APPENDIX A (Study 1)

Table 1

Climbing Specific Ambivalent Sexism (ASIc) and Feminism Items

Scales		Items	Factor loadings			
Benevolent sexism (BSc) – protective paternalism	1	Men should offer to lead a difficult pitch when climbing with women.	**.81**	-.22	.37	.43
	2	It is a man's responsibility to lead uncomfortable pitches, when climbing with a woman.	**.81**	-.16	.56	.37
	3	Men should be willing to risk their own security in order to protect women in dangerous situations when climbing.	**.62**	-.11	.27	.21
	4	In the event of a helicopter rescue in the mountains, women should be flown out first.	**.51**	-.10	.26	.33
Benevolent sexism (BSc) – complementary gender differentiation	5	Women are more aesthetic climbers and have a more refined climbing style compared to men.	.27	.02	.38	**.69**
	6	Men use more strength and women use more technique when climbing.	.31	.00	.15	**.67**
	7	Male climbers are more adventurous, and female climbers are more cautious.	.50	-.13	.41	**.59**
	8	Women climbers are more sensitive and more caring climbing partners than men.	.24	.13	.21	**.58**
Hostile sexism (HSc)	9	When climbing with women, men have to resolve any difficult situations.	.58	-.13	**.78**	.31
	10	Most women are not brave enough to become really good climbers.	.26	-.02	**.77**	.33
	11	Women climbers exaggerate the risks and difficulty of climbing.	.53	-.14	**.62**	.46
	12	Men are better prepared to deal with an accident than women.	.50	-.46	**.59**	.13
	13	Female climbers solve critical situations very well.	-.28	.39	**-.51**	-.09
Feminist (F)	14	Women still experience sexism in the climbing world.	-.09	**.77**	-.10	.13
	15	Women should stop whining about gender issues since they are non-existent in the climbing world.	.21	**-.76**	.29	-.08
	16	Women are still regarded as second-class climbers.	-.17	**.67**	-.14	-.06
	17	When climbing the help offered by men often undermines women's competences.	-.29	**.57**	.15	.13

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of the Gender Ideology Measures and Correlations between them

Ideological measure	Participant Gender			Correlations				
		M	*SD*	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. BS (ASI)	Women	3.46	1.09	-	.67***	.60***	.39**	-.57***
F(1,90)=7. 536**	Men	4.00	0.73	-	-.09	.41**	.37*	.16
2. HS (ASI)	Women	3.00	1.17		-	.56***	.53***	-.66***
F(1,90)=7.437**	Men	3.62	0.95		-	.07	.19	-.22
3. BSc (ASIc)	Women	3.34	0.91			-	.68***	-.35*
F(1,90)=9.81**	Men	3.95	0.95			-	.28t	.44**
4. HSc (ASIc)	Women	2.48	1.09				-	-.32*
F(1,90)=7.619**	Men	3.06	0.87				-	.18
5. Feminism	Women	4.05	1.37					-
F(1,90)=1.159	Men	3.76	1.16					-

Note. t $p < .10$; *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$, F-values from a MANOVA indicate differences between women ($n = 51$) and men ($n = 41$)

Table 3a

Leading in Alpine Climbing as a Function of Partner Gender, Sexist Attitudes (ASI), and Expertise for Female Participants

Within-participants effects	$F(1,27)$	p	η_p^2
Partner Gender	**5.048**	**.033**	**.158**
Partner Gender × Expertise	2.978	.096	.099
Partner Gender × BS	1.019	.322	.036
Partner Gender × HS	1.589	.218	.056
Partner Gender × BS × HS	0.007	.934	<.001
Partner Gender × Expertise × BS	1.282	.267	.045
Partner Gender × Expertise × HS	1.414	.245	.050
Partner Gender × Expertise × BS × HS	0.017	.896	.001

Note. Significant effects are marked in bold. BS = Benevolent Sexism, HS = Hostile Sexism

Table 3b

Leading in Alpine Climbing as a Function of Partner Gender, Climbing-Specific Benevolent Sexism (BSc) and Hostile Sexism (HSc), and Expertise for Female Participants

Within-participants effects	$F(1,27)$	p	η_p^2
Partner Gender	**6.183**	**.019**	**.186**
Partner Gender × Expertise	1.652	.210	.058
Partner Gender × BSc	0.092	.764	.003
Partner Gender × HSc	0.145	.706	.005
Partner Gender × BSc × HSc	0.088	.769	.003
Partner Gender × Expertise × BSc	0.028	.868	.001
Partner Gender × Expertise × HSc	0.092	.764	.003
Partner Gender × Expertise × BSc × HSc	0.105	.748	.004

Note. Significant effects are marked in bold. BSc = climbing-specific Benevolent Sexism, HSc = climbing-specific Hostile Sexism

Table 4a

Leading in Alpine Climbing as a Function of Partner Gender, Sexist Attitudes (ASI), and Expertise for Male Participants

Within-participants effects	$F(1,28)$	p	η_p^2
Partner Gender	**21.561**	**<.001**	**.435**
Partner Gender × Expertise	1.507	.230	.051
Partner Gender × BS	**4.705**	**.039**	**.144**
Partner Gender × HS	0.005	.942	<.001
Partner Gender × BS × HS	1.573	.220	.053
Partner Gender × Expertise × BS	0.862	.361	.033
Partner Gender × Expertise × HS	0.954	.337	.03
Partner Gender × Expertise × BS × HS	1.173	.288	.040

Note. Significant effects are marked in bold. BS = Benevolent Sexism, HS = Hostile Sexism

Table 4b

Leading in Alpine Climbing as a Function of Partner Gender, Climbing-Specific Benevolent Sexism (BSc) and Hostile Sexism (HSc), and Expertise for Male Participants

Within-participants effects	$F(1,28)$	p	η_p^2
Partner Gender	**21.725**	**<.001**	**.437**
Partner Gender × Expertise	2.794	.106	.091
Partner Gender × BSc	3.106	.089	.100
Partner Gender × HSc	0.530	.473	.019
Partner Gender × BSc × HSc	< 0.001	.991	<.001
Partner Gender × Expertise × BSc	0.525	.475	.018
Partner Gender × Expertise × HSc	0.548	.465	.019
Partner Gender × Expertise × BSc × HSc	0.956	.337	.033

Note. Significant effects are marked in bold. BSc = climbing-specific Benevolent Sexism, HSc = climbing-specific Hostile Sexism

Results of Table 4b

For male participants a non-significant Partner Gender × BSc interaction was revealed, $F(1, 28) = 3.106$, $p = .089$, $\eta_p^2 = .100$. Decomposing this interaction showed that high (+ 1 SD) benevolent sexist men reported to lead more with women ($M = 8.69$, $SE = 0.66$) than with men ($M = 6.87$, $SE = 0.49$), $F(1, 28) = 16.074$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .365$. For low (-1 SD) BS men this effect was not significant ($F(1, 28) = 3.388$, $p = .076$, $\eta_p^2 = .108$). Moreover, parameter estimates showed that male participants' BS positively predicted leading with female partners, $B = 1.253$, $p = .017$, $\eta_p^2 = .186$, 95% CI [0.238, 2.268], but not with male partners, $B = 0.647$, $p = .091$, $\eta_p^2 = .099$, 95% *CI* [-0.110, 1.405]. The between-participants analysis further revealed a main effect of BS on leading, $F(1, 28) = 5.590$, $p = .025$, $\eta_p^2 = .166$, suggesting that benevolent sexist men generally led more.