

HOSTILE AND BENEVOLENT SEXISM

Measuring Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes Toward Women

Peter Glick
Lawrence University

Susan T. Fiske
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

A theory of sexism as *ambivalence*, not just hostility, toward women is presented. Ambivalent Sexism Theory distinguishes between hostile and “benevolent” sexism (each addresses issues of power, gender differentiation, and sexuality). Benevolent sexism encompasses subjectively positive (for the sexist) attitudes toward women in traditional roles: protective paternalism, idealization of women, and desire for intimate relations. Hostile sexism encompasses the negative equivalents on each dimension: dominative paternalism, derogatory beliefs, and heterosexual hostility. Both forms of sexism serve to justify and maintain patriarchy and traditional gender roles. The validity of a measure of these constructs, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), is reviewed. Comparisons are offered between the ASI and other measures of sexist attitudes (e.g., the AWS), with suggestions for the proper domains of different scales.

Definitions of sexism generally emphasize two components: hostility toward women (i.e., hostile affect and negative stereotypes) and the endorsement of traditional gender roles (i.e., restricting women’s conduct to fit societal prescriptions and confining women to roles accorded less status and power than those of men). Measures of sexist attitudes, such as the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS; Spence & Helmreich, 1972; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973), have been guided by this conception,

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: Peter Glick, Department of Psychology, Lawrence University, Appleton, WI 54912-0599. Email: peter.s.glick@lawrence.edu.

generally devoting themselves to assessing hostile aspects of traditional views about women. Although it has long been considered a truism that traditional attitudes about women's roles go hand in hand with hostility toward women, recent research (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989, 1993; Glick & Fiske, 1996) suggests that this presumption is misleading because traditional attitudes are associated with highly positive *as well as* highly negative evaluations of women. We suggest a reconceptualization of the nature and measurement of sexism, which recognizes that sexism is fundamentally *ambivalent*, encompassing both subjectively benevolent and hostile feelings toward women. This article describes Ambivalent Sexism Theory, its measurement using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996), and how this theory and measure relate to the most frequently used scales of attitudes toward women, such as the AWS and Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale (SRES; Beere, King, Beere, & King, 1984).

AMBIVALENT SEXISM THEORY

Anthropological research reveals that patriarchy (men's structural control over political, legal, economic, and religious institutions) is virtually universal among human societies (Goldberg, 1993; Harris, 1991).¹ Patriarchal control has profound consequences for all aspects of relationships between men and women, from gender roles and stereotypes to power in intimate relationships (Guttentag & Secord, 1983). There can be little doubt that male structural power is related to hostility toward women. Many theories of prejudice note the connection between the restriction of a group to lower status roles and hostile stereotypes that justify this exploitation (e.g., Allport, 1954; Tajfel, 1969). We do not question this connection in the case of sexism. As Jackman (1994) notes, however, when such expropriative relationships occur over long periods of time in conditions that promote interaction between members of the dominant and subordinate groups, intergroup attitudes are not likely to be purely hostile. In such cases (e.g., colonial occupation), "benevolent" ideologies (e.g., the "White man's burden") become prominent. These ideologies serve both as a balm for the consciences of dominant group members ("We aren't exploiting anyone; they couldn't get along without us telling them what to do and taking care of them") as well as a more effective and pleasant means of coercing cooperation from the subordinate group, whose members receive various perks and even affection in return for "knowing their place."

Although outsiders may appropriately view such "benevolence" with a jaundiced eye, members of the dominant group may sincerely subscribe to these self-enhancing beliefs and possess genuine affection for those whom they exploit. In the case of women and men, such affection is especially likely because of the intimate connections between them (Fiske & Stevens, 1993). Not only do kin relations (of necessity) cross gender lines (whereas

ethnic and racial groups may, and often do, successfully avoid kinship ties), but sexual reproduction ensures that most men are dependent on women as wives, mothers, and romantic objects. In other words, although ethnic and racial groups may be able completely to avoid close interpersonal relations (or even casual interaction) that cross group lines, men and women are necessarily interdependent. As Guttentag and Secord (1983) note, these relationships lend women *dyadic power*—power that stems from dependencies in interpersonal relationships. Because men “can’t live without ‘em,” women are not typically viewed in a purely hostile fashion. For example, the venerable “social distance” measure of prejudice (Bogardus, 1928), on which willingness to marry a member of the outgroup is considered to indicate a lack of prejudice, clearly does not apply when assessing sexism. Although men may wish to exclude women from certain activities and roles, few (even among the most rabidly hostile sexists) wish to banish women completely from their lives.

The simultaneous existence of male structural power and female dyadic power creates *ambivalent* sexist ideologies composed of hostile and benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996). *Hostile sexism* seeks to justify male power, traditional gender roles, and men’s exploitation of women as sexual objects through derogatory characterizations of women. *Benevolent sexism*, in contrast, relies on kinder and gentler justifications of male dominance and prescribed gender roles; it recognizes men’s dependence on women (i.e., women’s dyadic power) and embraces a romanticized view of sexual relationships with women. Importantly, these attitudes are *subjectively positive* for the sexist; they encompass feelings of protectiveness and affection toward women. A woman toward whom benevolent sexism is enacted may recognize that, for instance, a man’s unsolicited help reflects an assumption that he is more competent than she. The man, on the other hand, may not be aware of the sexist assumptions implicit in his actions (indeed, he may be quite surprised and hurt when a woman deems the act to be patronizing and rejects his help).

Hostile and benevolent sexism may differ in the valence they place on the attitude object “women,” but they share common assumptions (e.g., that women are the weaker sex): both presume traditional gender roles and both serve to justify and maintain patriarchal social structures. Theoretically, the two forms of sexism are related in that they share three subcomponents, each of which has its hostile and its benevolent aspect, which comprise the critical issues in relationships between the sexes: power, gender differentiation, and sexuality.

Power differences between the sexes (a consequence of patriarchy) are rationalized through ideologies of *paternalism*. The hostile aspect of this ideology, *dominative paternalism*, is the belief that women ought to be controlled by men. Power carries with it the propensity to stereotype the powerless, both by default and by design (Fiske, 1993; Goodwin & Fiske, 1995). *Protective paternalism* is the benevolent aspect of paternalistic ide-

ology, which states that because of their greater authority, power, and physical strength, men should serve as protectors and providers for women. This protectiveness is particularly strong toward women on whom men are dyadically dependent or over whom they feel a sense of "ownership" (e.g., wives, mothers, daughters).

Shared stereotypes about men's and women's traits help to reinforce and maintain men's power by characterizing men as being fit for high-status work roles and women as only being suited to domestic and lower status roles (Eagly, 1987). These beliefs constitute shared ideologies about *gender differentiation*. *Competitive gender differentiation* is the hostile side of this ideology. Through negative stereotypes of women, men have long been able to gain self-confidence by believing that they are better than the other half of the population. This is a common strategy by which members of groups boost their own self-esteem through derogatory beliefs about other groups (e.g., Hogg & Abrams, 1990). Because of men's dyadic dependencies on women, however, traditional stereotypes about women also contain many traits that are viewed in an extremely positive manner (Eagly & Mladinic, 1993). This *complementary gender differentiation* is the benevolent aspect of traditional views of women, which assigns them traits consistent with traditional gender roles (e.g., wife, mother) that men depend on women to fulfill (Eagly, 1987). Women in such roles are viewed as having favorable traits (e.g., purity) that complement stereotypically male characteristics that reflect men's work role (e.g., competitiveness). These positively evaluated traditional presumptions about women are what make them men's "better half."

Men's sexual desires and fears with respect to women are the final component of ambivalent sexist attitudes. *Heterosexuality* can have either hostile or benevolent overtones. *Heterosexual hostility* reflects the tendency to view women merely as sexual objects, as well as the fear that women may use sexual attraction to gain power over men (because men's sexual attraction is a major source of women's dyadic power). In contrast, *intimate heterosexuality* romanticizes women as sexual objects, viewing a female romantic partner as necessary for a man to be "complete."

AMBIVALENT SEXISM VERSUS TRADITIONALISM-EGALITARIANISM

To date, the most frequently used scales of sexist attitudes, the AWS (Spence & Helmreich, 1972) and SRES (Beere et al., 1984), measure a construct that is related to, but significantly different from the construct of ambivalent sexism. The AWS measures attitudes about the rights and roles of women. Scores on this scale "presumably reflect the degree to which the individual holds traditional or liberal views" on this dimension (Spence et al., 1973, p. 219). The SRES was designed to assess "an attitude

that causes one to respond to another individual independently of the other individual's sex" (Beere et al., 1984, p. 564). Like the AWS, the SRES can identify those individuals who are more traditional in their attitudes about gender roles. The two scales are primarily distinguished in that the SRES explicitly includes items on men's roles, whereas the AWS focuses more on women's roles.²

How does a "traditional-egalitarian" dimension relate to the construct of ambivalent sexism? Both hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs clearly represent traditional attitudes toward women's roles. Indeed, this is why both sets of beliefs can be characterized as sexist. We presume that sexism is ambivalent, however, because some traditional beliefs about women and women's roles are associated with subjectively positive (for the sexist) feelings and stereotypes about women. In other words, what this theory adds to current concepts of attitudes toward women's roles is a way of dividing traditional attitudes about *women's roles* into those that entail subjectively positive and those that entail subjectively negative attitudes about *women*.

This distinction corrects the presumption that many researchers hold that traditional attitudes about women's roles imply only hostility toward women (cf. Eagly & Mladinic, 1989, 1993). A man who holds very traditional gender beliefs may "love women" (particularly those who uphold traditional roles). How such a man might score on the AWS and SRES is not clear. Most items on the AWS, for example, "Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers," seem to more directly assess hostile, as opposed to benevolent, sexist beliefs (see Swim, 1997). Because the SRES was constructed explicitly to equalize biases in favor of either gender (e.g., by including items such as "A male nurse cannot be as effective as a female nurse"), some of its items may assess benevolent sexism.

Two newer scales of gender-related policy attitudes assess a more contemporary form of sexism, which seems to masquerade as egalitarian, but which actually reflects more traditional attitudes. Swim, Aikin, Hall, and Hunter's (1995) Modern Sexism (MS) Scale and Tougas, Brown, Beaton, and Joly's (1995) Neosexism (NS) Scale both measure a more subtle form of sexism involving denial of the continuing existence of discrimination against women as well as hostility toward feminism and policies designed to compensate for discrimination against women (e.g., Affirmative Action programs). "Modern" sexists can claim to be egalitarian because they deny the premise that discrimination against women currently exists; thus their opposition to programs that "favor women" can be justified as consistent with an egalitarian view (e.g., "Women should not receive any special treatment"). Central to both versions of contemporary sexism is the notion that women are trying to get "special favors" (e.g., preferences in employment) rather than truly equal treatment.

Although modern sexists may claim to be egalitarian, the beliefs these

scales tap are predictive of traditional attitudes toward women's roles (Swim et al., 1995), suggesting that high scorers on these scales are not true egalitarians. As with the AWS, these scales focus more explicitly on hostile sentiments. Swim (1997) shows that MS is predictive of negative affect toward women in general and feminists in particular, but is not predictive of negative or positive affect toward women who maintain traditional roles. A similar pattern of results occurred for the AWS. Thus, the MS scale and AWS do not seem to measure benevolent sexist beliefs.

MEASURING AMBIVALENT SEXISM

Because other scales do not distinguish between hostile and benevolent forms of sexist attitudes, we have constructed a new measure, guided by Ambivalent Sexism Theory, to capture the full range of this conception of sexism. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996) is a 22-item self-report measure composed of two 11-item subscales that tap hostile sexism (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS). Each of the subscales contains items designed to measure attitudes relevant to power (dominative or protective paternalism), gender differentiation (competitive or complementary), and heterosexuality (hostile or intimate heterosexuality). The ASI and a scoring key are provided in the Appendix. Details on the construction of the ASI, its psychometric properties, reliability, and validity are reported by Glick and Fiske (1996), who conducted six ASI studies using well over 2,000 respondents (mostly college undergraduates, but also including two small community samples). The overall ASI score (an index of ambivalent sexism), as well as the HS and BS subscale scores, each have acceptable internal consistency reliability (with alphas averaging in the .8 to .9 range).

Structure of the ASI

Glick and Fiske (1996) report five independent samples for which confirmatory factor-analytic models were tested using LISREL (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). These analyses revealed that the best-fitting factor structure for the ASI has two factors (HS and BS) and three subfactors (for BS only: protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy). All three components of HS load on a single factor. This model consistently fit the data significantly better than simpler models with one sexism factor or two factors (HS and BS) with no subfactors. Apart from the lack of empirical evidence for the proposed HS subfactors, the factor-analysis results provide strong support for Ambivalent Sexism Theory.

The failure to find separate HS subfactors may indicate that dominative paternalism, competitive gender differentiation, and heterosexual hostility

are too inextricably bound together to distinguish empirically. Difficulty differentiating between dominative paternalism and competitive gender differentiation is not surprising—both aim to keep women “in their place” and characterize them as inferior to men (simultaneously reinforcing male domination and the belief that men are better than women). Furthermore, recent research by Bargh and Raymond (1995) and by Pryor, Giedd, and Williams (1995) shows that there are tight (and automatic) cognitive links between desires for power and for sex among sexist men, suggesting that sexual hostility may also be difficult to disentangle from the other components of HS.

We believe that the HS scale does tap the domains specified by the theory, but it does so in the context of a more egalitarian social environment in which dominative paternalism and competitive gender differentiation are couched in terms of backlash against women who want “too much” power (especially feminists) and in the belief that women cannot succeed in men’s roles unless given preferential treatment. These sentiments are closely related to those tapped by the MS and NS scales, but their content is subtly different. Whereas the MS and NS scales concentrate on the belief that discrimination against women no longer occurs, the ASI items emphasize the existence of a power struggle between men and women, both at work and in romantic relationships. Although only two items directly address sexual hostility (item 18, which concerns “sexual teases,” and item 15, which suggests that women try to keep their men “on a tight leash” in romantic relationships), others are also suggestive of adversarial romantic relationships between the sexes.³

Relationship Between HS and BS

Consistent with the idea that HS and BS both serve to justify patriarchy and traditional gender roles, Glick and Fiske found the two subscales to be positively correlated at about .5 (on average) for noncollege age women, undergraduate women, and undergraduate men, suggesting that both are components of a traditional sexist ideology. Women’s and younger men’s attitudes may depend mainly on whether they were socialized with traditionally sexist or egalitarian ideologies. Because HS and BS both serve to justify traditional roles, children raised in sexist environments are likely to be encouraged to adopt both HS and BS. In egalitarian environments, both HS and BS may be viewed as unacceptable.

The correlation between HS and BS, however, disappeared for older men in two independent samples (average $r = -.13$). Perhaps as sexist men get older and have more varied experiences with women—some that may particularly affect HS (e.g., losing a promotion to a woman) and others that may be especially relevant to BS (e.g., having a daughter)—they form their opinions based on personal histories of either generally

positive, negative, or mixed experiences with women in their lives. In other words, their attitudes may become more differentiated and experientially based, rather than reflecting more of an all-or-nothing adoption or rejection of traditional beliefs. Men who have mostly unsatisfying interactions with women may become purely hostile sexists, whereas men who have more satisfying experiences may become benevolently paternalistic as they grow older, more powerful, and have more resources. Such differentiation would account for the lack of relationship between HS and BS for older men.

Comparisons to Other Sexism Scales

We have suggested that scales such as the AWS and MS tend to concentrate on hostile aspects of sexism, though they may also indirectly measure BS. Glick and Fiske (1996) had a sample of 171 male and female undergraduates respond to the AWS, Swim et al.'s (1995) Modern Sexism (MS) and Old-Fashioned Sexism (OFS) scales, Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMA), and the ASI (the SRES and the NS scale were not included in this study). To simplify comparisons among them, all of the scales were scored so that higher scores indicate more traditional or sexist attitudes (including the AWS, which is typically scored in the opposite manner). These data are reviewed here in more detail than in Glick and Fiske (1996), with separate correlation matrices for men and women reported in Table 1. Because there were some interesting differences between the correlation matrices for male and female participants, we will deal separately with each. In addition, because HS and BS were significantly positively correlated for both men ($r = .45, p < .01$) and women ($r = .57, p < .01$), partial correlations for which each ASI subscale is partialled out of the other (as well as zero-order correlations) are presented.

For men, the correlations present strong evidence for the convergent validity of the HS scale and discriminant validity of the BS scale. Correlations between the HS and other scales were generally moderate (about .4), suggesting that HS is related to, but by no means completely redundant with, the other sexism scales. These correlations were virtually unaltered when the relationship of HS with BS was partialled out. With the exception of the strong correlation between the AWS and the OFS scale (which, like the AWS, taps openly anti-egalitarian sentiments concerning women), correlations among the other scales (e.g., AWS and MS) were also moderate in strength (generally in the .4 range). In contrast, the BS scale was only significantly correlated with one other sexism scale (RMA) and this relationship disappeared when the correlation of BS with HS was controlled. Thus, for men, the BS scale does seem to measure a construct that other sexism scales do not.

For women (as compared to men), the relationship between HS and the

Table 1
Correlation of the ASI and its Subscales to Other Measures of Sexism

<i>Scale</i>	<i>AWS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>OFS</i>	<i>RMA</i>
Male respondents (<i>N</i> = 74)				
ASI subscales				
HS	.54**	.46**	.38**	.47**
HS partial ^a	.52**	.46**	.34**	.39*
BS	.16	.10	-.01	.27*
BS partial ^b	-.10	-.13	-.20*	.08
Other sexism scales				
MS	.43**			
OFS	.68**	.38**		
RMA	.55**	.41**	.43**	
Female respondents (<i>N</i> = 88)				
ASI subscales				
HS	.67**	.68**	.38**	.57**
HS partial ^a	.54**	.61**	.23*	.54*
BS	.49**	.39**	.35**	.25*
BS partial ^b	.19*	.01	.18*	-.10
Other sexism scales				
MS	.62**			
OFS	.68**	.46**		
RMA	.61**	.60**	.49**	

Note: ASI = Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, HS = Hostile Sexism, BS = Benevolent Sexism, AWS = Attitudes Toward Women, MS = Modern Sexism, OFS = Old-Fashioned Sexism, RMA = Rape Myth Acceptance.

^aPartial correlations controlling for BS scores; ^bpartial correlations controlling for HS scores.

other sexism scales tended to be stronger (as did the relationships among the other sexism scales, such as the MS scale and AWS), but these differences were not statistically significant. In contrast to the male participants, significant correlations between BS and the other scales emerged for women; for the AWS and the OFS scale these gender differences were statistically significant, both z s > 1.96 , $p < .05$. The correlations between BS and these two scales (AWS, OFS) remained statistically significant even after HS was partialled out. Thus, benevolent sexist beliefs were related to the overtly anti-egalitarian beliefs tapped by the AWS and the OFS scale for women, but not for men. This gender difference may reflect the different motivational underpinnings (discussed below) that BS has for men as compared to women. Even though the partial correlations of BS with AWS and OFS were statistically significant, they were extremely weak, however, confirming the discriminant validity of the BS scale.

Predictive Validity

The ability to separate out HS and BS is the major advantage of the ASI over other scales. Even for samples in which HS and BS are correlated,

each scale can be partialled out from the other statistically to obtain pure measures of HS and BS. Pure measures of HS and BS, theoretically, ought to predict attitudes toward and stereotypes about women that have opposite valences (even if both are indicators of anti-egalitarian attitudes toward women's roles). Predictive validity studies of the ASI suggest that, for men, the scales do indeed predict opposing evaluations of women. Glick and Fiske (1996) conducted three predictive validity studies (two with community samples and one with undergraduates) using the ASI subscales to predict overall evaluations of the attitude object "women" as well as positive and negative stereotypes about women. Overall evaluations were measured by averaging responses to 5 pairs of bipolar semantic differential adjectives (e.g., "good-bad," "valuable-useless") taken from Eagly, Mladinic, and Otto (1991). To measure positive and negative stereotypes, participants were asked how well each of 32 traits characterized the group "women." Eight traits represented each of the following categories: masculine-positive, masculine-negative, feminine-positive, and feminine-negative traits (from the Extended Personality Attributes Questionnaire; Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979). For men, in both community samples, HS was significantly and consistently associated with negative evaluations and stereotypes of women, whereas BS was significantly and consistently associated with positive evaluations and stereotypes.

These results did not replicate for men in the student sample, perhaps because undergraduate men are reluctant, for self-presentational reasons, to stereotype women as a whole. In addition, because of the fact that most stereotyping of women occurs at the subtype level (e.g., career women, homemakers, etc.; Clifton, McGrath, & Wick, 1976; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990; Noseworthy & Lott, 1984; Six & Eckes, 1991; Taylor, 1981), ratings of attitudes toward "women in general" may be a less sensitive index than attitudes toward specific female subtypes. In a study of undergraduate men's spontaneous subtyping of women, Glick, Diebold, Bailey, and Zhu (1996) had men list the "types of women" that most easily came to their minds and then subsequently rate each type of woman on a 101-point evaluation thermometer and on separate 5-point scales of the degree to which each type possesses positive and negative traits and arouses positive and negative feelings. HS was negatively correlated with overall evaluations, positive trait, and positive affect ratings, but positively correlated with negative trait and negative affect ratings of the female types. BS showed precisely the opposite pattern of results. The total ASI score predicted polarized views of female types, as indicated by the variance of men's evaluative ratings of the female subtypes they produced. This pattern of results suggests that high ASI scorers spontaneously produced both extremely positively *and* negatively evaluated types of women (ones they loved and ones they hated), with HS accounting for the tendency to list

negatively evaluated types and BS predicting the generation of positively evaluated types.

Glick et al. (1996) suggest that ambivalent sexist men categorize women into more extreme or polarized subtypes as a method of avoiding the experience of ambivalent affect toward any *particular* female target. Because the conscious experience of conflicting feelings is unpleasant (Katz, 1981), sexist men are likely to have an habitual strategy by which to circumvent this experience in daily dealings with women. By placing women into "good" and "bad" types, most individual women would arouse only the positive or the negative side of sexist men's underlying ambivalence.

That men place women on a "pedestal" or in the "gutter" based on whether they see a woman as a "saint" or a "slut" is not a new idea (see Tavris & Wade, 1984). The rather Victorian tone of the BS items that measure gender differentiation, which imply that women are more "pure," "moral," and "refined," suggests that the BS scale taps the positive end of this traditional dichotomy. These BS items do not represent the "expressive" or "nurturant" cluster most closely associated with positive stereotypes of women (Spence et al., 1979), but rather more extreme visions of "pedestal-worthy" women.⁴ A second study reported by Glick et al. (1996) shows that these benevolent feelings are aroused by women who embrace the traditional "homemaker" role, whereas women who enact the nontraditional "career woman" role activate the negative feelings associated with HS.

Thus, there is promising evidence for the predictive validity of the ASI and its subscales in terms of men's attitudes toward women (particularly in terms of the subtypes into which sexist men habitually categorize women). HS is associated with negative affect toward and stereotyping of nontraditional women, whereas BS is associated with positive affect toward and stereotyping of traditional women. In terms of standard definitions of sexism, the component "hostility toward women" is clearly measured by the HS scale. That the ASI also measures anti-egalitarianism is strongly supported by the finding that HS is directed toward nontraditional women (e.g., career women, feminists), whereas BS is aroused by women in traditional roles (e.g., homemaker). Each scale assesses a form of anti-egalitarianism that attempts to maintain traditional roles: BS is the "carrot"—the reward of positive affect, esteem, and protectiveness given to women who embrace traditional roles; HS is the "stick"—the hostility that women who reject traditional roles in favor of taking on traditionally masculine roles face from men who wish to "keep them in their place." BS, though it is veiled by affection and protectiveness, is a sweeter form of coercion that, like HS, helps to maintain traditional gender roles (cf. Jackman, 1994).

Although the ASI exhibits the same factor structure for female and male

respondents, high ASI scores are not associated with ambivalence toward women on the part of female respondents. Each of the predictive validity studies described included female as well as male respondents. In general, to the extent that the ASI subscales are correlated with *women's* views of women, both HS and BS tend to predict negative evaluations and stereotypes. The difference may reflect the particular motivational relevance the attitude object "women" has for men who endorse BS, as opposed to women who do so. For example, a woman may endorse benevolent sexist beliefs, such as viewing a man as incomplete if he does not have a romantic relationship in which he protects and provides for a woman, but this, in turn, does not directly imply benevolent motives toward fellow women (who may be viewed as competitors for men's affection). For a male benevolent sexist, however, these beliefs reflect motivations that can only be fulfilled by women (e.g., the desires to form intimate heterosexual romantic attachments, to construct part of one's identity around being protective toward women) and that therefore create subjectively positive feelings toward the women who can fulfill these needs. These motivational differences may explain why BS correlated with the AWS and the OFS scale (which are more hostile in tone) for women, but not for men.

Hostile sexist beliefs may be motivationally relevant to both the women and the men who hold them. For men, these beliefs reflect the desire to dominate women, see themselves as superior to women, and exploit women as sexual objects—all of which promote hostility toward nontraditional women. Women who are hostile sexists are likely to be traditionalists who also hold negative views of nontraditional women because such women (e.g., feminists, career women) threaten to do away with the gender-role distinctions that are integral to traditional women's identities.

In addition to differences in the motivational relevance of HS and BS to men, as opposed to women, it is clear that many items on the ASI presume a heterosexual orientation on the part of the participant. This bias reflects the theoretical underpinnings of the measure, particularly in the case of BS, which is predicated on men's dependence on women as romantic objects, wives, and mothers. As a result, the ASI may not yield an accurate reading of sexism (especially BS) on the part of homosexual participants. Also, even though its items have implications concerning beliefs about men's roles, the ASI does not directly address attitudes toward men. Currently, we are developing a different scale to address women's ambivalence toward men. The Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory (AMI) is predicated on the notion that men's structural power provokes hostile resentment in women, whereas female dyadic power (which is gained only through close relationships with men) may create a maternalistic benevolence toward men.

USES OF THE ASI AND OTHER SCALES

The strength of the ASI is that it reflects a rich theoretical framework concerning the origins and nature of sexism. This conception of sexism explicitly addresses both components of general definitions of sexism: the *valence* of attitudes toward women as well as traditionalism in beliefs about women's roles and traits. The construct of benevolent sexism adds a new dimension to the definition of sexism, however—one which suggests that traditional gender-role attitudes are not exclusively predictive of negative affect toward and stereotypes about women. Ambivalent Sexism Theory recognizes the fact that traditional gender-role attitudes can be accompanied by subjectively hostile, benevolent, or both types of attitudes toward women. The ASI offers the ability to differentiate empirically between these two forms of sexism—a crucial distinction to make if one wishes to account for how sexist men evaluate, stereotype, and treat women.

Empirically, the ASI subscales can be used in a correlational fashion, with each subscale (HS and BS) partialled out from the other to obtain pure measures of HS and BS. The effects of each subscale can be compared to an interaction term ($HS \times BS$) as a measure of sexist ambivalence. Whereas indicators of hostility toward women should be predicted by HS and indicators of subjectively positive feelings and evaluations by BS, the interaction of the two should best predict measures of ambivalence. When evaluating a specific female target, however, ambivalent sexists are likely to be either hostile or benevolent, depending on whether the situation or the target activates HS or BS (see Fiske & Glick, 1995; Glick et al., 1996, for details on how various target and situational characteristics may activate the two types of sexism).

In contrast, the scales that are currently most preferred for measuring sexist attitudes, the AWS and the SRES, were designed to tap traditional versus egalitarian gender attitudes. As such, these scales more directly assess political ideologies about women's rights and roles, whereas the ASI is more focused on interpersonal relationships between men and women. The AWS and SRES have proven to be very capable at what they set out to do. The ASI should not be viewed as a replacement for these other scales, but as a tool that offers the ability to look at the subjectively positive (for the sexist) aspects of sexist men's evaluations of women.

Thus, each scale has its place. For instance, researchers interested in tracking historical changes in traditional versus egalitarian attitudes about women's roles would do well to make use of the AWS, for which more than 20 years of extensive historical data are already available (see Beere, 1990, for a list of citations). Changes in responses to the AWS (such as a lower rate of endorsement of traditional views assessed by the scale) very clearly demonstrate changing attitudes toward women's roles over the past

20 years. The AWS also still meaningfully predicts such things as political attitudes regarding women's rights, feminism, and adherence to gender stereotypes.

Scales such as the SRES and recent scales that assess more subtle forms of anti-egalitarian sentiment (e.g., Swim et al.'s MS scale, Tougas et al.'s NS scale) serve similar functions. The MS and NS scales are ideal for those who wish to study subtle forms of anti-egalitarianism toward women that are disguised as being consistent with egalitarian values. These measures probably are less reactive than the AWS and are particularly useful for understanding attitudes toward public policies, such as Affirmative Action, designed to reduce discrimination toward women.

Because it taps benevolent as well as hostile attitudes, the ASI should be particularly useful for researchers who are interested in how sexist attitudes affect heterosexual romantic relationships. It is within these relationships that men's benevolent sexism may be most likely to be activated (and, therefore, most important to measure). Sadly, HS may also have a pervasive influence in such relationships. Indeed, the all too frequent co-occurrence of love and affection with violent physical abuse in heterosexual romantic relationships suggests that ambivalence is powerfully at work in men's and women's closest relationships.

For researchers interested in understanding the conflicting emotions that sexist men feel toward women—how and when women may elicit either protectiveness and intimacy-seeking versus hostile affect and malicious discrimination on the part of men—the ASI presents opportunities not provided by other current measures. The distinction between hostile and benevolent sexism can aid us in understanding the volatility so often evident in men's feelings and behavior toward women, from the chivalry of benevolent sexism to the vicious antagonism of hostile sexism. Empirically, the ability to measure hostile and benevolent sexism separately offers a "royal road" into the psychology of the sexist mind, helping to illuminate the underlying motivations (needs for power, gender differentiation, and sexual contact) that animate men's thoughts, feelings, and behavior toward women.

First draft received: August 30, 1996

Final draft accepted: September 26, 1996

NOTES

1. There is evidence that hunter-gatherer societies tend to be roughly egalitarian, and that gender-based status inequalities arose (along with other forms of hierarchical social organization) in horticultural societies, persisting ever since (O'Kelley & Carney, 1986). Although hunter-gatherer societies dominated much of human history, they are rare (and at risk of extinction) today.
2. See King and King (1986), however, for an argument that the SRES measures a "traditional-egalitarian" dimension, whereas the AWS may measure a "traditional-feminist" dimension.

3. Additional items on the HS scale (e.g., "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men") are ambiguous about the context of adversarial relationships between men and women. Given that most of the BS items ask about relationships between men and women, many respondents may be thinking of romantic relationships as the context for such ambiguous items. After all, it is within such relationships that women can use their dyadic power to "gain the upper hand."
4. Glick and Fiske (1996) present evidence that *both* sexists and nonsexists alike view women as more expressive and nurturant. These less extreme stereotypical characterizations of women, then, are not useful for distinguishing whether someone is truly high in benevolent sexism.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bargh, J. A., & Raymond, P. (1995). The naive misuses of power: Nonconscious sources of sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 85-96.
- Beere, C. A. (1990). *Gender roles: A handbook of tests and measures*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Beere, C. A., King, D. W., Beere, D. B., & King, L. A. (1984). The Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale: A measure of attitudes toward equity between the sexes. *Sex Roles*, 10, 563-576.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1928). *Immigration and race attitudes*. Boston: D. C. Heath.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.
- Clifton, A. K., McGrath, D., & Wick, B. (1976). Stereotypes of women: A single category? *Sex Roles*, 2, 135-148.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 543-558.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1993). Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers from research on attitudes, gender stereotypes, and judgments of competence. In W. Strobe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 1-35). New York: Wiley.
- Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than men? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 203-216.
- Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, 621-628.
- Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (1995). Ambivalence and stereotypes cause sexual harassment: A theory with implications for organizational change. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 97-115.
- Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 1-74). New York: Academic.
- Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society: Applied social psychology annual* (pp. 173-196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey, B., & Zhu, L. (1996). *The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Goldberg, S. (1993). *Why men rule: A theory of male dominance*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Goodwin, S. A., & Fiske, S. T. (1995). *Power and impression formation: How powerholders stereotype by default and by design*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

- Guttentag, M., & Secord, P. (1983). *Too many women?* Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Harris, M. (1991). *Cultural anthropology* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1990). Social motivation, self-esteem and social identity. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 28–47). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8.0*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.
- Katz, I. (1981). *Stigma: A social psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1986). Validity of the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale: Discriminating egalitarianism from feminism. *Sex Roles*, 15, 207–214.
- Noseworthy, C. M., & Lott, A. J. (1984). The cognitive organization of gender stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 474–481.
- O'Kelley, C. G., & Carney, L. S. (1986). *Women and men in society* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). A social psychological model for predicting sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 69–84.
- Six, B., & Eckes, T. (1991). A closer look at the complex structure of gender stereotypes. *Sex Roles*, 24, 57–71.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure the attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 2, 667–668.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1673–1682.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2, 219–220.
- Swim, J. K. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism scales. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 103–118.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 199–214.
- Tajfel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 79–97.
- Tavris, C., & Wade, C. (1984). *The longest war* (2nd ed.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Taylor, S. E. (1981). A categorization approach to stereotyping. In D. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 88–114). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 842–849.

APPENDIX: THE AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN

Below are a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale below:

	0	1	2	3	4	5
	disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	disagree slightly	agree slightly	agree somewhat	agree strongly
<u>B(I)</u>						1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
<u>H</u>						2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
<u>B(P)*</u>						3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.
<u>H</u>						4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
<u>H</u>						5. Women are too easily offended.
<u>B(I)*</u>						6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.
<u>H*</u>						7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.
<u>B(G)</u>						8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
<u>B(P)</u>						9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
<u>H</u>						10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
<u>H</u>						11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
<u>B(I)</u>						12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
<u>B(I)*</u>						13. Men are complete without women.
<u>H</u>						14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.
<u>H</u>						15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
<u>H</u>						16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
<u>B(P)</u>						17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
<u>H*</u>						18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.
<u>B(G)</u>						19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
<u>B(P)</u>						20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
<u>H*</u>						21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.
<u>B(G)</u>						22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Note: H = Hostile Sexism, B = Benevolent Sexism, (P) = Protective Paternalism, (G) = Complementary Gender Differentiation, (I) = Heterosexual Intimacy, * = reversed item. A Spanish-language version of the ASI is available from the authors.

Scoring Instructions

The ASI may be used as an overall measure of sexism, with hostile and benevolent components equally weighted, by simply averaging the score for all items after reversing the items listed below. The two ASI subscales (Hostile Sexism and Benevolent Sexism) may also be calculated separately. For correlational research, purer measures of HS and BS can be obtained by using partial correlations (so that the effects of the correlation between the scales is removed).

Reverse the following items (0 = 5, 1 = 4, 2 = 3, 3 = 2, 4 = 1, 5 = 0): 3, 6, 7, 13, 18, 21.

Hostile Sexism Score = average of the following items: 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21.

Benevolent Sexism Score = average of the following items: 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22.

Copyright 1995 by Peter Glick and Susan T. Fiske. Use of this scale requires permission of one of the authors.