ARE FEMINISTS MAN HATERS? FEMINISTS' AND NONFEMINISTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD MEN

Kristin J. Anderson and Melinda Kanner
University of Houston, Downtown

Nisreen Elsayegh
University of Houston, Clear Lake

Despite the popular belief that feminists dislike men, few studies have actually examined the empirical accuracy of this stereotype. The present study examined self-identified feminists' and nonfeminists' attitudes toward men. An ethnically diverse sample ($N = 488$) of college students responded to statements from the Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI; Glick & Fiske, 1999). Contrary to popular beliefs, feminists reported lower levels of hostility toward men than did nonfeminists. The persistence of the myth of the man-hating feminist is explored.

Today, many young women decline to call themselves feminists. In surveys of college students, the number of those who identify as feminists ranges from 8% in a sample of African American women university students (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997) to 44% in a sample of White women attending a small private liberal arts college (Bullock & Fernald, 2003). The term "feminist" conjures up a variety of images that typically reflect both widespread misunderstanding of feminism and the cloud of negative stereotypes of women who identify themselves as feminists (Farnham, 1996; Yoder, 2003). In some quarters, feminists and feminism have been directly and indirectly blamed for a variety of social problems, including the comparatively lower rate of college entrance of young men (Sommers, 2000), the claimed decline in "manliness" in American culture (Mansfield, 2006), and even the attacks of September 11, 2001 (Falwell, 2001). In 2005, when the Pentagon established the Office of the Victim Advocate to investigate hundreds of claims by fe-

male soldiers of sexual assault committed by men in the military, Elaine Donnelly, the president of the Center for Military Readiness, publicly described the effort as establishing an "Office of Male-Bashing" (Donnelly, 2005, p. 7). The creation of an office whose mission was to investigate rape and harassment and to provide support to victims was denigrated by Donnelly from its inception when she declared that the office would "create a new job market for 'women's studies' graduates schooled in man-hating ideology" (p. 7). In popular media such as talk radio, reality television, news programs on television, Internet sites, movies, and music, feminism is situated culturally as an identity that depends on active hostility toward men. This presumption has remained largely empirically unexplored in social psychological literature. Such misrepresentations of feminism affect the extent to which women are willing to identify as feminists. Surveys have found that, although many women claim to hold and endorse feminist beliefs, they are, simultaneously, hesitant to describe themselves as feminists precisely because of the stereotype that feminists are anti-male (Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Aronson, 2003).

Empirical Studies on Feminists' Attitudes Toward Men

Although the relationship between feminist self-identification and attitudes toward men has not been examined directly in social science research, many issues that provide a foundation for this research have been well studied. For example, feminist self-identification and feminist activism have been linked with such factors as exposure to women's studies courses (Henderson-King & Stewart, 1999), adolescent socialization (Leaper & Brown, 2008), and race and racial identity (Cowan, Mestlin, & Masek, 1992; Harnois, 2005; Kane, 2000; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Reid 1984; White, 2006). In terms of the

feminists-as-man-haters stereotype, a few empirical studies have examined the subject directly. For example, Henderson-King and Stewart (1999) examined the influence of a semester-long women's studies course on women's attitudes, including their feelings toward men. Compared to women who were interested in women's studies but who had not taken a course, those women who completed a women's studies course were more likely to identify as feminists, but were no more likely to dislike men. Although the Henderson-King and Stewart (1999) study did not categorize women into feminists and non-feminists, the results imply that feminists may not differ in their feelings toward men from women who do not identify as feminists. Maltby and Day (2001) examined various psychological characteristics and their expected relationships with attitudes toward men and women. The more feminine (rather than masculine and androgynous) women regarded themselves, the more likely they were to hold negative attitudes toward men. Given that Maltby and Day (2001) found that women who endorsed more traditional gender-role orientation held more negative attitudes toward men, it seems plausible that nonfeminists (who often endorse more traditional gender roles; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006) would similarly report more negative attitudes toward men.

Finally, Iazzo (1983) developed the Attitudes Toward Men Scale, which measures women's agreement with statements about marriage, parenthood, sexuality, and work as well as physical and personality attributes about men. Scores from 28 feminists recruited from a local chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW) were compared to nonmembers. Iazzo (1983) reported that NOW members' attitudes toward men were not significantly different from those of nonmembers. To our knowledge, this is the only study that has measured feminists' (defined by their membership in NOW) attitudes toward men. The present study adds to this and related studies by examining the attitudes toward men of a larger, ethnically diverse sample of self-identified feminists, including both women and men.

Theoretical Background

Ambivalent sexism, a theory of sexism presented by Glick and Fiske (1997), describes the complex nature of sexist attitudes held by men about women and helps frame the current research. Ambivalent sexism begins with the observation that, as a form of prejudice, sexism differs significantly from other forms of prejudice, such as racism, in that women and men have lived in societies inside structural status inequality and in regular, close, and intimate contact with each other. In their measures of ambivalent sexism, Glick and Fiske (1997) found that men simultaneously appraise women in positive and negative terms or, more precisely, in terms Glick and Fiske (1997) describe as hostile and benevolent sexism. Sexism has conventionally been thought of as hostile attitudes toward women;

however, such a view neglects the positive regard that accompanies sexist antipathy. Indeed, such positive regard includes the belief that women are more refined than men, that a man is incomplete without a woman, and that women should be cherished and protected by men. These subjectively positive attitudes toward women are accompanied with beliefs that women should be protected from the outside, ugly world of men. Therefore, the subjectively positive attitudes of benevolent sexism confine women to restricted and conventional roles.

The Glick and Fiske (1999) Ambivalence toward Men Inventory (AMI), which complements their widely used Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, measures this dynamic ideological system in which ideas are, at once, competitive or contradictory and, at the same time, complementary. More specifically, the AMI is a measure of attitudes toward men that taps two dimensions of conventional attitudes toward men that have opposing valences. The first dimension, *hostility toward men*, represents overtly negative attitudes toward men. Hostility toward men refers to the expression of hostility toward men in response to inequalities between male and female power; men's aggressiveness; cultural attitudes that portray men as superior; and the ways in which men exert control within intimate, heterosexual relationships. The second dimension is *benevolence toward men*, which represents overtly positive or affectionate attitudes toward men. Benevolence toward men is based on a set of beliefs that hold that, just as women are dependent on men, so, too, are men dependent on women. Benevolence toward men suggests that the role of women is to take care of men, but only within the domestic context and the conventions of traditional gender-role behavior. Experiencing subjectively positive feelings of affectionate protectiveness, admiration, and connection with men in intimate relationships represents benevolence toward men. The phrase *benevolence toward men* sounds positive. However, these attitudes serve to reinforce gender divisions and are correlated with hostile and benevolent sexism (Glick et al., 2004) and therefore are inconsistent with most feminist principles.

Ambivalent sexism and ambivalence toward men allow us to understand the relationship between feminist self-identification and hostility toward men. The complex nature of women's attitudes toward men allows us to ask questions about social relationships and attitudes that seem counter-logical. The commonsense assumption that understanding oneself as a feminist necessarily entails harboring hatred for men must be understood in a larger social system that includes attitudes, institutions, roles, behavior, and interactions.

The theory of ambivalent sexism provides a framework for investigating the relationship between a feminist identity and the maintenance of ideological support for systematic gender inequality (Glick et al., 2004). Although Glick and Fiske (1999) have not specifically measured feminists' attitudes toward men, results from one of their studies have implications related to the relationship between feminist

identity and man-hating attitudes. In a large-scale study of 16 nations, Glick et al. (2004) investigated women's and men's attitudes toward men. They gathered individual responses to the AMI as well as a measure of attitudes toward women. In addition, they obtained United Nations indices of gender equality: (a) The Gender Empowerment Measure, which is a measure of women's representation in powerful occupational roles and government and (b) the Gender Development Index, which measures how women fare on development measures such as life expectancy, literacy rates, education, and standard of living. Glick et al. (2004) found that in most nations hostility toward men was higher among women than among men and benevolence toward men was higher among men than women. In addition, hostility-toward-men scores correlated with the national measures of gender inequality. Specifically, both hostility and benevolence toward men were higher in nations with less measurable equality than in nations with more equality. Glick et al. (2004) reasoned that women in traditional nations may be more resentful of men than women in egalitarian cultures regarding what women view as abuses of power, but that this resentment does not pose an overt challenge to gender hierarchy because it coexists with benevolent beliefs about men's roles as protectors and providers. Glick et al. (2004) also found that the more hostile men are toward women, as expressed in the form of hostile sexism, the more women resent men and feel hostility toward them. Heightened resentment of men's hostility toward women may explain why women's hostility-toward-men scores were higher in less egalitarian nations than in egalitarian nations. Because the gender gap in resources is larger and the endorsement of hostility toward women who seek equality is stronger in traditional nations, women in these cultures may show greater support for the idea that men should serve as protectors and providers. In terms of addressing the notion that feminists are man haters, the Glick et al. (2004) study on attitudes toward men suggests that resentment toward men may be linked more to antifeminism and gender inequality than it is to feminism and gender equality.

The Role of Ethnicity

The present research draws from an ethnically diverse population and explores ethnic variation in feminist self-identification and attitudes toward men. Research has found that, although White women have been reluctant to identify as feminists (Bullock & Fernald, 2003), women of color are even less likely to use the label (Kane, 2000; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997). Several explanations might account for African American women's reluctance to use the feminist label to describe themselves. White (2006), for example, suggests that African American women might shy away from the feminist label to decrease any doubt as to their cultural allegiance. In her study of gender differences in attitudes toward Black feminism among African

Americans, Simien (2004) notes that feminist consciousness among African American women is related to, yet distinct from, feminist identification and race identification. Previous research has not considered the role of ethnicity in studies of attitudes toward men. Feminist identity and its relationship to ethnic identity and to ethnic or racial identity development has been examined (Cowan, Mestlin, & Masek, 1992; Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997; Reid, 1984), but without the dimension of attitudes toward men. Even though many women of color in the United States do not label themselves feminists, many support feminist principles. In fact, African American women and men have been found to be more supportive of feminist principles than White women and men (Kane, 2000). This pattern is inflected, however, by a variety of social and political factors. For example, the Black Power movement of the 1970s tended to support extreme and traditional gender roles and a patriarchal family structure (see Hunter & Sellers, 1998, for a review). Thus, potential contradiction and conflict arise in a context of distinct support for egalitarian gender values and principles along with the possibility of social pressures toward more gender-stratified, traditional blueprints for social organization.

Two recent studies of Latinas reflect a somewhat complicated picture as well. Although results from one study suggest that Latinas report pressure to conform to traditional gender roles (Adams, Coltrane, & Parke, 2007), a different study showed that Latinas exhibited higher levels of feminist identity development than did Anglo women (Flores, Carrubba, & Good, 2006).

The Present Study

All the studies described above imply something about the nature of feminists' attitudes toward men; however, Iazzo's (1983) study was the only one to examine this question directly, and that study had a small sample. Thus, the primary goal of the present study was to compare feminists' and nonfeminists' attitudes toward men. Specifically, do feminist women and men report higher levels of hostility toward men than do nonfeminist women and men? In terms of women specifically, do feminist women hold more negative attitudes toward men than do women in general?

Based on the studies summarized above (Glick et al., 2004; Henderson-King & Sewart, 1999; Maltby & Day, 2001; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006), several hypotheses were generated. First, even though stereotypes of man-hating feminists are prevalent in popular culture, some empirical studies suggest that feminists might actually have lower levels of hostility toward men than nonfeminists. Therefore, feminist women and men were expected to report lower levels of hostility toward men than nonfeminists. Second, because feminists tend to hold less traditional gender-role ideology and tend to be less politically conservative than nonfeminists (Liss, O'Connor, Morosky, & Crawford, 2001), we expected that feminists would be less

likely to hold favorable opinions of the chivalrous qualities presumed ideal in men in traditional gender-role beliefs. Thus, feminists were expected to report lower levels of benevolence toward men than nonfeminists. We expected that feminist women would report lower levels of hostility and lower levels of benevolence toward men than would nonfeminist women.

In addition to hypotheses associated with feminist identification, we developed several secondary hypotheses regarding gender and ethnicity. Drawing from Glick and Fiske's (1999) study, we developed two hypotheses associated with respondent gender, independent of feminist identification. Women were expected to report higher levels of hostility toward men than men, and men were expected to report higher levels of benevolence toward men than women. Support for this hypothesis will replicate the patterns found in Glick et al. (2004). We examined levels of hostility and benevolence toward men among African Americans, Asian Americans, Latina/os, and Whites. Previous research among African Americans shows the coexistence of some intensified patriarchal ideology and strong progressive attitudes about gender, even for individuals who were not labeled feminist (Hunter & Sellers, 1998; Kane, 2000). With respect to African Americans, we expected to find higher levels of ambivalence toward men than among White respondents, as expressed in higher levels of hostility and benevolence toward men. Based on research described above (Adams et al., 2007), we expected that Latina/os would also report both higher levels of hostility toward men and benevolence toward men than would Whites.

METHOD

Participants

Undergraduate students ($N = 488$) from a large, nonresidential, Hispanic-serving public university in Texas participated. Sixty-six percent of respondents were women. Forty-one percent ($n = 200$) of the respondents identified as Latina/o, 27% ($n = 133$) as African American, 16% ($n = 80$) as White, and 7% ($n = 32$) as Asian American.

Measures

Attitudes toward men. The AMI (Glick & Fiske, 1999) served as the measure of attitudes toward men. The AMI measures two types of attitudes toward men: Hostility toward Men (HM) and Benevolence toward Men (BM). The nature of these attitudes characterizes men as inferior in ways that are regarded as culturally recognized and approved and are not threatening to male power, such as the notion that men behave like babies when they are sick. HM taps into resentment about men's power relative to women; men's aggressiveness; cultural attitudes that portray men as superior; and the ways in which men exert control within intimate heterosexual relationships. Individuals with high HM scores tend to agree with statements such as "When men act to 'help' women, they are often trying to prove they are better than women" and "Most men pay lip service to equality for women, but can't handle having a woman as an equal."

BM represents overtly positive or affectionate attitudes toward men. BM consists of a set of beliefs that hold that, just as women are dependent on men, so too are men dependent on women. BM assesses the degree to which an individual believes that the role of women is to take care of men, but only inside the domestic sphere. Experiencing subjectively positive feelings of affectionate protectiveness, admiration, and connection with men in intimate relationships represents benevolence toward men. Those who score high on BM agree with statements such as "Women are incomplete without men" and "Even if both members of a couple work, the woman ought to be more attentive to taking care of her man at home."

Participants indicated their agreement with each statement on a 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scale, with higher scores indicating more benevolence and hostility toward men. Each subscale includes 10 statements. Alphas for HM and BM in this study were .82 and .79, respectively, which is similar to the range reported in Glick and Fiske (1999): .81 to .86 for HM, and .79 to .83 for BM.

Feminist identification. Respondents were also asked to define feminism. Although there are many kinds of feminism (e.g., liberal, Marxist, eco-), definitions converge on an emphasis on the desire for equal rights for women (for a discussion, see, e.g., Leaper & Brown, 2008; Zucker, 2004). The definition of feminism in the present study included any reference to equal rights for women, the acknowledgement of inequality between women and men, and the need for social change on behalf of women. Two independent raters, using this rather broad definition of feminism, rated a subsample of respondents' definitions for consistency with our operational definition of feminism. We looked for definitions that included these explanations as well as terms such as *liberation* and *equality* and their synonyms. Many of the definitions of feminism that were coded as not consistent with the operational definition of feminism were cases in which feminism was confused with feminine (e.g., "Feminism is being ladylike."). A few definitions included simple statements such as "feminism is disliking men," which were coded as inconsistent with the operational definition of feminism. Responses were included as consistent with our operational definition of feminism only if they included some reference to gender equality; a definition was counted as consistent if it made some statement about disliking men, as long as it also included a reference to gender equality. "Feminists are women who dislike men and want to have the same rights as men have" was an acceptable definition. A few definitions referred to feminists as women who want to be superior to men (Feminism is "when women

think they are better than men"), and these definitions were coded as inconsistent with our operational definition of feminism. Inter-rater agreement between two coders on definitions was 94%. Finally, respondents were asked whether they were feminists and were classified according to one of three categories: feminists, nonfeminists, and those who were unsure as to whether they are feminists. The survey included other survey questions that are not part of the present study and concluded with demographic questions.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

The first analysis examined feminist identification. In all, 60.7% ($n = 296$) of the respondents defined feminism as being consistent with our operational definition of feminism. Of those who defined feminism in this way, 14.13% ($n = 41$) of the respondents identified as feminists. There were no significant ethnic differences between those who identified as feminists, those who did not identify as feminists, and those who were unsure as to whether they are feminists. Women were significantly more likely to identify as feminists than were men, $\chi^2(2, n = 290) = 9.99$, $p = .01$. Of those who identified as feminists, Table 1 displays percentages and raw numbers by respondent ethnicity and gender.

Feminists' Attitudes Toward Men

Do feminists report higher levels of hostility toward men than do nonfeminists? The main focus of the present study was to examine the stereotype that feminists dislike men. Respondents who did not define feminism in a way consistent with our operational definition of feminism, or who left the item blank, were excluded from this analysis. This reduced the sample size to 296. To have adequate cell sizes

Table 1
Percentage of Respondents Who Identified as Feminists, Nonfeminists, and Those Who Were Unsure

	Feminist % (n)	Nonfeminist % (n)	Unsure %(n)
By Ethnicity			
Latina/os	16.52% (19)	59.13% (68)	24.34% (28)
African Americans	4.88% (4)	62.20% (51)	32.93% (27)
Whites	22.64% (12)	56.60% (30)	20.76% (11)
Asian Americans	17.65% (3)	41.18% (7)	41.18% (7)
By Gender			
Women	17.00% (35)	51.94% (107)	31.07% (64)
Men	7.14% (6)	71.42% (60)	21.42% (18)
All Respondents	14.13% (41)	57.59% (167)	28.28% (82)

Note. Sample included only those respondents who defined feminism correctly ($n = 296$). Some of the totals do not add to 296 due to missing data.

Table 2
Hostility Toward Men and Benevolence Toward Men Scores Based on Gender, Ethnicity, and Feminist Identification

	Hostility toward men		Benevolence toward men	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
People of color				
Feminists	2.60	2.27	2.11	2.12
Nonfeminists	2.70	2.21	2.37	2.70
Whites				
Feminists	1.95	.85	1.07	1.4
Nonfeminists	2.55	2.04	1.83	2.55

Note. Sample size = 207. Means are based on a six-point scale ranging from 0 to 5. The values in this table reflect a significant Feminist Identification main effect for Hostility Toward Men and Benevolence Toward Men.

for the next analysis, Ethnicity was collapsed into two categories: Whites and people of color. Also, the "unsure" category of Feminist Identification was removed from this analysis.[1] This collapsing resulted in a sample size of 207. We performed a 2 (Feminist Identification) × 2 (Gender) × 2 (Ethnicity) between-participants multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with HM and BM as dependent variables. MANOVA was used because HM and BM were positively correlated, $r(487) = .46$, $p = .00$. Table 2 shows the means from this analysis.

The multivariate main effect for Feminist Identification was significant (Wilks's Lambda = .96, $F(1, 198) = 4.43$, $p = .01$, $\eta2 = .04$). The univariate tests revealed Feminist Identification main effects for BM, $F(1, 199) = 8.26$, $p = .01$, $\eta2 = .04$, and HM, $F(1, 199) = 4.81$, $p = .03$, $\eta2 = .02$. An examination of the means shows that, consistent with our hypotheses, feminists had lower levels of BM and HM than nonfeminists. Thus, contrary to popular stereotypes, feminists had lower levels of hostility toward men than did nonfeminists. The multivariate Feminist Identification × Gender interaction was not significant, Wilks's Lambda = .99, $F(2, 198) = .29$, $p = .75$, $\eta2 = .00$, nor was the multivariate Feminist Identification × Ethnicity interaction, Wilks's Lambda = .98, $F(2, 198) = .2.20$, $p = .11$, $\eta2 = .02$. Table 2 shows the means from this analysis. This analysis did produce significant effects associated with Gender and Ethnicity, but the effects are redundant with analyses using the entire sample that are reported below.

Are There Gender and Ethnic Differences in Hostility Toward Men and Benevolence Toward Men?

Finally, to test our hypotheses on the role of ethnicity on attitudes toward men, a two-way (Gender × Ethnicity) MANOVA was performed with HM and BM as dependent variables. Because Feminist Identification was not a factor in this analysis, an accurate definition of feminism

was not necessary and, therefore, all respondents ($n = 488$) were included. The multivariate main effects for Gender, Wilks's Lambda $= .84$, $F(1, 460) = 42.55$, $p = .00$, $\eta 2 = .16$, and Ethnicity, Wilks's Lambda $= .93$, $F(4, 460) = 4.51$, $p = .00$, $\eta 2 = .04$, were significant. There was a significant main effect for Gender on HM, $F(1, 460) = 22.04$, $p = .00$, $\eta 2 = .05$, and on BM, $F(1, 460) = 16.08$, $p < .001$, $\eta 2 = .03$. As expected, men reported higher levels of BM than women, and women reported higher levels of HM than men. Univariate tests revealed a significant main effect for Ethnicity on HM, $F(4, 460) = 4.87$, $p = .00$, $\eta 2 = .04$, and on BM, $F(4, 460) = 7.64$, $p = .00$, $\eta 2 = .06$. Tukey post hoc tests revealed that White respondents reported lower levels of HM than did Latina/os, $p = .01$, African Americans, $p = .00$, and Asian Americans, $p = .01$. White respondents also reported lower levels of BM than Latina/os, $p = .00$, African Americans, $p = .01$, and Asian Americans, $p = .00$. The hypothesis that White respondents would report lower levels of HM and BM than Latina/os and African Americans was supported. There was no significant Ethnicity × Gender interaction. Table 3 displays the means associated with this analysis.

DISCUSSION

The present study compared feminists' and nonfeminists' attitudes toward men and examined whether there are ethnic variations in feminist identification and attitudes toward men. In all, only 14% of the women and men respondents in our sample identified as feminists. This percentage is lower than others have found with predominantly White samples (e.g., Bullock & Fernald, 2003), but consistent with a study using a sample of African American and Latina women (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997). One obvious barrier for people of color to identifying as feminists is that, because of the history of racism in the U.S. women's movement, some African Americans view feminism as a White middle-class

women's movement representing White women's concerns (see Simien, 2004, for a discussion). Thus, women of color might be less likely to identify as feminists than White women, even if they hold values consistent with feminist principles (Myaskovsky & Wittig, 1997). Because our sample included a significant number of people of color (83%), it is not surprising that relatively few respondents identified as feminists. Interestingly, there were no ethnic differences in the likelihood of labeling oneself a feminist. In addition to the ethnic diversity of the sample, the fact that only 14% of the students in our sample identified as feminists, even when they understood what feminism is, could reflect a variety of cultural influences, including media representations that cast feminists and feminism in a negative light (Alexander & Ryan, 1997; Aronson, 2003).

To some extent, reluctance to identify oneself as a feminist might be understood in terms of a generational gap. Individuals who came into young adulthood and social awareness during the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s were exposed to relatively more public discourse and had an opportunity to understand the feminist label in terms of its core values (Lips, 2006; Yoder, 2003). During the last 25 years, feminism has suffered considerable denigration in mass media and neglect in academic curricula. Since the 1980s, feminists and feminism have been marginalized in the mass media and popular culture (Anderson, in press). This negative value of feminist as a label is reflected, for example, in the coinage of "the F word," drawing on a presumed parallel with the condemnatory "L word" as a delicate politically conservative avoidance of the word "liberal" and the more detestable and widely rejected "N word" popularized during the television coverage of the O.J. Simpson trial and retained in common usage. Another linguistic indication of the devaluing of feminist can be found in the coinage and adoption of the slang "feminazi" to both label feminists and to assert the notion that women who might identify as feminist or who might, by others, be identified as feminist, represent fascist rather than egalitarian values.

Table 3
Attitudes Toward Men Measured by the Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory

	Hostility toward men	Benevolence toward men
By ethnicity		
Latina/os	2.52$_b$	2.60$_b$
African Americans	2.65$_b$	2.63$_b$
Whites	2.13$_a$	2.10$_a$
Asian Americans	2.72$_b$	3.10$_b$
By gender		
Women	2.76$_a$	2.39$_a$
Men	2.25$_b$	2.88$_b$

Note. Means are based on scores from the entire sample ($n = 488$). Means are based on a six-point scale ranging from 0 to 5. Means in the same column within the categories of Ethnicity and Gender with different subscripts are significantly different.

Are Feminists Man Haters?

The main purpose of the present study was to examine the popular claim that feminists are man haters and, specifically, whether feminists have higher levels of hostility toward men than nonfeminists. Despite the popularity and durability of the stereotype that feminists are man haters, we found only one empirical study that directly examined feminists' attitudes toward men (Iazzo, 1983), and that study relied on a small sample of NOW members as respondents. Contrary to the common stereotype, feminists in the present study reported lower levels of hostility toward men than did nonfeminists. The presence of feminist men alone cannot explain the relatively low levels of hostility toward men in the Feminist category because there was no significant Gender × Feminist Identification interaction on hostility toward men. Our finding of gender

difference replicates the Glick et al. (2004) finding that women in the United States and other nations have more hostility overall toward men than do men. It is important to position women's hostility toward men in general against feminists in general, including women and men who self-identify as feminists. Again, the present study found that, whereas women's hostility toward men was higher than was men's, feminists' hostility toward men was lower than non-feminists'.

Because the present study found no evidence that feminists are hostile toward men and, in fact, found that nonfeminists reported higher levels of hostility toward men than did feminists, a larger question remains: What accounts for the persistence of the stereotype that feminists are man haters? Feminism as a political, ideological, and practical paradigm offers a critique of systems of gender stratification and, simultaneously, encourages equality. Perhaps there is a "unit of analysis" confusion whereby feminist critiques of patriarchy are confused with specific complaints about particular men and women's interpersonal relationships with men. Feminism itself entails an interrogation of the system of male dominance and privilege and not an indictment of men as individuals. To the extent that individual men exhibit sexist attitudes, feminist analysis focuses on the social institutions and ideologies that produce such behavior (see Anderson, in press).

Why might traditional, nonfeminist women in general express more hostility toward men than feminists express? Traditional women have more investment in traditional gender roles in which they are both dependent on men and frustrated and subordinated by male dominance. Glick et al. (2004) found in their 16-nations study that hostility toward men was higher among women than among men. Also, hostility toward men was correlated with the national measures of gender inequality. Glick et al. (2004) reasoned that women in traditional nations may feel more resentment toward men for what they view as abuses of power, but that this resentment is not necessarily a challenge to gender hierarchy because it coexists with benevolent beliefs about men's roles as protectors and providers. The more hostile men are toward women, the more women resent men and show hostility toward men. Heightened resentment of men's hostility and abuses of power may explain why women's reported hostility toward men was higher than that of men in more traditional cultures.

Hostility and Benevolence Toward Men: Gender and Ethnic Patterns

In addition to our primary question about whether feminists are man haters, we examined gender and ethnic differences in hostility toward and benevolence toward men, regardless of feminist identification. Consistent with previous studies (e.g., Glick et al., 2004), women reported higher levels of hostility toward men and lower levels of benevo-lence toward men than did men. Ambivalence toward men has been examined cross-nationally (Glick et al., 2004), but ethnic variation in the United States had not been examined previously. If there is more adherence to traditional gender-role dynamics among people of color, we would expect relatively higher levels of both hostility and benevolence toward men. Indeed, Latina/o, African American, and Asian American respondents reported higher levels of hostility toward men and benevolence toward men than White respondents. These relatively high levels of hostility and benevolence toward men (just above the midpoint in the present study) for Latina/os, African Americans, and Asian Americans suggest that two processes may be at work: an adherence to traditional gender roles, whereby women have relative power in the domestic domain while men serve as chivalrous protectors of women (benevolence toward men) and resentment of men's power and privilege (hostility toward men).

Limitations and Future Directions

The present research is the first empirical study that examines the relationship between hostility toward men, typically framed colloquially as "man hating," and self-identified feminism. As we close the discussion, we note specific limitations of this study and describe areas for future research suggested by our findings.

First, although our sample is more ethnically diverse than those in many studies of feminism, our results suggest that future research should include larger samples and greater ethnic diversity. Larger samples would allow the examination of multiple categories of ethnicity, whereas, in the present study, ethnic categories had to be collapsed into one category. The notion of feminism in contemporary American consciousness has been distorted through cultural forces and includes the presumption that feminism has accomplished its goals and is a passé form of identity. The relative lack of attention to race and ethnicity and their shaping roles in the formation of attitudes toward men can be addressed with more diverse research populations and settings that go beyond college subject pools. Additionally, the notion of "feminist" itself must be addressed in terms of its multiple meanings, as it is used by men and women, lesbians and gay men as well as presumed heterosexual subjects.

Another misconception about feminism, and one that will have significance when considering ethnic and racial diversity, is that feminism is a White, middle-class, heterosexual women's political movement. The expansion of the racial and ethnic diversity of subsequent research will challenge our understanding of the real-life relationship between feminism and women of color. Future research on these important questions might be broadened to include women and men outside of the academic world and beyond participants in political causes and organizations, a source of previous studies (e.g., Iazzo, 1983).

The present research directly examined the relationship between identification as feminist and attitudes toward men. Future research might explore more nuanced sources and correlates of women's attitudes toward men, such as cross-gender friendships and romantic relationships with men.

Due to the related stereotype of lesbians being man haters, an important contribution of future research could be to examine sexual orientation as a moderator of attitudes toward men. Lesbians, like feminists, might have less at stake in supporting conventional restrictive gender roles; therefore, we might predict that lesbians could show less hostility and more positive regard toward men in general, perhaps in contradiction to stereotypical images of lesbians as man haters. Finally, because of the influence of mass media representations on whether or not women identify as feminists, the persistence of the myth of feminist man haters in mass media should be further explored.

CONCLUSION

The present study examined feminists' compared to non-feminists' attitudes toward men and whether there are ethnic variations in the relationship between feminist identification and attitudes toward men. Nonfeminists reported higher levels of hostility toward men than did feminists. Perhaps nonfeminists, similar to the women in gender-stratified nations in Glick et al. (2004), support a system in which women are simultaneously required to privilege men, while tending to resent their differential power. Studies with predominantly White participants have found that hostility toward men and benevolence toward men are correlated with sexist attitudes toward women (Glick & Fiske, 1999). Thus, those who believe that men should protect women and that women should take care of men at home also tend to believe that women need protection because they are inferior to men.

The frequent claims that feminism is a form of male bashing and that feminists are man haters have the combined effect of serving the forces of institutional and individual sexism and, at the same time, interrupting the potential for solidarity between women in its apparent pitting of one woman against another in competition for men (see Cataldi, 1995). In general, feminism, whether in the form of ideological systems, women's studies courses, or individual attitudes and behavior, does not express or promote the idea that men are bad. Feminism, in addition to providing a set of core values of equal access to power, prestige, and resources, critiques not individual men but instead the underlying systems that produce male domination and privilege. As Cataldi (1995) has argued, oversimplifying and overgeneralizing feminism as male bashing trivializes and belittles the difficult and complex work involved in social critique and social movements. The man-hater stereotype serves as a scare tactic to frighten people away from

the notion of feminism, even when their actual values and beliefs might be characterized as feminist.

NOTE

1. These two modifications are the result of recommendations from reviewers.

REFERENCES

Adams, M., Coltrane, S., & Parke, R. D. (2007). Cross-ethnic applicability of the gender-based attitudes toward marriage and child rearing scales. *Sex Roles*, *56*, 325–339.

Alexander, S., & Ryan, M. (1997). Social constructs of feminism: A study of undergraduates at a women's college. *College Student Journal*, *31*, 555–568.

Anderson, K. J. (in press). *Benign bigotry: The psychology of subtle prejudice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Aronson, P. (2003). Feminists or "postfeminists"? Young women's attitudes toward feminism and gender relations. *Gender & Society*, *17*, 903–922.

Bullock, H. E., & Fernald, J. L. (2003). "Feminism lite?" Feminist identification, speaker appearance, and perceptions of feminist and antifeminist messengers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *27*, 291–299.

Cataldi, S. L. (1995). Reflections on "male bashing." *National Women's Studies Association Journal*, *7*, 76–85.

Cowan, G., Mestlin, M., & Masek, J. (1992). Predictors of feminist self-labeling. *Sex Roles*, *27*, 321–330.

Donnelly, E. (2005). Pentagon doesn't need an office of male-bashing. *Human Events*, *61*, 7.

Falwell, J. (2001, September 13). *700 Club* [Pat Robertson's television program]. Retrieved July 16, 2006, from www.pfaw.org/pfaw/general/default.aspx?oid=1817

Farnham, C. (1996). Male bashing or what's in a name? Feminism in the United States today. *Journal of Women's History*, *8*, 6–9.

Flores, L. Y., Carrubba, M. D., & Good, G. E. (2006). Feminism and Mexican American adolescent women: Examining the psychometric properties of two measures. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *28*, 48–64.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*, 119–135.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). The Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent beliefs about men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *23*, 519–536.

Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S. T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., et al. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 713–728.

Harnois, C. E. (2005). Different paths to different feminisms? Bridging multiracial feminist theory and quantitative sociological gender research. *Gender & Society*, *19*, 809–828.

Henderson-King, D., & Stewart, A. J. (1999). Educational experiences and shifts in group consciousness: Studying women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 390–399.

Hunter, A. G., & Sellers, S. L. (1998). Feminist attitudes among African American women and men. *Gender & Society*, *12*, 81–99.

Iazzo, A. N. (1983). The construction and validation of Attitudes Toward Men Scale. *The Psychological Record*, *33*, 371–378.

Kane, E. W. (2000). Racial and ethnic variations in gender-related attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 419–439.

Leaper, C., & Brown, C. S. (2008). Perceived experiences with sexism among adolescent girls. *Child Development*, *79*, 685–704.

Lips, H. M. (2006). *A new psychology of women: Gender, culture, and ethnicity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Liss, M., O'Connor, C., Morosky, E., & Crawford, M. (2001). What makes a feminist? Predictors and correlates of feminist social identity in college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *25*, 124–133.

Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2001). Psychological correlates of attitudes toward men. *The Journal of Psychology*, *135*, 335–351.

Mansfield, H. C. (2006). *Manliness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Myaskovsky, L., & Wittig, M. A. (1997). Predictors of feminist social identity among college women. *Sex Roles*, *37*, 861–883.

Reid, P. T. (1984). Feminism versus minority group identity: Not for black woman only. *Sex Roles*, *10*, 247–255.

Saunders, K. J., & Kashubeck-West, S. (2006). The relations among feminist identity development, gender-role orientation, and psychological well-being in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *30*, 199–211.

Simien, E. M. (2004). Gender differences in attitudes toward black feminism among African Americans. *Political Science Quarterly*, *119*, 315–338.

Sommers, C. H. (2000). *The war against boys*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

White, A. M. (2006). Racial and gender attitudes as predictors of feminist activism among self-identified African American feminists. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *32*, 455–478.

Yoder, J. D. (2003). *Women and gender: Transforming psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zucker, A. N. (2004). Disavowing social identities: What it means when women say, "I'm not a feminist, but . . ." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *28*, 423–435.