

Ambivalent Sexism: Definition, Examples & Impact

Authored by
mohammed looti

November 11, 2025

RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammed looti (2025). *Ambivalent Sexism: Definition, Examples & Impact*. Psychepedia.
Retrieved from <https://psychepedia.arabpsychology.com/?p=21445>

Introduction to Ambivalent Sexism

Ambivalent sexism represents a crucial theoretical development in the study of gender prejudice, moving beyond traditional conceptualizations of sexism as uniformly negative and overtly hostile. Developed primarily by psychologists Peter Glick and Susan Fiske, this framework posits that prejudice toward women is not monolithic but rather composed of two distinct, yet interconnected, components: **Hostile Sexism (HS)** and **Benevolent Sexism (BS)**. This duality reflects the complex, often contradictory, roles women occupy in contemporary industrialized societies, where they are simultaneously idealized in certain traditional roles (e.g., mother, romantic partner) and denigrated when challenging male power structures. Understanding this ambivalence is essential because it reveals how gender inequality can be maintained through both punishment and reward, making the system highly resilient to change.

Prior to the articulation of the ambivalent sexism theory, research often focused solely on overt expressions of prejudice, such as discriminatory hiring practices or explicit misogynistic attitudes. However, Glick and Fiske argued that a significant portion of modern sexism is far more subtle, appearing subjectively positive or protective to the perpetrator while nonetheless serving to reinforce traditional gender roles and limit women's autonomy. This subtle form, benevolent sexism, often operates under the guise of chivalry or affection, making it particularly insidious and difficult to challenge because it often elicits gratitude rather than resistance from the target. The theoretical utility of the ambivalent model lies in its ability to explain why sexism persists even in cultures that outwardly reject overt hostility against women, illustrating the deeply ingrained nature of gender hierarchy maintenance.

The core premise of the ambivalent sexism framework is rooted in the recognition that men often rely on women for three critical resources: reproductive capabilities, sexual companionship, and cooperative assistance in domestic and familial tasks. When women threaten the established male-dominated hierarchy--for example, by seeking high-status positions or rejecting traditional familial roles--they are met with hostility. Conversely, when women fulfill these traditional roles and maintain dependency on men, they are rewarded and protected through benevolent attitudes. This dynamic interplay ensures that the social system remains stable, utilizing both the carrot (benevolence) and the stick (hostility) to enforce compliance with traditional gender norms and maintain male dominance across societal institutions.

The Theoretical Framework: Glick and Fiske

The formal conceptualization of ambivalent sexism emerged in the mid-1990s, offering a comprehensive model that integrated motivational, cognitive, and structural factors contributing to gender prejudice. Glick and Fiske posited that sexism arises fundamentally from patriarchal structures where men hold disproportionate power. This power imbalance leads to specific

ideological justifications that rationalize the status quo. The resulting Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) became the primary tool for measuring these two distinct components, demonstrating empirically that while the two forms of sexism are conceptually opposite in tone (negative vs. seemingly positive), they are positively correlated statistically. This correlation confirms that individuals who endorse hostile views are also likely to endorse benevolent views, suggesting they share a common ideological root: the justification of male power.

The framework identifies three key motivational factors that drive the expression of ambivalent sexism. The first is the need for **patriarchal control**, wherein men seek to maintain dominance over societal resources and decision-making processes, leading directly to hostile responses when that control is threatened. The second is the need for **sexual differentiation**, which involves maintaining a clear, often exaggerated, distinction between the sexes, fueling both the objectification inherent in hostility and the idealization central to benevolence. Finally, the third factor is the reliance on women for **intimate interdependence**, especially in family settings, which necessitates the positive reinforcement provided by benevolent attitudes to ensure cooperation and emotional support within the existing gender arrangement.

Crucially, Glick and Fiske emphasized that both hostile and benevolent sexism function as distinct forms of ideological justification for gender inequality. Hostile sexism functions overtly by derogating women who step outside their prescribed roles, thereby punishing deviance. Benevolent sexism, however, functions more subtly by elevating women who conform to traditional expectations, framing their dependency as a desirable trait worthy of protection. This dual approach ensures that irrespective of whether a woman conforms or deviates, the underlying system of male dominance is reinforced, either through overt antagonism or through a subtle, yet limiting, form of praise and protection that restricts her independence and competence.

Hostile Sexism (HS): Overt Antagonism

Hostile sexism is the overtly negative and antagonistic component of the ambivalent framework, reflecting traditional antipathy toward women. It is characterized by negative stereotypes, overt expressions of domination, and the belief that women are inferior, manipulative, or overly sensitive. HS is most frequently directed at women who challenge male authority or seek equality in traditionally male domains, such as politics, business, or science. Expressions of hostile sexism often involve the perception that women are seeking unfair advantages or that they exaggerate gender discrimination claims to gain power.

The core tenets of hostile sexism include a strong belief in **male superiority** and the rejection of feminist movements, viewing them as aggressive attempts to dismantle natural gender differences and societal order. Specific manifestations often revolve around control over sexuality and reproduction, where women are seen as potentially dangerous manipulators who use their sexual

attractiveness to control men. This perspective frequently manifests as resentment toward women's increasing economic and social power, leading to open expressions of anger and contempt when men feel their traditional status or entitlements are being eroded. HS represents the punitive mechanism within the ambivalent system, serving to actively push women back into subordinate positions through direct confrontation and derogation.

In organizational and political contexts, hostile sexism translates into concrete barriers. For example, a man high in HS is more likely to question a female colleague's competence, dismiss her contributions, or actively impede her career advancement, believing she is fundamentally less capable of handling high-pressure or leadership roles. Unlike benevolent sexism, which can sometimes be internalized without immediate awareness of its harm, hostile sexism is often easily identified as prejudice, though its prevalence and acceptability vary significantly depending on the cultural and institutional context. The presence of strong hostile sexism is highly correlated with tolerance for sexual harassment and gender-based aggression.

Benevolent Sexism (BS): The Subtle Compliment

Benevolent sexism, while appearing subjectively positive and often expressed through compliments or acts of chivalry, is fundamentally restrictive and patriarchal. It is defined as a subjectively positive set of attitudes toward women that nonetheless reinforces the belief that women are weaker, more fragile, and require male protection and provision. Key themes within BS include the idealization of women as pure, morally superior beings (often referred to as the **pedestal effect**) and the romanticization of traditional gender roles, such as wife, mother, or caregiver. This form of prejudice is particularly effective because it frames inequality not as oppression, but as natural complementarity, where men and women fulfill different, equally valuable, but inherently unequal roles.

The danger of benevolent sexism lies in its ability to mask prejudice under the guise of care and affection. When a man holds a door for a woman because he believes she is delicate, or insists on carrying heavy items because she is fragile, he is expressing BS. While these actions may seem harmless or even polite, they subtly communicate that the woman is incompetent or incapable of managing challenges independently. This constant reinforcement of dependency limits women's opportunities for growth, risk-taking, and the development of self-efficacy in domains traditionally reserved for men. Furthermore, women who embrace benevolent sexism often internalize these limitations, leading to self-restriction in their career aspirations and reduced motivation to challenge the status quo.

Crucially, benevolent sexism is not extended universally; it is primarily reserved for women who adhere strictly to traditional norms, particularly those who are perceived as warm, nurturing, and sexually pure. Women who are assertive, career-driven, or sexually autonomous often lose the

protective benefits of BS and are instead targeted by HS. Therefore, BS serves as a critical reward system within the patriarchal structure, incentivizing women to maintain the status quo by offering affection, protection, and provision in exchange for adherence to subordinate roles. This mechanism makes benevolent sexism a powerful tool for system maintenance, often operating outside the conscious awareness of both the perpetrator and the recipient.

The Interplay and Functionality of Ambivalence

The true power of the ambivalent sexism framework lies in the dynamic interplay between its hostile and benevolent components. These two dimensions are not random; they are highly correlated and functionally interdependent, forming a cohesive strategy for maintaining male dominance. Hostile sexism acts as the punitive element, ensuring that women who deviate from traditional roles are marginalized and discouraged. Benevolent sexism acts as the seductive element, rewarding conformity and ensuring that women who embrace traditional roles are emotionally and materially invested in the system that ultimately restricts their autonomy. The simultaneous operation of the carrot and the stick makes the overall system of gender inequality extremely stable and resistant to organized opposition.

Societally, this ambivalence allows men to maintain a positive self-image even while subscribing to discriminatory beliefs. By expressing benevolent attitudes towards their wives or daughters (e.g., "I cherish women and believe they should be protected"), men can distance themselves from the label of "sexist," even if they simultaneously hold strong hostile views about women in the workplace or women who identify as feminists. This allows the individual to compartmentalize their prejudice, expressing warmth toward conforming women while channeling their resentment toward non-conforming women, thereby insulating their overall worldview from cognitive dissonance and external critique. This ideological buffer is a key reason why sexism often persists in environments that are ostensibly committed to egalitarian principles.

Furthermore, the functional interdependence of HS and BS has significant implications for how women react to prejudice. Research demonstrates that confronting benevolent sexism is far more difficult than confronting hostile sexism. When women challenge a hostile remark, they are fighting an obvious injustice. However, when they challenge a benevolent act (e.g., rejecting an offer of unsolicited help based on perceived fragility), they risk being perceived as ungrateful, overly sensitive, or cold. This social penalty for rejecting benevolence ensures that many women hesitate to challenge the subtle restrictions imposed by BS, inadvertently allowing these limiting attitudes to become normalized and accepted within social and professional environments.

Measurement and the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) is the primary psychometric tool developed by Glick and

Fiske to operationalize and measure the two components of sexism. The ASI consists of two distinct subscales, one measuring Hostile Sexism (HS) and one measuring Benevolent Sexism (BS), typically utilizing a Likert-type scale for participant responses. The development of this inventory was crucial because it provided empirical evidence that these two seemingly contradictory attitudes coexist within the same individual and culture, demonstrating their shared function in maintaining gender hierarchy.

The Hostile Sexism subscale includes items reflecting overt antagonism, such as beliefs that women seek to gain power by getting control over men, or that women are easily offended. These items capture the resentment and derogation directed toward women who challenge male dominance. Conversely, the Benevolent Sexism subscale features statements that appear positive on the surface but imply female weakness and dependency, such as the belief that men should be willing to make sacrifices to provide for women, or that women have a purity few men possess. The ASI has been extensively validated across dozens of cultures, confirming the universality of the ambivalent structure of gender prejudice.

The utility of the ASI extends beyond mere measurement; it has been instrumental in linking specific forms of sexism to various outcomes. For instance, studies using the ASI have shown that HS is a strong predictor of support for policies that restrict women's rights and is highly correlated with aggression toward women. BS, while less overtly aggressive, is a strong predictor of women's self-objectification, reduced career ambition in traditionally male fields, and lower self-efficacy. By separating the two constructs, researchers can precisely identify which ideological components are driving specific forms of gender inequality in different social contexts, allowing for more targeted interventions than generalized measures of prejudice.

Psychological and Societal Consequences

The consequences of ambivalent sexism are profound, affecting both individual psychological well-being and broad societal structures. For women, exposure to benevolent sexism can lead to a phenomenon known as **internalized sexism**, where they adopt the belief that they are indeed weaker or less capable in specific domains, leading to self-imposed limitations. This internalization often results in reduced professional ambition, particularly in fields requiring high competitiveness or technical skill, thereby reinforcing the very gender imbalance that BS seeks to justify. Furthermore, when women are exposed to high levels of BS, they often show reduced performance on difficult tasks because the subtle reminders of their fragility undermine their confidence and cognitive resources.

Societally, ambivalent sexism acts as a powerful barrier to achieving true gender equality in key institutions. In the workplace, hostile sexism overtly blocks women from promotion, while benevolent sexism restricts their access to challenging assignments or leadership roles under the

guise of protecting them from stress or conflict. For example, a manager high in BS might refrain from offering a high-stakes international assignment to a female employee because he believes she should prioritize her family, effectively derailing her career trajectory while believing he is acting kindly. This systemic combination ensures that even in organizations with formal equality policies, informal cultural barriers persist, driven by these complex prejudices.

The relationship between ambivalent sexism and political engagement is also critical. Hostile sexism directly correlates with opposition to feminist policies and female political candidates, viewing them as threats to male power. Benevolent sexism, however, subtly undermines female political efficacy by suggesting that women are too pure or emotionally sensitive for the aggressive, competitive world of politics, thus encouraging them to focus on less powerful, more nurturing public roles. Thus, the ambivalent framework explains how gender inequality is maintained not just through explicit political opposition but also through culturally accepted attitudes that discourage women from seeking and exercising high-level power.

Cross-Cultural Validation and Context

One of the most robust findings supporting the ambivalent sexism framework is its consistency across diverse cultures globally. Extensive research utilizing the ASI has demonstrated that the structure--the separation into hostile and benevolent components, and their positive correlation--is remarkably consistent, suggesting that the dynamics of patriarchy manifest in similar psychological patterns worldwide, regardless of specific cultural norms or economic development levels. However, while the structure is universal, the specific levels and relative strengths of HS and BS vary significantly based on cultural context.

In cultures where gender inequality is highly explicit and institutionalized (often characterized by lower levels of economic development or strong traditional religious mandates), both hostile and benevolent sexism scores tend to be very high. In these contexts, women who conform are heavily rewarded with protection and resources, but women who deviate face severe, often institutionalized, hostility. Conversely, in highly industrialized Western nations that explicitly endorse egalitarianism, hostile sexism scores tend to be lower, but benevolent sexism often remains robust. In these settings, BS becomes the more accepted and prevalent form of prejudice, acting as the primary subtle mechanism for restricting women's advancement while maintaining the cultural illusion of equality.

This cross-cultural validation emphasizes the critical distinction between formal legal equality and psychological ideological acceptance. Even when laws mandate equal treatment, the pervasive influence of benevolent sexism ensures that gender roles remain rigid and hierarchical in practice. The framework thus provides a powerful tool for analyzing how globalization and modernization impact gender ideology, demonstrating that while overt hostility may decline, the underlying

structure of ambivalence adapts, often relying more heavily on the subtle, rewarding nature of benevolent prejudice to preserve male dominance in a changing world.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM