PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF SHORT VERSIONS OF THE AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY AND AMBIVALENCE TOWARD MEN INVENTORY

CHIARA ROLLERO
UNIVERSITY OF TORINO

PETER GLICK
LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY

STEFANO TARTAGLIA
UNIVERSITY OF TORINO

The current paper assesses the psychometric properties of short versions of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) and Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory (AMI; Glick & Fiske, 1999), which represent widely used measures of sexist attitudes toward, respectively, women and men. Participants in the study were 960 Caucasian adults (48.6% male). The theoretical structure of both the short ASI and AMI was tested via confirmatory factor analysis using structural equations modeling. Moreover, the invariance of the factor structures across gender and age was investigated. Results showed that the shorter versions of the ASI and AMI have good psychometric properties that are consistent with the original versions of the scales. Researchers who wish to assess ambivalent sexist attitudes, but must use fewer items than the original ASI and AMI, can strongly consider using these short versions.

The theory of ambivalent sexism presented by Glick and Fiske (1996, 1999) posits that sexist attitudes encompass considerable ambivalence on the part of each sex toward the other. In respect to women, hostile sexism (HS) is an adversarial view of gender relations in which women are perceived as seeking to control men and usurping men's power. Benevolent sexism (BS) idealizes women as pure creatures who ought to be protected, supported and whose love is necessary to make a man complete, but it implies that women are weak and best suited for conventional gender roles. Similarly, sexist attitudes toward men include both hostility toward men (HM) and benevolence toward men (BM). The first expresses hostility toward male dominance, cultural attitudes that portray men as superior, and the ways in which men exert control within intimate relationships. Benevolence toward men represents subjectively positive attitudes toward men rooted in traditional admiration for men's role as protectors and providers, but also the belief that men require women to provide domestic, maternal care (e.g., tending to men at home).

The current paper assesses the psychometric properties of short versions of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) and Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory (AMI; Glick & Fiske, 1999), which represent widely used measures of sexist attitudes toward, respectively, women and men. The short versions contain approximately half the number of items of the original inventories (reducing the 22-item ASI and 20-item AMI to 12 items each). Researchers are likely to find shorter, yet psychometrically sound versions of the inventories extremely useful for surveys in which they must restrict the number of items administered.

Based on item analyses from data using the original ASI and AMI (Glick et al., 2000, 2004), Glick and Whitehead (2010) suggested items for short versions of each inventory. Items for the short versions of the inventories were selected based on the following criteria: each subscale (HS, BS, HM, BM) was represented by an equal number of items, each item selected had performed well psychometrically (e.g., good item-total correlations within its subscale) in past research, and the items selected represented the variety of themes (e.g., heterosexuality, gender roles, power) that characterize the original inventories.

The short versions of the ASI and AMI are reported in the Appendix. The current study tested the psychometric properties of these shorter versions in an Italian sample. The items were selected from the Italian adaptation of the scales (Manganelli Rattazzi, Volpato, & Canova, 2008), following Glick and Whitehead's (2010) suggestion. Specifically, confirmatory factor analyses were performed in order to test the two-factor structure of each inventory. Moreover, to verify the stability of the short versions across gender and across age of respondents, the structural invariance of the scales was tested.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 960 Caucasian adults (48.6% male), recruited via students' assistance. For their course in Methodology for Social Science, 20 undergraduates attending the University of Turin, Italy, contacted adults living in different parts of Italy. Those who agreed to join in the study became participants. Their average age was 36.37 years ($SD = 13.55$, age range: 18-70 years). Educationally, about equal numbers of respondents had received a college degree (39.5%) or graduated from high school (40.7%), but there were a number of respondents who had not obtained a high school diploma (18.8%). Most of the participants were workers (65%), followed by students (28.4%), retired people (4.8%), and a small percentage of unemployed people (1.8%).

Measures

Participants completed the 12-item versions of the ASI and AMI (six items each for HS, BS, HS, and BM scales). They indicated their agreement or disagreement with each statement on a 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scale. Alphas for BS and HS were .80 and .85 respectively. Alphas for BM and HM were .81 and .79 respectively.

Rollero, C., Glick, P.,
& Tartaglia, S.
Short versions of ASI and AMI

RESULTS

After preliminary exploratory factor analyses, we tested the theoretical structure of both the short ASI and AMI via confirmatory factor analysis using structural equations modeling. Finally, we tested the invariance of the factor structures across gender and age following the procedure indicated by Reise, Widaman, and Pugh (1993). The analyses were performed using the statistical packages SPSS 20 and Amos 4.0 (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A preliminary exploratory factor analysis (maximum likelihood extraction; oblimin rotation) of the short ASI suggested the same two factors structure found by Glick and Whitehead (2010). The two correlated factors, BS and HS, explained 54% of the total variance. Then we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (procedure maximum likelihood; covariance matrix) testing a structural equation model assuming this two-factor structure. Latent factors Benevolent Sexism and Hostile Sexism were correlated and regressed individually on the six items of the scale. As usually recommended (Bollen & Long, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1998), we tested the model fit by using different fit indexes to reduce the impact of their limits. We used χ^2, comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973) — also known as non-normal fit index (NNFI; Bentler & Bonett, 1980) — and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990). For CFI and TLI, values higher than .90 are considered satisfactory (Bentler, 1990). As for RMSEA values lower than .08 are considered to be satisfactory (Browne, 1990).

The model that we tested proved acceptable according to all the fit indexes except χ^2: $\chi^2(53) = 287.53$, $p < .01$; CFI = .94; TLI = .93; RMSEA = .068 (90% CL = .060, .076). Given that the significance of χ^2 depends on the sample size and that our sample was large ($N = 960$), we considered this model to be satisfactory. All estimated parameters were significant. Factor loadings and error variances are reported in Table 1. The correlation coefficient between BS and HS was .53.

We also performed an exploratory factor analysis (maximum likelihood extraction; oblimin rotation) on the AMI. We found the expected two-factor structure, BM and HM, which explained 51% of the total variance. Thus, we proceeded to the confirmatory factor analysis (procedure maximum likelihood; covariance matrix). The first model we tested was promising but not satisfactory: $\chi^2(53) = 480.60$; $p < .01$; CFI = .87; TLI = .84; RMSEA =.092 (90% CL = .084, .099). The examination of parameters and modification indexes suggested that the problematic point of the model concerned items 3 and 4. Examination of these items' content ("Every woman needs a male partner who will cherish her" and "A woman will never be truly fulfilled in life if she doesn't have a committed, long-term relationship with a man") revealed that the items focused on women more than men. It is possible that these two items could measure other stereotypes (i.e., toward women) as well as ambivalence toward men. On the grounds of this consideration and of the modification indexes, the model was retested correlating the residuals of the item pair. This second model proved acceptable: $\chi^2(52) = 346.40$, $p < .01$; CFI = .91; TLI = .90; RMSEA =.077 (90% CL = .069, .085). All estimated parameters were significant.

TABLE 1
Confirmatory factor analysis of the ASI: Factor loadings and error variances

Items	Benevolent Sexism	Hostile Sexism	Error variances
4. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores	.76		.42
5. Men are incomplete without women	.71		.50
2. Women should be cherished and protected by men	.69		.53
1. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess	.57		.67
10. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility	.52		.73
11. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives	.49		.76
8. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against		.78	.39
7. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash		.77	.41
6. Women exaggerate problems they have at work		.73	.47
3. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men		.72	.49
12. Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men		.64	.60
9. Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances		.57	.68

Factor loadings and error variance are reported in Table 2. The correlation coefficient between BM and HM was .46.

TABLE 2
Confirmatory factor analysis of the AMI: Factor loadings and error variances

Items	Benevolence toward men	Hostility toward men	Error variances
9. Men are more willing to put themselves in danger to protect others	.72		.48
11. Men are more willing to take risks than women	.70		.51
1. Even if both members of a couple work, the woman ought to be more attentive to taking care of her man at home	.65		.58
3. Every woman needs a male partner who will cherish her	.59		.65
7. Men are mainly useful to provide financial security for women	.58		.67
4. A woman will never be truly fulfilled in life if she doesn't have a committed, long-term relationship with a man	.56		.69
6. Men will always fight to have greater control in society than women		.67	.54
10. When it comes down to it, most men are really like children		.67	.55

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued)

Items	Benevolence toward men	Hostility toward men	Error variances
5. Men act like babies when they are sick		.63	.60
8. Even men who claim to be sensitive to women's rights really want a traditional relationship at home, with the woman performing most of the housekeeping and child care		.62	.61
2. When men act to "help" women, they are often trying to prove they are better than women		.59	.65
12. Most men sexually harass women, even if only in subtle ways, once they are in a position of power over them		.52	.73

Structural Invariance

To test the structural invariance of the scales, we first tested our model simultaneously on both gender groups (baseline model or B), and then tested a second model (M1), assuming invariance of the factor loadings in men and women. This means that these parameters were fixed to be equal in both groups. The hypothesis of invariance is accepted if the difference in the χ^2 values of the M1 model, compared with the B model, is not significant for a number of degrees of freedom equal to the difference in degrees of freedom between the two models. In other words, a model is invariant if the constraining parameters to invariance do not significantly increase the χ^2, thereby worsening the model fit. The invariance of the loadings is satisfactory enough to maintain the generalizability and the stability of the constructs between groups (McCallum & Tucker, 1991; Reise et al., 1993). However, the invariance of the relations among constructs and of the error coefficients could strengthen the validity of a set of measures (Bagozzi & Foxall, 1995). Thus we tested two other models. The model M2 tested the invariance of the relation among factors fixing the covariance between the latent factors to be equal in males and females. The model M3 tested the hypothesis of full invariance fixing the loadings, the covariance and the error coefficients to be equal between groups. Every invariance hypothesis is accepted if the χ^2 of the model with more fixed parameters does not differ significantly from the less restricted model. The same procedure was replicated for the ASI and the AMI. The test of the invariance hypotheses are reported in Table 3. Both the ASI and the AMI are not completely invariant across gender groups because in both analyses the constraining of the error coefficients (M3) increases significantly the χ^2 of the model. The factor loadings and the covariance between the latent factors are invariant across gender groups, whereas the error coefficients could not be considered invariant.

Finally, we tested the invariance of the ASI and AMI across age groups following the same procedure used for gender invariance. We compared three age groups: 18-29 years old ($n = 435$), 30-49 years old ($n = 300$), and 50-70 years old ($n = 225$). The test of the invariance across age groups, reported in Table 4, revealed that the loadings and the covariances of the ASI and the AMI were invariant across age groups.

TABLE 3
Test of the invariance of the ASI and the AMI across gender groups

Model	χ^2	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	$\Delta\chi^2$
ASI					
Baseline	396.66 (106)	.93	.92	.051	–
M1 (loadings invariant)	378.72 (116)	.93	.93	.049	M1-B = 9.06 (10) $p = .53$
M2 (loadings and covariances invariant)	382.37 (117)	.93	.93	.049	M2-M1 = 3.65 (1) $p = .06$
M3 (loadings, covariances, and error coefficients invariant)	420.89 (129)	.93	.93	.049	M3-M2 = 38.52 (12) $p < .01$
AMI					
Baseline	437.95 (104)	.90	.87	.058	–
M1 (loadings invariant)	450.27 (114)	.90	.88	.055	M1-B = 12.32 (10) $p = .26$
M2 (loadings and covariances invariant)	450.59 (116)	.90	.89	.055	M2-M1 = .32 (2) $p = .85$
M3 (loadings, covariances, and error coefficients invariant)	488.81 (128)	.89	.89	.054	M3-M2 = 38.22 (12) $p < .01$

TABLE 4
Test of the invariance of the ASI and the AMI across age groups

Model	χ^2	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	$\Delta\chi^2$
ASI					
Baseline	386.95 (159)	.94	.93	.039	–
M1 (loadings invariant)	408.23 (179)	.94	.94	.037	M1-B = 21.28 (20) $p = .38$
M2 (loadings and covariances invariant)	409.32 (181)	.94	.94	.036	M2-M1 = 1.09 (2) $p = .58$
M3 (loadings, covariances, and error coefficients invariant)	476.67 (205)	.93	.93	.037	M3-M2 = 67.35 (24) $p < .01$
AMI					
Baseline	469.22 (156)	.91	.88	.046	–
M1 (loadings invariant)	496.17 (176)	.90	.89	.044	M1-B = 26.95 (20) $p = .14$
M2 (loadings and covariances invariant)	504.25 (180)	.90	.89	.043	M2-M1 = 8.08 (4) $p = .09$
M3 (loadings, covariances, and error coefficients invariant)	542.43 (204)	.90	.90	.042	M3-M2 = 38.18 (24) $p = .03$

TPM

Gender Differences and Correlations among Subscales
of the ASI and AMI — Short Versions

After verifying that the ASI and AMI short versions had psychometric properties consistent with those of the longer scales, we calculated correlation indexes among the subscales and conducted a gender difference analysis on the scores of the four subscales, in order to evaluate the consistency with the extant literature.

Correlations between subscales are reported in Table 5. All the dimensions correlated positively to each other. Gender differences were analysed using *t*-test. In Table 6 mean scores and *t* values are reported. Men scored significantly higher than women on HS, whereas no gender difference was found on BS. Concerning AMI, women, as compared to men, were more hostile and less benevolent toward men.

TABLE 5
Correlation indexes (Pearson's *r*) among the four subscales
of the ASI and the AMI — Short versions

	ASI BS	ASI HS	AMI BM
ASI			
Benevolent Sexism			
Hostile Sexism	.56**		
AMI			
Benevolence toward men	.64**	.67**	
Hostility toward men	.48**	.37**	.37**

** *p* < .01.

TABLE 6
Differences between males (*n* = 467) and females (*n* = 493): Mean scores and *t* values

	Mean scores		
	Males	Females	*t*
ASI			
Benevolent Sexism	2.38	2.29	1.15
Hostile Sexism	2.60	2.25	4.79**
AMI			
Benevolence toward men	2.48	1.92	7.75**
Hostility toward men	2.55	3.04	−7.25**

** *p* < .01.

TPM Vol. 21, No. 2, June 2014
1-11
© 2014 Cises

Rollero, C., Glick, P.,
& Tartaglia, S.
Short versions of ASI and AMI

DISCUSSION

The data generally suggest that the shorter versions of the ASI and AMI have good psychometric properties that are consistent with the longer, original versions of the scales, suggesting that researchers are not likely to compromise measurement of the constructs by using the short ASI and AMI. More specifically, the short versions replicated the factor structure of the larger scales, with the ASI exhibiting HS and BS subfactors and the AMI exhibiting HM and BM subfactors. Individual items showed good factor loadings on their scales and confirmatory factor analyses showed good fits. These results are consistent with Glick and Whitehead (2010) and add strong evidence for the goodness of the structure of the scales by means of structural equation modeling for confirmatory factor analysis. As in prior research using the original, longer scales, the subscales within each inventory (HS and BS; HM and BM) correlated moderately positively. Additionally, both short versions of the inventories showed invariance across gender and across age of the respondents, suggesting highly stable scales.

Correlations among the subscales are completely in line with literature, which has extensively demonstrated that hostile and benevolent attitudes toward women (as measured by the ASI) correlate positively to each other and to hostile and benevolent beliefs about men (as measured by the AMI) (Glick et al., 2004; Rollero & Tartaglia, 2012). Indeed, HS, BS, HM, and BM constitute a complementary set of gender-traditional beliefs. Gender differences on subscales of the ASI and AMI-short versions were consistent with results obtained using the original ASI and AMI. Women, as compared to men, tend to be more hostile and less benevolent toward men (Glick & Fiske, 1999), whereas men show higher hostility toward women in all countries where the scales were used (Glick et al., 2000). Instead, the BS gender difference is often nonsignificant, especially when Italian samples are considered (Glick et al., 2000; Rollero, Rutto, & De Piccoli, 2013).

In sum, researchers who wish to assess ambivalently sexist attitudes, but have pragmatic considerations that dictate the need to use fewer items than the original ASI and AMI, should strongly consider using the short versions recommended originally by Glick and Whitehead (2010). Psychometrically, the short scales exhibit the same factor structure as the original, longer scales, similar correlations between the subscales, and do not sacrifice reliability.

REFERENCES

Arbuckle, J. L., & Wothke, W. (1999). *Amos 4.0 users' guide*. Chicago, IL: Smallwaters.
Bagozzi, R. P., & Foxall, G. R. (1995). Construct validity and generalizability of the Kirton Adaptation-Innovation Inventory. *European Journal of Personality*, *9*, 185-206. doi:10.1002/per.2410090303
Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*, 238-246. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, *88*, 588-606. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588
Bollen, K. A., & Long, J. S. (1993). *Testing structural equation models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Browne, M. W. (1990). *Mutmum Pc: User's guide*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, *3*, 424-453. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.424
Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491-512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

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. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00379.x

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 763-775. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763

Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S. T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., ... Wells, R. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 713-728. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.5.713

Glick, P., & Whitehead, J. (2010). Hostility toward men and the perceived stability of male dominance. *Social Psychology*, *41*, 177-185. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000025

Manganelli Rattazzi, A. M., Volpato, C., & Canova, G. (2008). L'atteggiamento ambivalente verso donne e uomini. Un contributo alla validazione delle scale ASI e AMI [Ambivalent attitudens toward women and men. A contribution to the Italian validation of ASI and AMI]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia*, *35*, 261-287.

McCallum, R. C., & Tucker L. R. (1991). Representing sources of error in the common-factor model: Implication for theory and practice. *Psychological Bulletin*, *97*, 501-511.

Reise, S. P., Widaman, K. F., & Pugh, R. H. (1993). Confirmatory factor analysis and item response theory: Two approaches for exploring measurement invariance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*, 552-566. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.114.3.552

Rollero, C., Rutto, F., & De Piccoli, N. (2013). Political leadership from a gender perspective. In J. D. Vanvactor (Ed.), *The Psychology of Leadership* (pp. 117-130). Hauppage, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Rollero, C., & Tartaglia, S. (2012). Genere, ideologia e mass media: I differenti predittori del sessismo ambivalente [Gender, ideology and mass media: The different predictors of ambivalent sexism]. *Psicologia di Comunità*, *2*, 119-128.

Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification. An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *25*, 173-180. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr2502_4

Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C. (1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *38*, 1-10. doi:10.1007/BF0229

APPENDIX

Short Version of the ASI
(Italian version in brackets)

1. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess
[Molte donne hanno una qualità di purezza che pochi uomini posseggono]
2. Women should be cherished and protected by men
[Le donne dovrebbero essere coccolate e protette dagli uomini]
3. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men
[Le donne cercano di acquisire potere tenendo a freno gli uomini]
4. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores
[Ogni uomo dovrebbe avere una donna da adorare]
5. Men are incomplete without women
[Gli uomini sono incompleti senza le donne]
6. Women exaggerate problems they have at work
[Le donne tendono a ingigantire i problemi che hanno sul lavoro]
7. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash
[Quando una donna ha indotto un uomo a dichiararsi, generalmente cerca di mettergli il guinzaglio]
8. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against
[È tipico delle donne lamentarsi di essere state discriminate quando perdono in una competizione corretta con gli uomini]
9. Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances
[Ci sono molte donne che provano piacere a provocare gli uomini mostrandosi sessualmente disponibili e rifiutando poi i loro approcci]
10. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility
[Le donne tendono ad avere una maggior sensibilità morale rispetto agli uomini]
11. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives
[Per mantenere economicamente le loro donne, gli uomini dovrebbero essere disposti a sacrificare il proprio benessere]
12. Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men
[Le femministe pretendono dagli uomini cose irragionevoli]

Scoring:
Hostile Sexism = average of items 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12
Benevolent Sexism = average of items 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11.

Note. The appropriate citation for the ASI scale (whether in the short or original version) is Glick and Fiske (1996).

Short Version of the AMI
(Italian version in brackets)

1. Even if both members of a couple work, the woman ought to be more attentive to taking care of her man at home
[Anche se entrambi i membri di una coppia lavorano, la donna dovrebbe essere attenta a prendersi cura del proprio uomo a casa]
2. When men act to "help" women, they are often trying to prove they are better than women
[Quando gli uomini si danno da fare per "aiutare" le donne, spesso tentano di dimostrare che sono migliori di loro]
3. Every woman needs a male partner who will cherish her
[Ogni donna ha bisogno di un compagno che si prenda cura di lei]
4. A woman will never be truly fulfilled in life if she doesn't have a committed, long-term relationship with a man
[Una donna non sarà mai veramente appagata nella vita se non avrà una relazione impegnativa e a lungo termine con un uomo]
5. Men act like babies when they are sick
[Quando sono ammalati, gli uomini agiscono come bambini]
6. Men will always fight to have greater control in society than women
[Gli uomini si batteranno sempre per avere, nella società, un maggior controllo rispetto alle donne]
7. Men are mainly useful to provide financial security for women
[Gli uomini sono utili soprattutto per dare sicurezza finanziaria alle donne]
8. Even men who claim to be sensitive to women's rights really want a traditional relationship at home, with the woman performing most of the housekeeping and child care
[Anche gli uomini che dichiarano di essere sensibili ai diritti delle donne in realtà vogliono a casa una relazione di tipo tradizionale, in cui la donna assolva alla maggior parte delle cure della casa e dei figli]
9. Men are more willing to put themselves in danger to protect others
[Gli uomini sono più disposti a mettere se stessi in pericolo per proteggere gli altri]
10. When it comes down to it, most men are really like children
[Quando le cose non vanno bene, molti uomini sono in realtà come bambini]
11. Men are more willing to take risks than women
[Rispetto alle donne, gli uomini sono più disposti a rischiare]
12. Most men sexually harass women, even if only in subtle ways, once they are in a position of power over them
[Molti uomini molestano sessualmente le donne, anche se solo in modo sottile, quando si trovano in posizione di potere rispetto ad esse]

Scoring:
Hostility toward men = average of items 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12
Benevolence toward men = average of items 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11.

Note. The appropriate citation for the AMI scale (whether in the short or original version) is Glick and Fiske (1999).