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THE CONCEPT OF GENDER HOSTILITY

The expression, "You can't live with them and you can't live without them" reflects an aspect of the relationships between men and women that we will call gender hostility. Gender hostility permeates American culture and it is at the intersection of several traditions of sociological analysis. Identifying gender as a "master status", Everett Hughes (19??) emphasized the centrality of gender for understanding social relationships by identifying gender as a "master status." While long being at the core of feminist theory, gendered experiences and socially ascribed differences between men and women in power and privilege are increasingly a primary focus of conflict theory (Collins, 1971) and stratification theory (Hartmann, 1976; England, 1986). Given the relevance of gender hostility to important streams of sociological analysis, a valid and reliable scale to measure gender hostility could facilitate a great deal of sociological research. The purpose of this paper is to describe the development of such a scale.

The Gender Hostility (GH) scales described in this article is not the first measure of gender hostility. Check and Malamuth (1993) developed Hostility Toward Women Scale and Hostility Toward Men Scales. Research with this scale has shown the utility of this type of instrument. Reilly, Lott, Caldwell, and Deluca (1992) used one of these scales and found that hostility to women is related to tolerance of sexual harassment among undergraduate students. Malamuth (1986) found that hostility to women predicted men's sexual aggression toward women. Dewhurst, Moore, and Alfano (1992) found that hostility to women is one of the best discriminators between male sexual offenders and batterers and nonabusive men. Similarly, Scott, Owens, and Stecker (1993) found that for men, but not for women, hostility toward the opposite sex, is related to sexual pressure and manipulation.

PREVIOUS MEASURES OF GENDER HOSTILITY

Our search of the literature since August, 1995 located three scales whose titles suggested that they measure gender hostility. Two of them -- the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1980) and the Attitude Toward Women Scale (Spence and Helmreich (1972) -- are measures of negative attitudes about the relationships between men and women or attitudes about appropriate gender roles, but are not measures of hostility to men and hostility to women.

The Hostility Toward Men and Hostility Toward Women Scales
hostility per se. Moreover, there are parallel scales for hostility to men and women. The existence of parallel scales is essential for comparing the degree to which men and women are antagonistic to the other gender, and can also play a critical role in research on the causes of hostility toward the other gender. For example, the use of a Hostility Toward Men scale in addition to a Hostility toward Women scale enabled Check and Malamuth to show that fear of victimization is related to women's hostility to men.

Despite these strengths, Check and Malamuth's scales have some limitations. First, the items in the two scales, while often comparable, are not symmetrical. As a result of using different items for men and women, it is not possible to make accurate gender comparisons of the level of hostility. Second, some of the items themselves appear to be faulty. For example, "I used to think that most men told the truth, but now I know otherwise" would be difficult to answer by someone who has always believed that men lie. The item "Men irritate women a great deal more than they know of" confuses whether men are believed to irritate women with whether men realize this. Third, Check and Malamuth's scales focus on beliefs about negative attributes about men and women and do not pay explicit attention to hostile emotions such as anger or resentment. Fourth, some of the items are reality based such as "Men always seem to get the breaks." One could agree with this and want to correct the inequalities, but not be hostile to men. Fifth, all the items are True-False choices restricting the range of measurement.

EXPLORATORY STUDY

Before attempting to create the GH scales, we carried out a qualitative study to let men and women tell us in their own words what bothered them and what pleased them about each gender. Open-ended questionnaires were given to students in three general education courses (62 women and 34 men). The respondents were asked to list four things they liked and disliked about men and women.

Positive Characteristics. There was a great deal of symmetry between what is viewed as "likeable" between women and men. Fun to be with, beautiful, intelligent, good friends, easy to talk to, sexually attractive, and sensitive were common characteristics to describe both men and women positively. There were, however, some gender specific positive characteristics. Only men were described as strong, laid back, cool, and straightforward saying what they mean. Women were more likely than men to be described as caring or opening up to someone.
Negative Characteristics. While there was some symmetry between men and women in negative characteristics, these responses tended to be very gender-specific and often opposite. Symmetrical attributes included arrogance and jealousy. Some characteristics were similar attributes but were applied differently to men and women. For example, both men and women were said to act differently when among friends of the same sex. Women were described as being gossipy, cliquey or competitive about men with women. Men's changes were not as specific, generally described as a change in behavior or personality.

Both men and women were described as treating the opposite sex badly, but men were described as using women and being insensitive to their feelings, whereas women were described as manipulating men. Finally, some of the negative characteristics used to describe men and women were opposites. Some examples include: "Women are overly emotional" and "Men can't express feelings," "Women are too dependent on men and worry too much about men" and "Men treat women poorly and are insensitive to their feelings," and "Men act too macho" and "Women act too ditsy or silly".

Number of Characteristics Mentioned. Women tended to identify a greater number of and more diverse qualities that they liked and disliked each sex. Fifty percent of women listed at least 14 of the 16 possible characteristics. Only thirty-five percent of the men provided the same number of responses. This different ability of men and women to recognize and acknowledge hostility toward men and women as a group is also apparent with the preliminary analysis of the GHS.

SCALING METHODS

The bases for generating the questions to include in the GH scales included the findings form the qualitative study, our theoretical judgements, previous measures of gender hostility, and measures of hostility or prejudice toward other groups such as the Attitude Toward Homosexuality Scale (Larsen, Reed, and Hoffman, 1980), the Index of Homophobia (Hudson and Rickett, 1980), the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933), and the State-Trait Anger Scale (Speilberger and London, 1983), and the qualitative research of Christa Reiser (1993).

Sub-scales For Negative Emotions and Beliefs

On the basis of our review of previous work and the qualitative data, we decided that it was important for the GH
THE GENDER HOSTILITY SCALES
(Items arranged in random order)

The following statements are about you or the relationship between you and your partner. Please read each statement and describe how much you agree with it.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Disagree
3=Agree
4=Strongly Agree

1) I often feel resentful of men.
2) I am more easily angered by women than by men.
3) Men change personalities when with male friends.
4) Women are more dishonest than men.
5) Women care only about themselves.
6) Men are rude.
7) Women respect men.
8) Men are too competitive.
9) Men don't understand women.
10) Women are too demanding.
11) Women are rude.
12) Men like to hurt women.
13) I can trust women as much as men.
14) Women treat men badly.
15) There are days when I don't like men.
16) Women are better than men.
17) Men's feelings are more easily hurt than women's.
18) Women manipulate men.
19) Men get pleasure in putting women down.
20) Women are smarter than men.
21) Men are better than women.
22) Women get pleasure in putting men down.
23) Women always want to be right.
24) Men are better listeners than women.
25) Women don't understand men.
26) I am easily frustrated by men.
27) I admire men more than women.
28) I admire women more than men.
29) Men give women credit for their achievements.
30) Women are too competitive.
31) Women are too sensitive.
32) Men treat women badly.
33) I can trust men as much as women.
34) Women are gossipy with their friends.
35) Men always want to be right.
36) I am sometimes suspicious of men.
37) Women care about men's feelings.
38) Women are too emotional.
39) Women's feelings are more easily hurt than men's.
40) Men annoy me more than women.
41) Women annoy me more than men.
42) There are days when I don't like women.
43) Women irritate me a lot.
44) Men are too interested in sex.
scales to provide separate scores on two aspects or dimensions of hostility: negative emotions and negative beliefs. The negative belief dimension is measured by items referring to negative attributions about the characteristics and behaviors of each gender, such as "Men are rude" "Women are too demanding." The items refer to the beliefs or opinions about these traits, not how the respondent feels about them. The negative emotions dimension is measured by items referring to negative emotions about a gender, such as "I often feel resentful of men" or "There are days when I don't like women", without identifying specific traits or behaviors of men or women which might be the basis for the negative emotions. Respondents were asked to rate how much they agree or disagree with each statement on a four point scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree.

Initial Item Pool

We created an item pool consisting of 33 items for the Hostility to Men scale and 33 for the Hostility to Women scale. Both sets of 33 items consisted of 9 intended to measure negative emotions and 24 intended to measure negative beliefs. The items also have the following characteristics:

Symmetrical And Gender Specific Items. Although almost all items included in the scales were symmetrical, we included 5 items for men and women that emerged from the qualitative data as frequently noted opposite negative attributes for men and women. Examples include, "Men act to macho" and "Women act to silly".

Comparative Items. Ten of the items in each scale compared beliefs and emotions about men and women. Examples include, "I admire men more than women" and "Women are smarter than men".

Balancing of Items Favoring One Gender. Although the GHM and GHW scales consist primarily of parallel items, the qualitative data alerted us to the possibility that some of these pairs could bias the scales toward hostility to one gender or the other. For example, the items "Men are too sensitive" and "Women are too sensitive" may be biased toward hostility to women since the qualitative data indicate that women are more likely to be described as "too sensitive". We dealt with this problem by also including characteristics that qualitative data suggested may be more likely to describe men, such as being untrustworthy. Thus, we included the items, "I can trust men as much as women" and "I can trust women as much as men".

Alternation of Scoring Direction. We worded some of the items so that an "agree" response meant hostility, and some so
that an "disagree" response meant hostility. This was done to prevent respondents from falling into a response pattern of marking agree or disagree to every item.

Scoring

The items for which a response of Disagree indicated hostility were first reversed. The score for each scale or subscale consists of the sum of the code 1 to 4 code values. Thus, the range of possible scores is 33 to 132 for the GHM and GHW scales, 24 to 96 for the beliefs subscales, and 9 to 36 for the negative emotions subscales. The scores were computed using SPSS/PC. The reliability program in SPSS/PC requires "listwise deletion" which means dropping any cases which are missing a response to even one item. While the number of cases dropped was not extremely high, about 17 percent, we plan to explore the effect of replacing the missing data with the mean of the available responses.

Sample

The sample consisted of 232 undergraduate students in introductory sociology courses. Sixty-four percent of the sample was female. The median age of the respondents was 20 and they were representatives from all years at the university. The sample was not ethnically and racially diverse, over ninety-three percent of the sample was white. The socioeconomic status of the sample was very high. Almost 25 percent of fathers and 17 percent of mothers with four year and graduate degrees. Over 27 percent of respondents reported their family income to be over $80,000.

Half the sample was currently in a relationship, of which almost all (92.8%) were dating rather than engaged or married. Three-fourths of the respondents were sexually active in their current or past relationships. Twenty-four percent of the respondents were members of fraternities or sororities.

Questionnaire

A self-administered questionnaire was used. It included the 76 GHS items as well as a preliminary version of a Jealous Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney McCoy, and Tsang, 1995), and the revised Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, Hamby, McCoy, & Sugarman 1996).

The revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) asks respondents
to report how often in the past year they and their partners used certain tactics to handle conflict in their dating, cohabiting, or marriage relationship. The CTS2 includes subscales for Negotiation (12 items), Psychological Aggression (16 items), Physical assault (24 items), Sexual coercion (14 items), and Injury (10 items). Each subscale can further be divided into minor and severe treatment.

Psychometric Analyses

Reliability. Alpha coefficients were computed using the Reliability program in SPSS/PC for the total scales and both subscales. Examination of the item-total correlations from the reliability analysis identified two items with very low or negative correlations. These were dropped to create the versions of the scales for this paper. Both of the deleted items were in the pool of items for the negative belief scale. Elimination of the items did not lose any content coverage because there were other items which capture the aspects of hostility. Reliability was recalculated with the expected very slight increases in the size of the coefficients. Table 1. shows the alpha coefficients for the total hostility scale and the subscales. Reliability is adequate for all scales (over .7) and quite high for some, such as the total Hostility To Women scale.

Validity. Evidence for construct validity is provided in the analysis which shows the theoretically expected gender differences in hostility to men and women and statistically significant relationships between gender hostility and using violence against a partner. These results are discussed in the following section.

SOME PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

Extent of hostility

The BOTH column of Table 2 shows the mean score and percent of maximum score for the total scale and subscales. The results suggest that there is a great deal of hostility toward men and women. The theoretical range of the scores is 33 to 132. In this sample of undergraduate students, the actual scores for hostility to men ranged from 39 to 116, and to women, from 37 to 103. Thus, the average score for both the GHM and GHW scales, and also for the subscales are over 50 percent of the maximum score. There is a tendency for the there to be slightly more hostility to men than to women.
Gender differences in hostility. Table 2 also compares GHS scores by gender. The consistent trend reveals that there is greater hostility toward men by women than by men, and greater hostility toward women by men than by women. Three of these differences are statistically significant, but none are very large.

Table 3 rearranges some of the data from Table 2 in order to facilitate comparing the degree to which men and women are hostile to their own gender with hostility to the other gender. It shows that men tend to have similar hostility scores regardless of gender. Their scores are 69 for both Hostility to Men and Hostility to Women on the total scale, and 49 for both men and women on the negative beliefs subscale. A slight exception appears to be on negative emotions subscale where men indicate fewer negative emotions toward men than women. However, the differences in the scores is still not large (19.3 vs 20.1).

For women, there are substantial difference in their hostility to men as compared to hostility to women. Women tend to have higher scores on the scales measuring hostility to men than on hostility to women. The exception is the same as the exception for men: the negative emotions scale. Women's scores for negative emotions toward men are very similar to their scores on negative emotions toward women.

Although not a perfectly consistent pattern, it appears that men do not make a sharp distinction between men and women in their attitudes and beliefs. Women, on the other hand, seem to perceive greater differences between men and women. These findings are supported by the qualitative data which also shows that women identified more aspects of each gender that they liked and did not like than did men.

These findings are consistent with feminist and power theories and research that find that women, being in a less powerful and less privileged position, are more likely to experience and recognize gender as an important organizing force in society. Men, in a more powerful gender position, are less likely to feel the effects of gender in their everyday lives and therefore, are less likely to see the world through gendered lens (Harding, 1995). Thus, when asked about hostility, beliefs, and emotions based on gender, women, are more likely than men to distinguish between attitudes and impressions of men and women.

Correlates of Gender Hostility

One main effect and one interaction effect stand out from
our analysis as important and interesting findings. First, current relationship status is related to levels of hostility toward both your own and the opposite sex. Respondents who were not in a relationship indicated greater hostility toward men and women. These findings could be explained in two ways. First, people who are hostile towards men and women may avoid intimate relationships with others. Or, the lower rates of hostility could result from being close and compatible with someone in a relationship.

Our results also show an interaction effect between sex and fraternity membership on the Negative Beliefs About Women subscale. Men who are members of fraternities have the highest negative beliefs about women: 40.9 as compared to non-fraternity men (F 3.87 p. = .05). This is consistent with studies examining the culture of fraternities (Martin and Hummer, 1989). As for women, sorority members have fewer negative beliefs about women than nonmembers (28.6 vs 37.3). This difference may be a factor of the close friendships and "sisterhood" that a sorority can provide or the scores may reflect sorority members' reactions to stereotypes that they face, such as being "ditsy".

Gender Hostility and Abuse of Partners

The GH scales were created as part of a larger project to develop measures of risk markers for abuse in intimate relationships (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1995). We are currently in the process of analyzing this data and there appears to be a significant relationship between gender hostility and abusive behavior in relationships. Further work, however, is needed for an accurate interpretation of the data. The results of this analysis will be the topic of a paper to be given this summer at the 12th World Meeting of the International Society For Research on Aggression.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Gender hostility is at the intersection of several traditions of sociological analysis including feminist theory, conflict theory, and social stratification. This paper describes the development of scales to measure hostility to men and hostility to women which are intended to facilitate research in each of those traditions. The Hostility to Men and the Hostility to Women scales have subscales for negative beliefs and negative emotions. The items in the scales are based on a qualitative study which let men and women tell us in their own words what bothered them and what pleased them about each gender;
and on previous scales. Since the scales are symmetrical in the sense that they consist of parallel items, they permit a more complete analysis of gender hostility than would be the case if we had developed only a Hostility to Men or only a Hostility to Women scale.

The paper presents preliminary data based on the responses of 232 undergraduate students in introductory sociology courses. Sixty-four percent of the sample was female. The alpha coefficients of reliability were adequate (over .70) for all scales and quite high for some, such as the total Hostility To Women scale.

The findings reveal a high level of hostility toward men and toward women. As expected, women had higher scores on hostility to men than did men did. Surprisingly, however, both men and women also expressed a high level of hostility to their own gender.

At this early stage, not much can be said about validity, except that the scores seem to follow a pattern of gender differences, and of relationships with other variables (such as fraternity membership and violence against a partner in a dating, cohabiting, or marital relationship), that is consistent with what is known about the social origins and consequences of gender hostility.

Table 1. Reliability of Gender Hostility scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostility to Men:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotions</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility to Women:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scale</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotions</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Gender of Respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hostility to Men:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Emotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hostility to Women:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total - Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Emotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F < .05
Table 3. Comparison Men and Women's Mean Hostility Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Gender of Respondent</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Hostility:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Men</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Women</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Beliefs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Men</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Women</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Men</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Women</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENDER HOSTILITY (GH) SCALES
Items grouped by subscale

**Negative Emotions**

I often feel resentful of men/women.
I am sometimes suspicious of men/women.
I am easily frustrated by men/women.
Men/women irritate me a lot.
I can trust men/women as much as women/men.
There are days when I don't like men/women.
Men/women annoy me more than women/men.
I admire men/women more than women/men.
I am more easily angered by men/women than by women/men.

**Negative Beliefs**

Men/women are more jealous than women/men.
Men/women treat women/men badly.
Men/women are better listeners than women/men.
Men/women care only about themselves.
Men/women like to hurt women/men.
Men/women are rude.
Women/men are more dishonest than men/women.
Men/women get pleasure in putting women/men down.
Men/women are too competitive.
Men/women don't understand women/men.
Women/men are better than men/women.
Men/women are too sensitive.
Men/women give women/men credit for their achievements.
Men/women are too demanding.
Men/women always want to be right.
Men/women respect women/men.
Men/women are smarter than women/men.

(Gender specific negative beliefs)
Men dominate women.
Women manipulate men.

Men are too interested in sex.
Women are not interested enough in sex.

Men can't express their feelings.
Women are too emotional.

Men change personalities when with male friends.
Women are gossipy with their friends.

Men act too tough.
Women act too silly.
I often feel resentful of women.  
I am easily frustrated by women.  
Women like to hurt men.  
Men dominate women.  
Men irritate me a lot.  
Women are more jealous than men.  
Women are not interested enough in sex.  
Men care about women's feelings.  
Men are too sensitive.  
Women act too silly.  
Men are too demanding.  
Men can't express their feelings.  
Men are more jealous than women.  
Men are more dishonest than women.  
Men respect women.  
Women are better listeners than men.  
Women give men credit for their achievements.  
Men care only about themselves.  
I am sometimes suspicious of women.  
I am more easily angered by men than by women.  
Men are smarter than women.  
Men act too tough.