Men in Social Sciences: Attitudes & Perceptions

Authored by
mohammed looti

November 21, 2025

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammed looti (2025). *Men in Social Sciences: Attitudes & Perceptions*. Psychepedia. Retrieved from https://psychepedia.arabpsychology.com/?p=25535

Introduction: Defining Attitudes and the Scope of Study

The study of attitudes toward men within the social sciences, encompassing psychology, sociology, and gender studies, represents a critical area of inquiry necessary for a comprehensive understanding of gender dynamics and social perception. While much foundational research historically focused on attitudes toward women--often driven by feminist critiques of patriarchy and sexism--a complete picture requires dedicated examination of how men, as a social category, are perceived, evaluated, and stereotyped by both men and women across various cultural contexts. These attitudes are not monolithic; they operate along complex dimensions, including hostility, benevolence, admiration, and resentment, and are deeply intertwined with established societal norms regarding masculinity, power distribution, and perceived social roles. Understanding these attitudes is essential not only for identifying sources of potential prejudice or discrimination against men but also for analyzing how restrictive gender roles are enforced and maintained, impacting mental health, interpersonal relationships, and professional opportunities.

Social psychologists define an attitude as a relatively enduring organization of beliefs, feelings, and behavioral tendencies directed toward a socially significant object, group, event, or symbol. When applied to the category of men, these attitudes reflect widely shared cultural schemas about male competence, warmth, agency, and communal traits. Research in this domain moves beyond simple descriptions of male traits to analyze the evaluative component--the positive or negative emotional charge associated with those traits. For instance, the perception of men as highly competent (high agency) often carries a positive evaluation in professional settings, yet the accompanying stereotype of low communal warmth might lead to negative evaluations in caregiving or domestic roles. This nuanced approach reveals the paradoxes inherent in gender attitudes, where high status can coexist with specific forms of social resentment or negative affective responses.

The scope of this research is intentionally broad, covering micro-level interpersonal interactions, macro-level institutional policies, and the mediating effects of media representation. Crucially, the academic exploration of attitudes toward men seeks to differentiate between the legitimate critique of systemic patriarchal structures--which often focuses on male behavior and power--and generalized prejudice or stereotyping directed against men as individuals simply based on their gender identity. This distinction is vital for maintaining academic rigor and avoiding conflation. Furthermore, the study must account for the diverse experiences within the male category, recognizing that attitudes vary dramatically depending on the target man's race, class, sexual orientation, and perceived adherence to traditional masculine ideals. The resulting body of literature provides insights into the mechanisms of gender maintenance and the psychological costs associated with navigating rigid social expectations.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

Historical Context: Early Social Science Perspectives on Men

Historically, early social science often treated the male experience and perspective as the default or universal human standard, leading to a significant period where specific attitudes toward men were rarely scrutinized as a distinct research subject. In early 20th-century sociology, functionalist theories often described the division of labor based on sex--men occupying instrumental, public roles and women occupying expressive, private roles--as necessary for social equilibrium. Within this framework, societal attitudes toward men were implicitly positive, reflecting their perceived role as providers, protectors, and leaders. The focus was less on the negative emotional or behavioral responses directed at men and more on the expectations placed upon them, which were generally viewed as reflective of their higher social status and inherent competence in the public sphere. This approach, while descriptive of the prevailing social order, often obscured the psychological strain and rigid behavioral constraints imposed by these high-status expectations.

The shift began significantly with the rise of the second-wave feminist movement in the 1960s and 1970s. While initially focused on attitudes toward women and the mechanisms of oppression, this movement inadvertently necessitated a closer look at the male role. Scholars began to analyze masculinity not as a natural state, but as a socially constructed set of behaviors and attitudes that required constant performance and maintenance. This critical lens allowed researchers to identify the negative consequences of rigid masculinity, such as emotional repression, heightened aggression, and limited self-disclosure. Attitudes began to be studied indirectly, focusing on the cultural scripts that dictated acceptable male behavior, revealing that while men held structural power, they were also subject to intense scrutiny and negative evaluation if they deviated from the prescribed masculine mold.

By the late 20th century, the concept of the "male sex role" became a central focus, leading to the development of the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) and related instruments. These tools measured the extent to which men and women internalized or endorsed traditional masculine ideals, such as the need for success, dominance, and restrictive emotionality. Research showed that adherence to these norms correlated with negative psychological outcomes, indicating that the attitudes society held *about* what men should be were detrimental to men's well-being. This marked a pivotal change: the focus shifted from viewing men as merely the beneficiaries of power to analyzing them as subjects constrained by powerful, often contradictory, social expectations. This paved the way for modern theories that directly measure generalized societal attitudes, both positive and negative, directed specifically at the male group.

Theories of Prejudice: Ambivalent Attitudes Toward Men (ATMI)

Modern social psychology has adapted sophisticated models of prejudice, originally developed to study racism and sexism against women, to analyze generalized attitudes toward men. One of the

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

most influential frameworks is the Ambivalent Sexism Theory, which posits that prejudice is often composed of both hostile and benevolent components. This model has been extended to study attitudes toward men, recognizing that societal perceptions are rarely purely negative; they are complex and often contradictory. The concept of Ambivalent Attitudes Toward Men (ATMI) suggests that men are simultaneously viewed with hostility in certain domains (e.g., as arrogant, aggressive, or overly competitive) and with benevolence in others (e.g., as needing protection or support due to perceived incompetence in emotional or domestic roles).

Hostile Attitudes Toward Men (HAT) reflect overtly negative evaluations and stereotypes. These attitudes often arise from perceptions of men as a powerful, dominant outgroup that exploits others. HAT includes beliefs that men are collectively power-seeking, prone to violence, emotionally shallow, or inherently flawed in their moral judgment. Research indicates that HAT is often related to perceived threats to equality or safety. For example, individuals high in HAT may endorse statements suggesting that men exaggerate their problems or that they are responsible for most societal ills. While often less socially acceptable than other forms of prejudice, HAT can manifest in institutional settings, such as biases in family court proceedings or differential treatment in mental health diagnoses, particularly concerning issues of perceived aggression or lack of emotional control.

Conversely, **Benevolent Attitudes Toward Men (BAT)** are subjectively positive or protective attitudes that, nevertheless, are rooted in restrictive stereotypes. BAT often casts men as dependent on women for emotional validation, or as simple, strong figures who require care in areas where they are stereotypically perceived as deficient (e.g., domestic tasks, emotional processing). While seemingly flattering or caring, BAT serves to maintain traditional gender roles by limiting men to specific, rigid expectations. For example, the attitude that men are "lost without a woman" or that they need female guidance to be socially competent reinforces the stereotype of men as emotionally inept but physically capable. This form of benevolence, like its counterpart directed toward women, is paternalistic and subtly undermines men's autonomy and capacity for complex emotional expression or communal behaviors. The simultaneous existence of HAT and BAT demonstrates the complexity of societal attitudes, where men are both resented for their perceived power and pitied or coddled for their perceived emotional deficits.

The Masculinity Crisis and Role Strain Theory

A significant focus within the social sciences has been the concept of the "masculinity crisis," an idea suggesting that modern social and economic shifts have rendered traditional masculine roles obsolete or incompatible with contemporary society, leading to widespread confusion, distress, and negative attitudes toward men who fail to adapt. This perceived crisis is often linked to the decline of traditional manufacturing jobs, the rise of female participation in the workforce, and increased calls for emotional vulnerability and shared domestic labor. Societal attitudes often reflect this

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

tension, with men who rigidly adhere to outdated patriarchal norms being increasingly pathologized or resented, while men who successfully integrate newer, more communal traits are sometimes viewed with suspicion or perceived as less "manly."

Role Strain Theory provides a powerful explanatory framework for understanding the negative attitudes directed toward men who struggle with these competing demands. This theory posits that the traditional male role is inherently stressful because its requirements are often contradictory, impossible to fulfill, or subject to social prohibition. Key components of male role strain include restrictive emotionality (the injunction against expressing vulnerability), success and status preoccupation (the constant pressure to achieve), and anti-femininity (the strong prohibition against adopting traits associated with women). When men exhibit behaviors that violate these norms--such as seeking psychological help, expressing sadness, or taking on primary caregiving roles--they often face negative attitudes from both men and women, ranging from mild ridicule to social exclusion.

The psychological impact of role strain is profound and contributes directly to negative public attitudes. For instance, the pressure for men to maintain an image of invulnerability often leads to delayed health-seeking behavior, higher rates of completed suicide compared to women, and reliance on maladaptive coping mechanisms like substance abuse. Societal attitudes, which often equate stoicism with strength, inadvertently punish men who show weakness, reinforcing the very behaviors that lead to poor outcomes. Consequently, when men do present with mental health issues, the prevailing societal attitude may be one of judgment rather than empathy, reflecting the belief that they have failed to meet the essential requirements of their gender role. Research confirms that the degree of negative attitude towards men is often correlated with the degree to which they are perceived as failing in the domains of physical strength, financial success, or emotional control.

Men in Intersectionality: Race, Class, and Sexual Orientation

The experience of being male and the attitudes directed toward men are profoundly mediated by intersecting identities, including race, socioeconomic class, and sexual orientation. A singular focus on "men" as a homogenous group ignores the vast differences in power, privilege, and vulnerability that exist within this category, and how societal attitudes shift based on these intersecting axes. For instance, the stereotypes and resulting attitudes directed toward White, middle-class, heterosexual men--who often represent the normative standard of masculinity--center primarily on issues of perceived arrogance, excessive power, or emotional distance. However, attitudes toward men from marginalized groups often incorporate unique forms of prejudice rooted in racial or sexual biases.

For **men of color**, attitudes are often complicated by racial stereotypes that intersect with

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

gendered expectations. Black men, for example, may face attitudes that stereotype them as simultaneously hyper-masculine, aggressive, and threatening, leading to heightened scrutiny and negative interactions with law enforcement and institutional authorities. Conversely, Asian men may confront stereotypes that portray them as less masculine, more passive, or less competent in leadership roles, leading to different forms of discrimination in professional settings. These attitudes are not simply about gender; they are about the specific, culturally defined forms of masculinity deemed acceptable or threatening based on racial background. The attitude directed toward a man of color is thus a composite of gendered expectation and racialized prejudice, often resulting in more severe negative outcomes than those faced by men whose race aligns with the cultural ideal.

For **gay, bisexual, and transgender men**, societal attitudes involve complex layers of homophobia or transphobia intertwined with gender expectations. Gay men frequently face attitudes that question their adherence to traditional masculinity, often being stereotyped as overly emotional or feminine, which triggers negative reactions rooted in anti-femininity norms. Furthermore, heterosexual society often holds specific hostile attitudes toward gay men related to perceived deviation from reproductive and social norms. Similarly, attitudes toward working-class men often incorporate classist biases, leading to stereotypes of being less educated, more physically oriented, or less refined. These intersectional analyses demonstrate that prejudice is not merely additive; the combination of marginalized identities creates unique forms of vulnerability and generates distinct clusters of hostile and benevolent attitudes that must be studied independently to capture the full spectrum of social perception.

Attitudes in Contemporary Research: Fatherhood, Mental Health, and Help-Seeking

Contemporary social science research increasingly focuses on specific domains where attitudes toward men have significant practical consequences, particularly in the areas of parental competence, mental health, and the propensity for seeking professional help. In the domain of **fatherhood**, traditional attitudes often reflect a benevolent sexism that views men as secondary caregivers--competent providers but emotionally less capable than mothers. This attitude manifests in institutional settings, where fathers may face greater skepticism regarding their custody claims or caregiving abilities, even when they assume primary roles. Research indicates that negative attitudes toward men's competence in nurturing roles can lead to workplace discrimination (e.g., skepticism when taking paternity leave) and reinforce the idea that emotional labor is fundamentally feminine, thereby discouraging men from fully engaging in communal parenting roles.

Attitudes surrounding **men's mental health** are particularly critical. Societal attitudes often pathologize male emotional vulnerability, viewing it as a sign of weakness or failure to adhere to

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

the masculine ideal of stoicism. This normative pressure contributes to the high rates of untreated mental illness among men. When men do express distress, they may encounter attitudes of skepticism or dismissal, often summarized by the cultural injunction to "man up." These negative attitudes are internalized, creating significant barriers to **help-seeking behavior**. Men are less likely to seek therapy or counseling because they anticipate being judged negatively by peers, family, and even healthcare providers who may implicitly hold biases related to male emotional restrictive norms.

Furthermore, contemporary research explores the public attitudes toward men as victims of crime or abuse. While attitudes toward male aggression are often hostile, attitudes toward men who are victims of violence (especially domestic or sexual violence) often involve disbelief, minimization, or even ridicule. This phenomenon is rooted in the gendered stereotype that men are inherently strong and resilient, making them incapable of being true victims. These negative attitudes serve as a powerful silencing mechanism, deterring male victims from reporting incidents and seeking necessary support services. The complexity of modern attitudes thus requires researchers to analyze how men are perceived not only as agents of power but also as potential victims of societal and interpersonal harm.

Future Directions and Methodological Challenges

Future research on attitudes toward men must address significant methodological challenges to produce a more robust and generalizable body of knowledge. A primary concern is the heavy reliance on self-report measures, which are susceptible to social desirability bias, especially when assessing hostile or prejudiced attitudes. Given the increased social pressure against expressing overt prejudice, participants may underreport negative attitudes toward men, particularly those related to perceived aggression or power. Future studies should increasingly utilize implicit measures, such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT), to capture unconscious biases and automatic evaluations that are less subject to conscious control. Furthermore, experimental designs that manipulate target attributes (e.g., perceived adherence to traditional masculinity, occupational status) will be essential for isolating the specific triggers of both benevolent and hostile attitudes.

Another critical direction involves expanding cross-cultural studies. The vast majority of current research originates from Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) societies, limiting the generalizability of findings. Attitudes toward men are deeply embedded in specific cultural narratives regarding honor, family structure, and economic roles. Comparative studies across diverse cultures--particularly those with varying levels of gender equality--are necessary to determine which attitudes are universal and which are culturally specific. For instance, the balance between hostile and benevolent attitudes toward men may shift dramatically in cultures where male financial provision is absolutely mandatory versus cultures where gender

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

roles are more fluid.

Finally, future research must focus more intently on the longitudinal effects of evolving societal attitudes. As gender roles continue to change rapidly, especially among younger generations, tracking how attitudes toward men influence men's life outcomes--such as career choices, relationship satisfaction, and engagement in communal activities--will be paramount. This includes studying the effectiveness of interventions designed to mitigate prejudice against men (e.g., challenging stereotypes about male emotional incompetence) and fostering attitudes that promote healthy, equitable masculinity. By addressing these methodological and substantive gaps, the social sciences can move toward a more comprehensive and actionable understanding of attitudes toward men, ultimately contributing to better outcomes for all genders.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM