers. At the same time, confirming the existence and understanding the effects of such factors as consumer sexism should help businesses know if and how to adapt important activities such as marketing communication, branding, and product portfolio. The implications are also potentially important for all other businesses and may suggest the need for adaptation in the partnerships they pursue, distribution channel selection, and so on. For governments, the conclusions of this research could suggest a need to provide support to women-owned businesses in order to compensate for gender-based discrimination by consumers or the need to raise public awareness.

In order to address these critical issues, this article proposes to test the effects of consumer sexism on consumption behavior in a variety of product categories. The following pages first review past research on sexism and derive hypotheses on the basis of extant literature. A scale to measure consumer sexism (CS) is developed, and the effects of consumer sexism on consumer attitudes toward products and on consumers’ intentions to buy said products are then empirically tested in two different settings. Finally, conclusions and implications are discussed.

CS AND CONSUMER PERCEPTIONS OF PRODUCTS PROMOTED OR ADVOCATED BY WOMEN
Sexism is commonly considered to be discrimination and/or hatred against people based on their gender rather than their individual merits, but can also refer to any and all systemic differentiations based on the sex of the individuals. It can be partitioned as consisting of sexism against the female sex, sexism against the male sex, sexism against the intersex (hermaphrodite and pseudohermaphrodite), and sexism against the transsex (transmale and transfemale). Yet the term sexism, in common usage, usually implies “sexism against females” and may include sexism directed from men toward women as well as from women toward women.

Sexism comes in many different forms, including blatant, covert, and subtle sexism (Benokraitis and Feagin 1999). Blatant sexism is defined as obviously unequal and unfair treatment of women relative to men, whereas covert sexism is defined as unequal and unfair treatment of women that is recognized but purposefully hidden from view. Both blatant and covert sexism are intended, but only covert sexism is hidden. In comparison to these two forms, subtle sexism represents unequal and unfair treatment of women that is not recognized by many people because it is perceived to be normative, and therefore does not appear unusual. Like covert sexism, subtle sexism is hidden but unlike covert sexism, subtle sexism is not intentionally harmful. Subtle sexism was deemed particularly interesting from both theoretical and practical perspectives in psychology because it may be quite prevalent (Benokraitis and Feagin 1999) and have an insidious impact on its victims (Swim et al. 2003).

Unlike old-fashioned sexists who explicitly support gender inequality and endorse traditional gender roles, Neosexists or (Modern Sexists) express beliefs that indirectly condone the unequal treatment of women and men (Swim et al. 1995; Tougas et al. 1995). There is evidence that Neosexist beliefs are associated with a lower likelihood of defining some behaviors as sexist. Endorsement of Neosexist beliefs was associated with a lower likelihood of labeling beliefs from several sexism scales and everyday sexist behaviors as being, in fact, sexist (Swim et al. 1995; Tougas et al. 1995; Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar 2000). Yet modern sexism was deemed particularly interesting from both theoretical and practical perspectives in psychology because it may be quite prevalent (Benokraitis and Feagin 1999) and have an insidious impact on its victims (Swim et al. 2003).

Unlike old-fashioned sexists who explicitly support gender inequality and endorse traditional gender roles, Neosexists or (Modern Sexists) express beliefs that indirectly condone the unequal treatment of women and men (Swim et al. 1995; Tougas et al. 1995). There is evidence that Neosexist beliefs are associated with a lower likelihood of defining some behaviors as sexist. Endorsement of Neosexist beliefs was associated with a lower likelihood of labeling beliefs from several sexism scales and everyday sexist behaviors as being, in fact, sexist (Swim et al. 1995; Tougas et al. 1995; Stevenson, Bruner, and Kumar 2000). Yet modern sexism was deemed particularly interesting from both theoretical and practical perspectives in psychology because it may be quite prevalent (Benokraitis and Feagin 1999) and have an insidious impact on its victims (Swim et al. 2003).
Another subtle manifestation of sexism may occur in consumption settings. The same way that consumer racism has been suggested to be a way for ethnic majorities to perpetuate racial imbalance in their favor (Ouellet 2007), CS may be a way of reinforcing and perpetuating gender stereotypes and status differences between women and men (Banaji and Hardin 1996; Crawford 2001; Gay 1997; Maass and Arcuri 1996; McConnell and Fazio 1996). Although not documented in the scope of sexism per se, the academic literature provides hints of the influence of sexism on consumer evaluations of products and/or services. Following a review of the literature, Wolin (2003) found that some research concluded that endorser gender did not significantly affect consumer attitudes toward products while other research showed the opposite. Wolin concluded that “controversy exists in this realm of the gendered advertising literature and begs for further elucidation” (2003, p.113), calling for further research in the field.

MEASURING CS: SCALE DEVELOPMENT

From sexism to CS

The most widely used sexism scale in the extant literature is certainly Tougas et al.’s (1995) 11-item Neosexism scale. However, because it was not developed with consumer-specific sexism in mind, it contains items that are definitely not related to consumption behavior, such as “It is difficult to work for a female boss,” or “Women will make more progress by being patient and not pushing too hard for change.” Since all other available scales in the literature share this lack of relevance in the consumer context, it was therefore thought necessary to develop a more specific consumer-oriented sexism scale.

Prior research has attempted to draw parallels between racism and sexism (Hacker 1951, 1975; Myrdal 1944; Campbell et al. 1997). In this context, several authors have adapted modern racism models and scales in order to better describe contemporary sexism (Benokraitis and Feagin 1986; Swin, Aiken, Hall, and Hunter, 1995; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, and Joly, 1995). Since the two are defined as stereotypes-based prejudices from a dominant group toward another, we decided to attempt adapting Ouellet’s (2007) consumer racism scale to the concept of consumer sexism.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

After adapting Ouellet’s (2007) scale items to the context of CS, we asked respondents to complete a first version of the scale. Participants were originally recruited in personal circles and were offered a chance to win a $200 participation prize. Data were collected through a web-based interface using a viral (snowball) approach through which respondents could get an additional chance of winning the $200 participation prize for each friend and acquaintance they invited to participate in the survey. Usable answers were gathered from 138 respondents aged 19 to 65 with a mean age of 26.8 years.

All items were scored using a seven-point Likert format with higher scores representing greater levels of CS. Before data analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett test of sphericity were used to determine the appropriateness of factor analysis and both indicated that factor analysis was appropriate for the data. Because the CS concept was assumed to reflect a single latent person variable, it was considered most appropriate to test for a general factor on which most of the items would load positively. Thus, exploratory principal components factor analysis was performed on the set of 9 original items. To increase homogeneity and in the interest of developing a more parsimonious scale, items that did not have corrected item-total correlations greater than .40 were deleted, resulting in the deletion of 4 items. Follow-up factor analyses on the remaining items as well as Cattell’s scree plot criterion indicated that only one factor should be retained, suggesting a 5-item, unidimensional scale with a Cronbach alpha of .631.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A second survey was conducted to generate data for confirmatory factor analysis. This time, items were scored on 9-point Likert scales to induce greater variance. Again, the survey involved a web-based questionnaire and a viral recruitment approach, this time using different networks. A total of 139 questionnaires were gathered in this second phase, none of which from participants to our first study. Mean age was slightly higher in this case, with 31.0 years. Additional socio-demographic measures showed that 61.9% of respondents were female, 79.9% had at least some college education, 48.9% were single, 46.8% were working full time, and 43.2% had revenues of $60,000 or more.

We ran confirmatory factor analysis through structural equations modeling. The first model we tested yielded rather bad fit indices: $\chi^2 = 43.376$ (p.<.001), $\chi^2/df = 8.675$; GFI = .943; AGFI = .830; CFI = .876; and RMSEA = .166. Follow up analysis however suggested that this was due to one specific item. After removing it from the analysis and performing CFA on the remaining 4 items, fit indices confirmed the internal validity of the scale: $\chi^2 = 2.500$ (p.<.05), $\chi^2/df = 1.250$; GFI = .996; AGFI = .978; CFI = .997; and RMSEA = .030. Cronbach alpha was also near the .700 threshold at .699. The 4 items and their factor loadings appear in Table 1.

It should be noted that such a unidimensional conception of CS is consistent with previous research on sexism. All related research appears to have considered sexism a single-factor construct and used unidimensional scales to measure the phenomenon (Tougas et al. 1995; Swim et al. 2005), thus making it logical for CS to be a single-dimension concept as well.

### TABLE 1
*Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for CS items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Single-Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We should support women in their struggle to build their own successful businesses in this country by consuming their goods and services.</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is easy to understand the frustration of women business owners in this country, who see us patronizing other stores instead of theirs.</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Generations of economic domination and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for women to create businesses and get us to purchase their products.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is very little discrimination against women-owned businesses.</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Single-factor model $\chi^2 = 2.500$ with 2 degrees of freedom (p.<.05), $\chi^2/df = 1.250$; GFI = .996; AGFI = .978; CFI = .997; and RMSEA = .030. *Item is reverse scored.
Nomological Validity

To assess nomological validity, we had administered Tougas et al.’s (1995) Neosexism scale in the two studies described above. In the first study, correlation between the final 4-item scale and the Neosexism scale was .252 (p<.005) while it was .248 (p<.001) in the second study. This tends to confirm nomological validity for this scale.

FACE VALIDITY ASSESSMENT IN THE CONTEXTS OF ADVERTISING AND ONLINE RECOMMENDATIONS

Study 1. CS in Advertising

To validate the scale and test it further, two studies were designed to test whether CS levels influence reactions to products that are promoted using ads depicting the two different genders, as well as advocated online by reviewers of both genders. In our first study, our chief hypothesis was that sexist consumers should hold less favorable attitudes and purchase intentions in the case of products or services advertised as originating from, or being enjoyed by, women, as stated in the following hypothesis:

H1: CS will negatively affect consumer attitudes towards products advertised as being recommended by women—that is, the more sexist the consumer, the less favourable the attitudes towards said products.

H2: CS will negatively affect purchase intentions for products advertised as being recommended by women—that is, the more sexist the consumer, the less favourable the intentions to purchase said products.

To test these hypotheses, an online survey was developed to gather respondent attitudes as well as purchase intentions for private nursing care services displayed in a fictitious ad depicting a female nurse as being the founder and president (see Appendix 1). Respondents saw this single ad, after which their attitudes and purchase intentions for this service were measured. Both attitudes and intentions to buy were measured using 7-point semantic differential scales: attitudes (6 items): bad/good, unfavorable/favorable, disagreeable/agreeable, unpleasant/pleasant, negative/positive, dislike/like (Cronbach alpha = .964); purchase intentions (3 items): unlikely/likely, improbable/probable, impossible/possible (Cronbach alpha = .968). Socio-demographic data were then gathered, along with levels of CS and Neosexism (for further comparisons).

Four hundred and thirty-two people aged 18 to 65 (mean age was 26.1 years) completed this quick questionnaire. An overall CS score was computed for each respondent. The mean CS score was 3.64 (median was 3.50) with a standard deviation of 1.021. The scale ranged from a low of 1.00 to a high of 6.75 and also exhibited low Skewness (.175) and close-to-normal Kurtosis statistics (3.282). In comparison, the neosexism scale ranged from 1.45 to a high of 6.00, with a mean of 2.96 and a standard deviation of .771, and higher Skewness (.793) and Kurtosis statistics (4.806). To test our hypothesis, we ran two different linear regressions with, in the first model, attitude toward the services as a dependent variable and CS as predictor variable. In the second model, the dependent variable was intention to purchase the service and predictors were CS and attitudes toward the product.

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A_service</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>-2.401</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purch. Int.</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A_service</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>26.124</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1: R² = .013. Dependent variable = Attitudes toward the Service (A_service)
Model 2: R² = .617. Dependent variable = Purchase Intentions for Service

As Table 2 depicts, CS does exert a significant and negative effect on attitudes toward the product. However, this effect appears to be completely mediated by the impacts of CS on intentions to buy as: (1) a marginally significant negative effect is found when considering the direct influence of CS on purchase intentions without attitude toward the service (p<.10); and (2) these effects become non significant in the second model that includes consumer attitudes. This tends to confirm H1 but not H2. As a side note, for comparisons with the neosexism scale, it should be noted that the latter failed to exert any significant effects in both similar models (p>.10).

Study 2. CS and Online Product Reviews

Product Gender. The effects of CS may not be linear across product categories, as previously suggested by Wolin (2003). Previous research indeed suggests at least one potential moderator of consumer prejudice applicable in this case: perceived credibility in the product category. Extent literature confirms that consumers tend to attribute masculine, neutral, or feminine characteristics to products and services (Alphonso, Golden, Mullet, and Coogan 1980; Alreck, Settle, and Beck 1982). As in the case of product-country or product-ethnicity image, which refer to how consumers attribute more credibility to certain nations or ethnicities as providers of certain goods and services (Papadopoulos and Heslop 1993; Peterson and Jolibert 1995; Ouellet 2007), it is very likely that women should be perceived as more capable, or credible, than men when advocating, providing, or promoting (e.g., through advertising) certain goods or services. For instance, even sexist consumers are likely to perceive that women are more credible when promoting or endorsing feminine products, such as cosmetics. Following extent literature on the hierarchy of effects and online product recommendations, it was expected that:

H3: CS will negatively affect the credibility of female recommendation sources—that is, a main effect of CS is expected.

H4: The perceived product gender will moderate the influence postulated in H3—that is, an interaction between CS and perceived product gender is expected.
H5: CS will negatively affect customer attitudes toward products recommended by female sources—that is, a main effect of CS is expected.

H6: The perceived product gender will moderate the influence postulated in H5—that is, an interaction between CS and perceived product gender is expected.

H7: CS will negatively affect customer intentions to buy products recommended by female sources—that is, a main effect of CS is expected.

H8: The perceived product gender will moderate the influence postulated in H7—that is, an interaction between CS and perceived product gender is expected.

FIGURE 1.
The Postulated Effects of Consumer Sexism on Online Recommendation Source Credibility, A_{product}, and Purchase Intentions of Recommended Product

To test hypotheses 3 through 8 as summarized by the model displayed in Figure 1, a 2-cell design varying product gender was used. Product gender had been pretested with 20 undergraduate students who had evaluated 10 products already demonstrated in the literature as either masculine or feminine. Swiss knives had been selected as the most masculine of all tested products, and hand lotion as the most feminine one, and a manipulation check later confirmed this difference in the perceived gender of both products \((p<.001)\). CS was measured and introduced as a covariate. Other measures included online recommendation source credibility (Lichtenstein and Bearden 1989; 5 items, Cronbach alpha = .842), attitude toward the product scale (3 items, Cronbach alpha = .982), and purchase intentions (3 items, Cronbach alpha = .871). For further comparison with the sexism concept in the extent literature, we measured neosexism once again using Tougas et al.’s (1995) instrument. All items were scored using 9-point Likert scales.

Respondents were randomly assigned to one of the 2 conditions and shown a product along with a positive recommendation from a female consumer for this product. One hundred and thirty three respondents provided usable questionnaires, 67 for the swiss knife (i.e., masculine product) and 66 for the hand lotion (i.e., feminine product).

As a first step, we ran an analysis of covariance with source credibility as the dependent variable, and both CS and a CS \times Product Gender interaction term as predictors, in order to test H3 and H4. As Table 3 shows, no effects were found for either CS or the CS \times Source Gender interaction term. These results therefore fail to support H3 and H4. It should be noted that, when comparing a same model using Tougas et al.’s (1995) Neosexism instead of CS, both terms also fail to achieve significance \((p>.10)\).

TABLE 3
The effects of CS and Product Gender on Source Credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial (\eta^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Gender \times CS</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(R^2 = .008\) (Adjusted \(R^2 = -.007\))

As a second step, we ran another analysis of covariance with attitude toward the product as the dependent variable and source credibility, CS, and a CS \times Product Gender interaction term as predictors, in order to test H5 and H6. As Table 4 shows, a significant effect was found for the CS \times Product Gender interaction term, but CS only reached marginal statistical significance \((p<.10)\). For illustration purposes, Figure 2a shows that when comparing high CS with low CS respondents following a median split, attitudes toward products are lower for masculine products than for feminine ones in high CS consumers but not in low CS ones. These results provide support for H5 but only marginal support H6. As a comparison, when estimating a same model using Neosexism instead of CS, the model explains slightly less variance \((R^2 = .377\) as opposed to \(.396\) for the model with CS) and only source credibility turns out significant, although the Product Gender \times Neosexism interaction term exerts (barely) marginal significance \((p=.098)\).
TABLE 4
The effects of CS, Product Gender, and Source Credibility on Attitude toward the Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source credibility</td>
<td>137.738</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.656</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>6.177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.483</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Gender × CS</td>
<td>7.662</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .396 (adjusted R² = .382)

Finally, we ran a last analysis of covariance with attitude toward the product as the dependent variable, source credibility, attitude toward the product, CS, and a CS × Product Gender interaction term as predictors, in order to test H7 and H8. As Table 5 shows, a significant effect was found for CS, but the CS × Product Gender interaction term failed to achieve statistical significance. For illustration purposes, Figure 2a shows the evolution of purchase intentions by CS level (following a median split) and product gender. These results support H7, but fail to support H8. As a comparison, a same model using Neosexism instead of CS explains slightly less variance (R² = .656 vs. .684), and only attitude toward the product is significant or even marginally significant.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The objectives of this research program were to explore whether sexist sentiments could influence consumer behaviors toward products advertised or advocated by women, and also to develop a reliable measurement instrument for the concept of consumer sexism. An adaptation of Ouellet’s (2007) consumer racism scale to the concept of consumer sexism has demonstrated good internal validity as well as nomological validity in comparison with the mainstream sexism scale used in psychology (Tougas et al. 1995). Furthermore, its use in two distinct validation studies shows that the scale exerts good face validity, influencing consumer attitudes and/or behaviors in both studies while psychological scales fail to demonstrate the same effects.

More specifically, our results indicate that a sexist-based influence on consumer behavior does exist. The results indeed highlight the fact that the more sexist consumers are, the less favourable they are to products advertised as originating from female providers (study 1). Moreover, sexist consumers appear to significantly exert less favourable attitudes towards masculine products recommended by female reviewers, but also appear to be less willing to buy any product recommended by women, no matter their perceived gender. Overall, these results thus also highlight the moderating influence of a certain Product-Gender Image on the effects of sexism on consumer behavior. No study had so far directly established relationships between a measure of sexism in consumers and their evaluations of products. Our results warrant further investigation in this field.

FIGURE 2
Interaction effects of Product Gender and CS Level (after Median Split) on (a) Attitudes toward the Product and (b) Intentions to Buy.

TABLE 5
The effects of CS, Product Gender, Source Credibility, and Aprod on Purchase Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source credibility</td>
<td>2.221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward the Product</td>
<td>158.578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128.135</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>16.793</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.569</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Gender × CS</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .684 (adjusted R² = .674)
This research has a number of implications. First, it suggests that marketing practitioners carefully review their options before making a decision on the gender image they want to project for their products or services, especially when the product is perceived as a highly masculine one. This is obviously most especially true if marketers’ target consumers may be thought to exhibit sexism. The results also raise concerns for policy makers, who should question whether they should provide assistance to help women entrepreneurs enjoy similar chances of commercial success than male entrepreneurs despite apparent sexist effects on their business.

For academic researchers, research implications of this study are two-fold. First, findings in this study suggest consumer sexism as a key construct for future academic research involving consumer behavior across gender groups and in relation with each other. Second, this investigation has shown how CS may impact consumer attitudes toward products of different perceived genders. Of course, although many of the postulated effects of sexism were demonstrated as statistically significant and in line with expectations based on the literature, other studies on sexism should be undertaken before confidently concluding in the existence and influence of sexism on consumer attitudes and behavior. Further research should try to clarify more directly how sexism plays in relation with other key discrimination variables, such as consumer racism.
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