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Abstract

Despite decades of improvement, women still face disparities in the workplace relative to men (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). In a total of four studies, I examined how men can play an important role in getting other men to endorse gender-equitable attitudes and behaviors. In Study 1, men and women read articles related to gender that have either male or female authors. The results of this study show that male respondents react more positively when the article is written by a man; however female respondents reacted similarly to both male and female authors. In Study 2, male and female sellers sold cookies for and asked for donations to support a women’s resource center, and asked customers to fill out a survey of their attitudes towards gender equity. The results of this study revealed that male customers bought more cookies and donated more money to male sellers. In Study 3, men read articles authored by men or women, and that used one of five different persuasion strategies. Results revealed that men endorsed more support for gender equity when the author was male. Also, the strategy of “highlighting male role models who support women” was the most successful strategy for persuading both men and women. In Study 4, male and female sellers sold restaurant cards to support a women’s organization using either no strategy, or highlighting male role models. Although there were no gender differences in the amount who purchased restaurant cards (less than 3% of those asked actually purchased cards), male (versus female) sellers indicted more positive feedback from potential male customers. As a whole, this research suggests that men may be more effective at getting other men to embrace gender equitable beliefs than women.
Male Allies: Men Convince Other Men that Gender Equity Matters

“Men – I would like to take this opportunity to extend your formal invitation. Gender equality is your issue too.” - Emma Watson, United Nations (2014)

In promoting the launch of the novel HeForShe campaign, UN Women Goodwill Ambassador Emma Watson attempted in her speech at the United Nations Headquarters to rouse and inspire boys and men to be strong advocates for gender equality. Indeed, although gender equality mostly has been a struggle for women lead by women, the HeForShe (2014) campaign encourages men worldwide to stand up; and at present, half a million men have done so. And why might men need to help? Because gender inequality is not only a U.S. but a worldwide phenomenon – as HeForShe (2014) reports, 1/3rd of all women have been in a relationship involving some sort of violence; girls/women account for 3/4ths of all trafficking victims; complications from pregnancy and childbirth are one of the leading causes of death in many countries for girls who are 15-19 years old; girls/women reflect 2/3rds of the world’s illiterate population; women spend up to 10 times the amount of time per day caring for children, elderly and sick; and women are paid considerably less than men for the same work; women are less likely to hold leadership positions in companies, businesses, and legal professions. Clearly, there is a need to accelerate progress toward the reality of gender equity.

In this thesis, I focus on a U.S. context and particularly examine the extent to which men might be successful at persuading other men to support women’s initiatives. This research is overlooked and overdue – there is simply a scarcity of research that looks at successful and compelling ways to bring men into the gender debate with the goal of having them successfully side with issues and participate in behaviors that ensure more equitable gender outcomes.
To do this, I begin by addressing briefly the leaky pipeline and glass ceiling that exists for women in the workplace. I discuss some of the elements that lead to these barriers. I then discuss the vast amount of literature that offers women -- sometimes compelling -- advice about what to and not do to succeed in the workplace and gain more equitable outcomes. Perhaps most notably, Sheryl Sandberg’s recent book, “Lean In” advises women to do just that – to sit at the table and lean in like a man (Sandberg, 2013). While such advice may be helpful to some, in some ways, I argue, it misses the point by continuing to focus on women and not responding to what men might do to help. Next, I discuss how men can complement, not collapse, such initiatives and that they may be a critical constituent to bolstering gender equity. I consider men as partners in the attempt to raise consciousness about and equity for women’s (and men’s) issues in the workplace. Although it is clear that organizational structures also could pave the way for more workplace equity, I focus the current research on the important and underutilized role that men may have in recruiting other men to the table. Additionally, I focus on why men may be successful in recruiting other men and what moderators may be particularly likely to influence men’s success at getting others to support feminist issues.

**Evidence of Gender Inequity**

In many aspects of the workforce, women are met with some disadvantage and particularly so relative to men (Lyness & Heilman, 2006). This emerges in the wage gap (U.S. Department of Labor, 2013); a lack of a paid maternity leave (Blau & Kahn, 2013; Budig & Hodges, 2010); inequities of developmental experiences (King et al., 2012) and promotions (Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010; Booth, Francesconi, & Frank, 2003; Wilson, Marks, Noone, & Hamilton - Mackenzie, 2009); stereotypes that others hold about female employees (Heilman, 2012); and discrimination that women experience in the workforce (Cortina, 2008; King et al.,
These inequities are not new and may help to explain many of the reasons that there continue to be a leaky pipeline.

Despite decades of improvement, women and men are still not treated fairly in the workplace. Most dramatically, perhaps, women still make only $0.77 to men’s dollar (U.S. Department of Labor, 2013); remain at lower pay-grades when promoted (Booth et al., 2003); make up very small percentages of legislative, executive, and military power; and hit a glass ceiling when they should be continuing to ascend (Baumgartner & Schneider, 2010). It is clear that though overt discrimination against women is declining (Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995), but over time the experiences of subtle forms of sexism can accumulate over time to create vast inequality between men and women, especially at the highest levels (Martell, Lane, & Emrich, 1996). This can explain why, according to Catalyst (2007), women earn less than 7% of the top salaries and hold less than 1% of the board seats in Fortune 500 companies.

A Focus on Women’s Behavior to Enhance Gender Equity

There are many ways to attempt to remediate these gender inequities found in the workplace and among them is the forming of coalitions working groups, associations, advisory boards, or ad hoc groups whose mission it is to increase gender equity in the workplace (Connell, 2005). Such groups are often lead, championed, and furthered by an almost exclusive group of female participants (Prime & Moss-Racusin, 2009. For instance, the Global Fund for Women has three female board officers and 14 additional female officers. Joining the ranks of having only female trustee members are other associations such as The Business and Professional Women’s (BPW) Foundation and the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators. Twenty-eight out of 29 members comprise the executive staff of Catalyst, a leading nonprofit organization with the goal of increasing opportunities for women (Catalyst, 2013). In large part,
in recent years, the reasoning has been that gender inequity is something that women are responsible for fixing. This can also be seen in the large number of books (e.g., Lean In (Sandberg, 2013), Mean Girls at Work (Crowley & Elster, 2013), See Jane Lead (Frankel, 2007), Play Like a Man, Win Like a Woman (Evans, 2000)) that are written about what women can do to reduce gender inequality.

That gender related issues have largely been advanced by women makes sense—it is women who have been most disadvantaged by gender inequality, thus it has been mostly women who have been wanting for change. This has been so much the case, that largely, gender issues are seen to be women’s issues—and thus of little to no concern of men. One potential problem with amassing mostly female-only groups involves the fact that men may be receiving a signal that they are not welcome, that they are the problem, and that they are resented. Additionally, the rise in a backlash movement against feminism may lead men to eschew any group solely comprised of women who focus on women’s issues.

However, I argue that men need to be invited to such groups and the movement to increase gender equity. There are a number of reasons why it is compelling to think about ways to engage them. First, they are half the population. Inviting them to the table seems necessary to ensuring any large-scale changes. Second, men are the major stakeholders in the workforce and hold the majority of the power. And third, as I will argue in the current research and attempt to address across a number of studies, men (versus women) have the potential to engage other men in the challenge of creating more equitable consciences and environments.

The premise that men need to be involved in creating gender equity is not new. At the Fourth World Conference on Women, held in 1995 in Beijing, their resulting document the Beijing Declaration states one of their goals as to “encourage men to participate fully in all
actions towards equality” (“Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing 1995,” para. 25). In
their Platform for Action, it argued that the concerns of women can only be addressed “in
partnership with men” (“Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing 1995,” para. 3).

At a United Nations General Assembly in 2000, the resulting Political Declaration
again called for the involvement of men—this time even stronger. The document states that they
“emphasize that men must involve themselves and take join responsibility with women for the
promotion of gender equality” (“Beijing +5 - Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and
Peace for the 21st Century Twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, 5-9 June
2000,” para. 5).

In addition to the onus being on women, there also exists a considerable difference
between men and women’s perception of whether gender equity has been reached. In 2013, 75%
of millennial women said that changes still needed to be made to achieve workplace equity. This
is opposed to the only 57% of millennial men who endorsed the same statement (Pew Research
Center, 2013). It is important that research finds a way to bring men into the conversation about
gender equity. One such way is by having other men speak up for gender equity issues, having
the potential to better bring in more men.

Studies have found that people tend to evaluate male speakers and authors as being more
competent and better (Goldberg, 1968; Gruber & Gaebelein, 1979; Paludi & Bauer, 1983). In one
study, male and female subjects listened to either a male or female speaker who discussed chess
(presumably masculine), interior decorating (presumably feminine), or snow skiing (presumably
neutral). Male speakers, compared with female speakers, were consistently given more attention
and their speeches were recalled better by all subjects. Interestingly, the topic seemed to make
little difference in male and female listening comprehension (Gruber & Gaebelein, 1979).
Another study had both men and women evaluate an academic article in fields from politics to education. Half of the articles were said to be written by a man; the other half were said to be written by a woman. Both male and female subjects rated articles more favorably when they thought that the author was male (Goldberg, 1968). In sum, it appears that people may not take women’s issues as seriously if they are presented by women versus by men.

Connell (2005) discusses reasons why men may be averse to gender equality and suggests that many organizations surrounding gender-related issues have used “women” in their titles (e.g., National Organization for Women, League of Women Voters of the United States, and National Association of University Women). This has made it clear that women are invited to act, but not as clear that men are even welcome as part of the initiative to work toward gender equity. Additionally, by talking about women as the disadvantaged group, it implies (and even sometimes names) the men as the perpetrators. This adds to men not being a part of the gender equity solution. Connell, in a document prepared for the United Nations highlight many important reasons why men need to be involved in addressing gender equality. Also addressed, are four reasons that men may resist gender equality: material benefits, identity problems about change, resentment about gender programs, and ideological defense of male supremacy (Connell, 2003). Some have even gone so far as to state that gender-equality policies and feminism are an injustice and discrimination towards men (Sommers, 2001).

**Overview of Four Studies**

Study 1 begins by examining whether men (versus women) may be a more effective way to get other men to support issues involving gender egalitarianism. This study focuses predominantly on attitudes. In Study 2, however, I examine whether this potentially effective strategy extends to behaviors. That is, the second study addresses whether men (versus women)
can persuade men to act in significantly more female-positive ways. Then, in Study 3, I consider strategies that might be most effective in influencing men to embrace egalitarianism. I particularly develop and describe five theory-guided approaches and test these strategies to see which might be most influential. Finally, in Study 4, I examine whether the strategies identified in Study 3 as the most strategic are also more likely to affect increased gender egalitarian behaviors in men women enacted by men (versus women).

**Study 1: Are Men (Versus Women) More Effective at Convincing Men?**

Employing male (versus female) allies might be one way to enhance the likelihood of men embracing gender equity. That is, male allies might be more successful than female advocates in recruiting men to believe in and take action on women’s issues. There exist many potential reasons that this may be the case: men may be more likely to see male (versus female) advocates as being more objective, credible, less self-interested (Czopp & Monteith, 2003), and higher in status (Cleveland, Stockdale, Murphy, & Gutek, 2000), the information is coming from an unexpected source (Eagly & Chaiken, 1975; Petty, Fleming, Priester, & Feinstein, 2001), men may see the author as a role model, they will be more influenced by men (versus women) presenting the gender equity case.

In order to examine whether men are more responsive to men talking about gender related issues, compared to women, we specifically examine the ratings of articles manipulated to either have a male or a female author. In addition, we manipulate the topic of the article to either pertain to gender equity issues or not be related to gender. Given the potential reasons men may respond more positively to other men, we anticipate:

**Hypothesis 1:** Men will rate gender related articles authored by a man (versus a woman) more favorably. Specifically, men will rate author talent (H1a), belief in the importance of the
topic (H1b), and their enjoyment of reading the article (H1c) higher when the article is written by a man (versus a woman).

**Study 1 Method**

This study utilizes a 2 (author gender: male, female) x 2 (reader gender: male, female) x 2 (article topic: gender-related, non-gender-related) between subject experimental design. The study was distributed online using Amazon’s mTurk.

**Study 1 Participants**

Participants were 457 mTurk workers, 60% were female, 34% male, and 6% did not report their gender. They were on average 44 years old (SD = 15.8) ranging from 18-90 years of age. Sixty percent of participants were white, 12% Asian, 8% Hispanic, and 8% Black. Ninety percent reported having some college or greater educational background. Participants had diverse political ideology, 28% reporting being liberal or very liberal, 20% moderate, and 21% conservative or very conservative. Fifty-six percent reported being married.

**Study 1 Materials**

**Stimuli**

Four articles were used for this study. Two articles were about gender inequity (“Time Crunch for Female Scientists: They Do More Housework than Men,” “Women’s Groups Call Out Political Sexism”) and two articles were unrelated to gender (“Us Students Still Struggle to Grasp World Geography,” “Scientists Still Struggle to Identify 911 Remains”).

Articles were specifically developed for this study. Each article was about the same length. The articles were identical in the male and female author conditions, other than the authors first name. Each article was also manipulated to be authored by either a woman (Michelle Thompson, Jill Laster) or a man (Michael Thompson, John Laster). This resulted in a
total of eight stimuli (APPENDIX B). Two stimuli for each condition was used to make more
generalizable conclusions.

**Measures**

Ratings. Participants rated 18 items on a scale of one to seven (1-Do not agree at all, 4-
Somewhat agree, 7-Very strongly agree). This scale was thematically broken up into three
composites: Author Talent, Importance, and Article Enjoyment.

Author talent and writing skill, which included five items such as “The author seems
intelligent” and “This article is well written,” this composite had good reliability (α = .92).

Belief that the topic was important, which included seven items such as “I feel compelled
to take direct action on this issue,” “The article reflects my personal values and beliefs,” and
“This issue is important to me,” this composite had good reliability (α = .94).

Article enjoyment, which included two items “This article stimulates me to want to act “I
enjoyed reading the article,” and “I enjoyed reading about this topic.” This scale has good
reliability (α = .90).

**Procedure**

Participants were shown randomly one of the eight stimuli articles described previously.
They were lead to believe the article was written by a new guest columnist and told that they
would evaluate the content and writing, as well as their reactions to the issues discussed in the
article. After reading the article, participants were asked to rate statements pertaining to the
content, writing, and issue addressed in the article. They then completed manipulation checks
and demographic information. Participants were then debriefed and thanked for their time.
Study 1 Results

To test the main hypothesis—that men reading about a gender related topic will respond more favorably to a male author than a female author—three t-tests were conducted, using only the 77 male participants who read an article related to gender. There was not a significant effect for Author Talent (H1a), $t(75) = 1.24, p = .217, d = 0.28$. There was a significant effect for belief in the importance of the topic (H1b), $t(75) = 1.99, p = .049, d = 0.46$. Men rated the importance of the topic about half a standard deviation higher when the article was written by a man ($M = 4.27, SD = 1.56$) than they did when the article was written by a woman ($M = 3.58, SD = 1.46$). There was also a significant effect on their enjoyment of reading the article (H1c), $t(75) = 1.99, p = .050, d = 0.46$. Men rated enjoying the articles with male authors ($M = 4.29, SD = 1.74$) about a half standard deviation higher than they rated articles with female authors ($M = 3.51, SD = 1.65$). Thus, hypothesis one was partially supported.

To further assess what was happening, a $2$ (author gender: male, female) x $2$ (article topic: gender related, not gender related) x $2$ (participant gender: male, female) between-subject analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the three composite ratings: Author Talent, Topic Importance, and Article Enjoyment. There was a significant main effect of article topic $F(3, 447) = 4.09, p = .007, \eta^2 = .027$. There was also weak evidence for a three-way interaction between author gender, article topic, and participant gender $F(3, 447) = 1.84, p = .139, \eta^2 = .012$. However, follow up univariate ANOVAs show a significant three-way interaction for Topic Importance, $F(1, 449) = 3.90, p = .049, \eta^2 = .009$, and Article Enjoyment, $F(1, 449) = 5.286, p = .022, \eta^2 = .012$. There was also some evidence of a three-way interaction for Author Talent, $F(1, 449) = 3.18, p = .075, \eta^2 = .007$. 
This three-way interaction can be explained by examining the effects based on whether the article was related to gender or not. When the article was not related to gender, there was no effect of participant gender, $F(3, 219) = 0.49, p = .685, \eta^2 = .007$, author gender, $F(3, 219) = 0.15, p = .927, \eta^2 = .002$, or an interaction, $F(3, 219) = 0.61, p = .606, \eta^2 = .008$.

However, when the article was related to gender, there was weak evidence for a three-way interaction between author gender, article topic, and participant gender $F(3, 226) = 1.76, p = .155, \eta^2 = .023$. However, follow up univariate ANOVAs show a significant three-way interaction for Topic Importance, $F(1, 228) = 4.49, p = .035, \eta^2 = .019$, and Article Enjoyment, $F(1, 228) = 4.02, p = .046, \eta^2 = .017$. There was however not an interaction for Author Talent, $F(1, 228) = 4.09, p = .151, \eta^2 = .009$.

The means, as shown in Figure 1 show the same pattern as shown in the initial t-tests. Men rated articles with male articles higher then articles with female authors on Topic Importance, Author Talent, and Article Enjoyment. Interestingly, you can see that men rated articles with male authors about the same as women rated articles by male and female authors. It was in conditions where men read articles about gender written by a female author that there were the lowest ratings.

**Study 1 Discussion**

Hypothesis one was supported, the t-tests revealed that men responded more favorably to articles about gender related topics when the author was male. Additional analyses reveal that this finding that men responded more favorably to male authors than female authors was only true when the article was about gender. In contrast to the Gruber and Gaebelein (1979) study that found men preferred male speakers, regardless of topic, and the Goldberg (1968) study that found men preferred male authors, regardless of topic, this suggests that there is not an overall
effect that men prefer male authors, but instead that this is specific to the topic being about gender. In addition, these results find that it is not just an effect of participants preferring authors who are the same gender as themselves, as women did not show a preference for female authors over male authors. Additionally, we find that men who read articles about gender by a male author rated articles the same as women who read articles about gender by male and female authors. It was instead, that men who read articles about gender by female authors that showed the decrement.

These results show that attempts by women to get men to support gender equity may not be beneficial. This bolsters the claim that male allies can play an important role in garnering additional support for gender equity, particularly when trying to increase support from other men.

**Study 2: Do the Differences Found in Attitudes Translate to Behavior?**

Because past research has found that attitudes and intentions do not always directly translate into behaviors (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). In the second study, I design a field study that determines whether the findings for Study 1 generalize beyond paper people. Male and female sellers will be asked to purchase cookies, with the proceeds of the cookie sales benefitting the campus women’s center. In this study, I only focus on the reactions of men and women when the topic is related to gender, because this was where we saw effects in Study 1. By informing the customers that the proceeds go to the women’s resource center, the task becomes gender relevant, thereby a parallel to the articles pertaining to gender from Study 1. As such we anticipate:

**Hypothesis 1:** Male customers will buy more cookies (H1a) and donate more money to the Women’s Resource Center (H1b).
In addition to looking at the number of cookie sales, sellers will ask customers to fill out a short questionnaire about their attitudes towards gender-related issues. Following from the findings of Study 1, we anticipate:

_Hypothesis 2_: Male customers will rate indicate that they have higher gender-egalitarian attitudes when the seller is a man (versus a woman).

**Study 2 Method**

This study utilizes a 2 (seller gender: male, female) x 2 (buy gender: male, female) experimental field study design.

**Study 2 Participants**

Potential participants included anyone who looked 18 or older and walked past the experiment table. Actual participants included those who approached the table, 473 people actually approached the table. Of these people, 304 were female and 169 were male.

**Study 2 Materials**

**Confederate Experimenters.** Experimenters consisted of 16 male and 16 female research assistants. Experimenters were all students, aged 18-21. Each experimenter sold cookies for one hour over the course of two days. Many confederates were employed, so that we could make broader generalizations about the effect of men championing women, and to control for any idiosyncratic features of any one individual.

**Questionnaire.** A ten-item questionnaire was used to assess participant’s attitudes about several topics related to women and gender equity. Participants responded to items on this questionnaire using 7-point Likert-type scales ranging from 1-Extremely Negative, 4-Neutral, 7-Extremely Positive. Participants were asked “What is your attitude towards…” “feminism”, “women”, “gender equity”, “the campus Women’s Resource Center”, and “cookies” (Appendix
A). Additionally, they were asked how many cookies they bought, how much they donated, their gender, the seller’s gender, and whether or not they knew the seller. A composite of the four gender related attitude questions (feminism, women, gender equity, WRC) was created and these items had a reliability, $\alpha = .73$.

**Study 2 Procedure**

Two tables were set up in the student center on a small campus. Each table had signs and banners indicated that people at the table were selling cookies to support the campus Women’s Resource Center. To ensure gender issues were highlighted, each table was covered by a pink tablecloth. The two tables were both in the same section of the student center and could both be seen at the same time. Each table was filled with cookies. Each table was staffed by one individual at a time; at all times, one table was staffed by a male student and the other by a female student. At each hour, the gender of the seller at each table switched seller gender so that any possibility in different rates could not be attributed to the different (albeit small) location of one table being better than the other. In addition to the sellers, there was also a coder watching each table to record how many people walked past the table, approached, and bought cookies.

Over the course of three days, every adult who passed the table had the chance to be a participant in the study. Sellers called out to the passersby to see if they would like to have cookies in lieu of a suggested 25 cent donation for each to support the campus Women’s Resource Center. Each person who approached the table was asked also to complete a questionnaire. After completing the survey, they were thanked and left.

Each participant also recorded whether or not they knew the seller. Only participants who did not know the seller were used in all analyses. We were not interested in the effects of selling to friends or acquaintances.
Study 2 Results

To test hypothesis one, two t-tests were conducted. Male customers bought significantly more cookies when the seller was male \((M = 1.54, SD = 0.97)\) than when the seller was female \((M = 1.13, SD = 0.91)\), \(t(110) = 2.27, p = .025, d = 0.43\). In addition to buying more cookies, male customers also donated more when the seller was male \((M = 1.93, SD = 2.07)\) than when the seller was female \((M = 1.45, SD = 1.09)\), however this effect was not statistically significant \(t(114) = 1.59, p = .114, d = 0.28\). Thus hypothesis 1 was partially supported, H1a was fully supported and H1b was not statistically significant.

To test hypothesis two—male customers would endorse more gender equitable beliefs when the seller was male rather than female—was tested with a t-test. Male customers’ attitudes towards women were lower when the seller was male \((M = 5.78, SD = 0.89)\) than when the seller was female \((M = 6.07, SD = 0.74)\), however this effect was not significant, \(t(101) = -1.74, p = .084, d = -0.34\). Thus, H2 was not supported.

In addition, a 2 (seller gender: male, female) x 2 (buyer gender: male female) between-subjects MANOVA was performed on three dependent variables operationalized to be associated with support for gender equity: number of cookies bought, amount donated, and attitudes. Descriptive statistics and correlations of the independent and dependent variables are shown in Table 1.

The hypothesized effect, that men would differentially affected by male sellers was not supported. There were no significant interactions. However, with the use of Wilks’ criterion, the combined DVs were significantly affected by both seller gender, \(F(3, 336) = 2.67, p = .048, \eta^2 = .023\), and buyer gender, \(F(3, 336) = 10.80, p < .001, \eta^2 = .088\), but not by their interaction, \(F(3, 336) = 0.83, p = .478, \eta^2 = .007\).
The two significant main effects, were followed up by univariate ANOVAs. Attitudes towards women varied significantly by buyer gender, $F(1, 338) = 28.26, p < .001, \eta^2 = .077$. Women gave more favorable attitude ratings ($M = 6.28, SE = .05$) than did men ($M = 5.87, SE = .06$). There was no significant main effect for buyer gender for either amount of cookies sold, $F(1, 338) = 0.77, p = .382, \eta^2 = .002$, or amount donated, $F(1, 338) = 0.56, p = .457, \eta^2 = .002$.

Amount donated varied significantly by seller gender, $F(1, 338) = 5.37, p = .021, \eta^2 = .016$. Participants donated more to male sellers ($M = 1.75, SE = .15$) than to female sellers ($M = 1.27, SE = .14$). There was a marginally significant effect of seller gender on number of cookies bought, $F(1, 338) = 3.29, p = .070, \eta^2 = .010$. Participants bought more cookies from male sellers ($M = 1.61, SE = .15$) than from female sellers ($M = 1.25, SE = .14$). There was no significant main effect of seller gender on attitudes, $F(1, 338) = 1.42, p = .234, \eta^2 = .004$.

Additionally, the break-down of the average number of men and women who approached the table to purchase a cookie, make a donation, fill out a survey, or ask a question can be seen in Table 1. You can see that more men stopped at the table when the seller was male ($M = 7.4, SD = 4.76$) rather than female ($M = 6.94, SD = 3.78$). Though this difference is not statistically different $t(30) = 0.30, p = 0.762$. Additionally, women stopped at the table about equally whether the seller was male ($M = 11.0, SD = 6.57$) or female ($M = 11.35, SD = 6.66$). This difference was not significant $t(30) = 0.14, p = 0.882$. Women did stop at the table ($M = 11.19, SD = 6.51$) significantly more than men ($M = 7.16, SD = 4.21$) did, $t(30) = 2.08, p = 0.046, d = 0.73$.

**Study 2 Discussion**

Hypothesis 1, men will buy more cookies and donate more money when the seller is also a man was partially supported, men bought more and donated more, but only number of cookies was significant. Further analysis found that customers in general, both men and women, bought a
greater number of cookies from male sellers than they did from female sellers. Unlike in study 1, there was no interaction between participant gender and asker gender. Male sellers were more effective overall.

Hypothesis 2, men will endorse higher women-related attitudes when asked by men, was not supported. Men in general, to both male and female sellers, endorsed lower women-related attitudes than did women participants. There was no significant interaction between buyer and seller genders.

The results of this study did not indicate the expected interaction between seller and buyer gender. If the results of this study was entirely consistent with the findings of Study 1, we would have expected that men would buy the same number of cookies and donate the same amount to male sellers as women did to both male and female sellers. There was, however no significant interaction (ps both greater than .3). Men on average endorsed less favorable evaluations. However, on average their attitudes were still positive (5.87 on a 7-point scale), just not as positive as women’s (6.28 on a 7-point scale).

It is possible that the attitudes towards women scale was more similar to a long standing attitude that is not dependent on short interactions. In this way it may be more similar to the ASI or other prejudice scales. It is also worth reiterating the on average, all participants were endorsing positive egalitarian attitudes towards women and gender equity. Additionally, only those who actually approached the table took the attitudes towards women scale. This could also be why these scores were so high. Only those who thought it was interesting even approached the table.
Study 3: Are There Effective Strategies to Influence Men?

Studies 1 and 2 provide some support that men are effective at influencing the behaviors of other men to support gender egalitarian views. However, it is important to understand what kinds of strategies can be used by both men and women to convince men. To begin to assess this, we return to the research paradigm used in Study 1, articles written about gender equity. If men are more influenced by articles written by male authors, it is important to examine the strategies that people might use to get male customers particularly interested in engaging in gender-egalitarian behaviors. In particular, I have identified five theoretical strategies that might persuade men to increase their promotion of gender equity. These strategies include a) perspective taking (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000), b) combatting zero-sum perspective (Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Wilkins, Wellman, Babbitt, Toosi, & Schad, 2015), c) highlighting male role-models (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955), d) appealing to egalitarian beliefs (Prime & Moss-Racusin, 2009), and e) self-extension (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992; Maner et al., 2002). I describe in more detail each of these three strategies, and the theories that support predictions about why they might be useful.

**Perspective taking**

First, perspective taking has been found to reduce the automatic expression of racial biases (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000; Todd, Bodenhausen, Richeson, & Galinsky, 2011) and promote action on others’ behalf (Batson et al., 1997). Perspective taking is actively thinking about the psychological experience of others (Todd et al., 2011). Participants who viewed a “humanizing” video about someone who was transgender and then did a perspective taking exercise reported less transprejudice and a greater desire for social contact with people who are
transgender than did participants who only read about what it means to be transgender diagnostically (Tompkins, Shields, Hillman, & White, 2015).

A series of five studies by Todd and colleagues (2011) found that perspective taking was predictive of lower pro-White bias on the IAT (studies 1, 2, and 3), warmth towards Blacks as a group (study 3), less avoidance (studies 4 and 5), and friendliness to a Black confederate (study 5). We therefore think that perspective taking can be a useful strategy in increasing men’s support for women and gender equity.

**Combatting the Zero-Sum Perspective**

Second, research has shown that high-status groups tend to perceive greater zero-sum patterns than do low-status groups (Bosson, Vandellos, Michniewicz, & Lenes, 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Norton & Sommers, 2011). For example, White participants reported that there have been substantial decreases in discrimination towards Blacks, however there has also been a parallel increase in discrimination towards Whites in the past decade (Norton & Sommers, 2011). Similar results have been found with men, men and women both report that there is less discrimination towards women than there used to be, but men report that there is a parallel increase in discrimination towards men (Bosson et al., 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013).

Wilkins and colleagues (2015) replicated and extended these findings for men and women. Men who had higher endorsements of zero-sum beliefs showed this pattern of reported discrimination even more than men who had lower endorsements of zero-sum beliefs. In addition, they found that they could change men’s endorsement of zero-sum belief by reading articles about anti-male discrimination. Men who read about anti-male discrimination endorsed higher zero-sum beliefs than did men who read about decreasing anti-female discrimination.
Women’s zero-sum beliefs were lower than men’s and unaffected by reading the articles (Wilkins et al., 2015).

Wilkins and colleagues (2015) also found that zero-sum beliefs were predictive of decreased support for affirmative action policies by Whites. They expect that this would also hold true for men in relation to policies that support women. For this reason, we think that by combatting zero-sum beliefs there will be increased positivity towards attempts to support women.

**Extension of Self**

Third, I will examine self-extension theory (Aron et al., 1992) or including others in one’s self concept. This will entail having men think about their wife, daughter, mother, sister, or other significant female in their life. (Maner et al., 2002) found that when self-extension was included in their model, the relation between empathy and helping disappeared, and instead self-extension was directly related to helping. This would suggest that when a man thinks about women in his life who are potentially part of his self-concept, he might be more likely to help their cause.

**Egalitarian Principles**

Fourth, Prime & Moss-Racusin (2009), with the Catalyst group, found that men who were champions for gender equity identified recognizing the gender biases was the primary reason that the promote gender equity. These results were qualitative and from 250 men who identified by Catalyst as being leading champions for this issue, the strategy of manipulating the salience of equity primes has potential for influencing men. Many men who do act to achieve gender equality report doing so because equality is a principle that is important to them (Connell, 2003).
**Highlighting Male Role Models**

Fifth, studies of social influence have found that people use cues from other people to make their own opinions about topics (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955; Mahaffey & Bryan, 2015; Zitek & Hebl, 2007). This research, however, does not examine how individuals who share group membership differentially affect attitude changes. Relatedly, research shows that people tend to like people who are similar to themselves. For these reasons we think that highlighting male role models will be an influential strategy.

No hypotheses are made about the relative success of these strategies, but it is hypothesized that all five strategies will be more useful when utilized by men than when communicated by women.

Hypothesis 1: Men will rate articles written by a male author more favorably than when the author is female.

**Study 3 Method**

This study utilizes a 2 (author gender: male, female) x 5 (strategy: highlighting male role-models, combatting zero-sum perspective, extension of self, egalitarian principles, empathy) experimental design. This study was distributed to men using Amazon’s mTurk.

**Study 3 Participants**

Participants were 340 men from mTurk in the US. Participants were between 18 and 71 years old (M = 35.7, SD = 12.33). The majority (75.9%) of participants were White (N = 258), 9.1% Asian (N = 31), 6.5% Black (N = 22), 4.4% Hispanic (N = 15), and 3.2% Other (N = 11); 3 participants did not report their race/ethnicity. The sample was educated, 89.2% reported having some college education or higher (N = 304). Most participants reported being heterosexual (92.9%, N = 316). 40.3% of participants were single (N = 137), 32.1% married (N = 109), 21.5%
in a committed relationship (N = 73), and 5.3% casually dating one or more people (N = 18).
Participants ranged from Very Liberal to Very Conservative, but on average were right in the
middle on a 7 point Likert-type scale (M = 3.54, SD = 1.68).

**Study 3 Materials**

Stimuli.

For each of the five strategies (extension of self, empathy, male role-models, egalitarian,
and combatting zero sum), three stimuli were created utilizing that method. This resulted in 15
different articles. Each article consisted of the same first and last paragraph, the second
paragraph was manipulated based on strategy. Each title was also manipulated to reflect the
strategy being used. Multiple stimuli for each strategy were used to make sure the effect reflects
the strategy, rather than the particular wording in that paragraph. No differences were found
within strategy condition.

Besides the strategy paragraph, the remainder of the article remained the same for each
condition. Each article was titled “Workforce Woes,” following the main title, each article had its
own subtitle to further reflect the condition.

Extension of self. For each article in the extension of self condition, the subtitle used was
“Workforce Woes: Think about the Important Women in your Life.” These stimuli were written
to have the reader think about important women in their life. The purpose of this manipulation
was to have the male readers think about women who are potentially part of their self-concept
and how they are experience gender inequity in the workplace. An example stimuli paragraph
was “Your sister graduates with high honors from Harvard Law School and accepts a job with a
prominent and well-respected New York City firm. A few months into the job, she calls you over
the phone and relays a frustrating message. Despite her glowing performance reviews and
admirable work ethic, your sister receives an annual salary of only $100,000. While this is
certainly an impressive sum, a male attorney who graduated without honors from Harvard in the
same class as your sister received a starting salary of $120,000 from the same exact firm. What
do you tell your sister to encourage her?”

Empathy. For each article in the empathy condition, the subtitle used was “Workforce
Woes: Imagine a Day in the Life.” This strategy paragraph was manipulated to have male readers
think about what it may be like to be a woman facing gender inequity in the workplace. These
paragraph stimuli asked men to imagine themselves in the position that many women find
themselves in. An example stimuli paragraph was “Imagine a year in the life of a woman: you
put in countless hours at the office and you work hard at your job, but when your paycheck
comes, you find it to be significantly less than your male colleagues who hold the same
qualifications. Also imagine that it is time for a promotion. Despite your strong work ethic and
incredible qualifications, you are not chosen to advance to a higher position, only because of
your gender. What would imagining this feel like?”

Highlighting male role models. For each article in the male role-models condition, the
subtitle used was “Workforce Woes: Men Championing Women.” These paragraph stimuli were
manipulated to highlight men who are supporting women. This primarily relied on highlight men
who have stood up in favor of gender equity. An example paragraph for male role models was
“Although it may appear that only women are concerned with gender issues; this is not the case.
Men everywhere - of all races, ages, and sexualities - are stepping up alongside women to serve
as role models and fight for equality. From famous actors like Ashton Kutcher, to political
figures like Prince Harry, to professional athletes like Richard Sherman, men of all backgrounds
are not only acknowledging gender issues but are also taking action to fight for gender equity.”
Egalitarian beliefs. For each article in the egalitarian beliefs condition, the subtitle used was “Workforce Woes: Calling on your Sense of Fairness.” These paragraphs focused on the moral and egalitarian reasons why a man would support women and gender equity. An example of this strategy was “How can businesses that strive to maintain and project wholesome values continually pay women employees less than their male counterparts? The very principle of unequal pay goes completely against the do-good business values supposedly upheld by so many American companies. Adidas, IMAX, and Google proudly proclaim slogans such as “Impossible is nothing,” “Think big,” and “Don’t be evil.” But how can corporate America encourage the rest of the country to adopt this egalitarian mentality when popular business practices speak otherwise? In order to make positive change in the world, businesses first must treat their own employees fairly. That starts with equal pay for men and women.”

Combatting zero sum. For each article in the combatting zero-sum condition, the subtitle used was “Workforce Woes: A Win for Women is a Win for All.” This strategy paragraph was designed to highlight that women succeeding did not mean that men would not succeed. An example of this strategy was “What I think is amazing is that if men believe that a woman gets equal pay, they think the job may not be as good. Men stand to lose nothing by supporting wage equality. Proponents of wage equality are not asking that male salaries be lowered to match female salaries, but that equally qualified women are offered comparable salaries to their male colleagues—that is essentially it.”

In addition to manipulating the strategy paragraph, the author was manipulated to reflect author gender. The female author condition was Rebecca Green and the male author was Robert
Green as the author. In total, 30 different stimuli, reflecting 10 different conditions, were created (Appendix C).

Measures

Response to the article. Participants completed 19 items about their reactions to the article that they read. The responses to these items were on a 6-point Likert-type scale (1-Do Not Agree at All, 6-Very Strongly Agree). These items made up three subscales: Important to Me, Take Action, and Writing Skill. Important to Me included five items such as “I believe in the purpose of this article” and “Gender equity in the workplace is important to me.” This subscale had good reliability ($\alpha = .87$). The Take Action subscale included seven items such as “I feel compelled to take direct action on this issue of gender inequity in the workplace” and “I am motivated to work on women’s behalf.” This subscale had strong reliability ($\alpha = .95$). The Writing Skill subscale had seven items such as “This article was well written” and “The author’s argument was well reasoned.” This subscale had strong reliability ($\alpha = .95$).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. We used the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996). This is a 22 item measure, 11 measuring benevolent sexism and 11 measuring hostile sexism. Items were on a scale of one to six (1-Disagree strongly, 6-Agree strongly). The benevolent sexism subscale had good reliability ($\alpha = .87$), as did the hostile sexism subscale ($\alpha = .90$). Composite scores of each subscale were used.

Manipulation Checks and Demographics. Participants also completed manipulation checks and demographics.

Study 3 Procedure

Participants were told that the purpose of this study was to evaluate the ways in which people evaluated newspaper articles on controversial issues. After completing the informed
consent, participants read the following prompt. “For this study, you will be reading an article from a well-known national newspaper. We would like you to read this article. Please pay very careful attention to the information as you will be asked to recall some of the information later.”

Next participants saw one of the thirty article stimuli created for this study. After reading this article, participants completed the questionnaire response to the article, the ASI, the manipulation checks, and demographic questions. Participants were then thanked and received credit for participating.

**Study 3 Results**

To test the main hypothesis, that men would respond to articles more positively to articles written by men, we used three t-tests, for Important to Me, Take Action, and Writing Skill. There was weak evidence that men thought the topic was more important when the author was male ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 1.27$) compared to female ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.15$), $t(338) = 1.72$, $p = .086$. There was evidence that men were more likely to endorse taking action when the author was male ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 1.41$) compared to female ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.26$), $t(338) = 2.32$, $p = .021$. And finally, there was evidence that men were more likely to the author was better when the author was male ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.32$) compared to female ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.20$), $t(338) = 2.24$, $p = .025$.

Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

To further explore, a $2$ (author gender: male, female) x $5$ (article strategy: egalitarian, empathy, extension, role model, and zero-sum) between-subjects multivariate analysis of covariance was performed on the overall responses to the article. Adjustment was made for two covariates: benevolent sexism and hostile sexism. The three dependent variables were Important to Me, Take Action, and Writing Skill. Descriptive statistics and correlations of the independent and dependent variables can be found in Table 2.
After adjustment by covariates, multivariate responses to the article varied significantly with author gender, as summarized in Table 3, with $F(3, 326) = 3.14, p = .026$. The strength of the relationship between response to the article and author gender was weak, however, with partial $\eta^2 = .028$. This effect was true for the three univariate ANOVAs. Men thought the topic was more important when it was written by man ($M = 3.83, SE = 0.08$) than a woman ($M = 3.49, SE = 0.09$), $F(1,328) = 8.87, p = .007, \eta^2 = .022$. Men endorsed wanting to take action more when it was written by man ($M = 3.43, SE = 0.09$) than a woman ($M = 3.01, SE = 0.11$), $F(1,328) = 9.44, p = .002, \eta^2 = .028$. And finally, men thought the writing was better when it was written by man ($M = 3.55, SE = 0.87$) than a woman ($M = 3.22, SE = 0.9$), $F(1,328) = 5.76, p = .017, \eta^2 = .017$. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

There was weak evidence that responses the article also varied significantly with the article strategy as summarized in Table 6, with $F(12, 326) = 1.51, p = .113, \eta^2 = .018$. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs show that: Important to Me is not significant, $F(4,328) = 1.66, p = .155, \eta^2 = .020$; Take Action is significant, $F(4,328) = 298, p = .019, \eta^2 = .035$; and Writing Skill is not significant, $F(4,328) = 2.77, p = .028, \eta^2 = .028$. The adjusted marginal means, as displayed in Table 4, show that, for all three DVs, highlighting male role models had the most favorable ratings of the article, and promoting empathy had the least favorable ratings to the article.

There was no significant interaction between author gender and article strategy, $F(12, 984) = 0.634, p = .815, \eta^2 = .008$.

**Study 3 Discussion**

Hypothesis 1 predicted that men would respond more favorably to articles with a male author than articles written by female authors. This hypothesis was supported. There was an overall main effect of author gender on ratings of the articles. By looking at the means, this is
true in every strategy condition. There was no interaction between author gender and article strategy.

In addition to the main effect of author gender, there was also a main effect of article strategy. The most effective strategy, in both author gender conditions, was highlighting male role models. This condition highlighted men in positions of power and authority, such as celebrities, CEOs, politicians, and athletes, who support women.

The least effective strategy was promoting empathy for women. This strategy had readers imagine a day in the life of a woman. This strategy was least successful for both male and female authors.

Taken as a whole, this study further supports the findings of Study 1, men respond more favorably to articles written by male authors than by female authors when the topic of the article is related to women and gender equity. In addition, this study highlights five potential strategies that can be used. Highlighting male role models was the most effective strategy for both male (M = 4.02, SE = .19) and female authors (M = 3.58, SE = .24). In fact, when this strategy was used by a female author (M = 3.58, SE = .24), ratings were very similar to ratings for the average male author (M = 3.58, SE = .08), it was also higher that ratings for male authors in two of the four other strategy conditions, Egalitarian (M = 3.42, SE = 3.42) and Empathy (M = 3.27, SE = .176). Because of the success found for highlighting male role models for both male and female authors, Study 4 will use this strategy in a field experiment.

**Study 4: Using Different Strategies, Do Differences in Attitudes Translate to Behaviors?**

As a follow-up to the studies 1, 2, and 3, Study 4 extends this question to include actual behavior (as opposed to attitudes). There is evidence that attitudes do not directly translate into actual behaviors, though are highly related to one another (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). This study
follows up Study 3 by using the most successful strategy, highlighting male role-models, but bringing it into the field setting.

Based on the findings from studies 1, 2, and 3, we expect that men will buy more restaurant cards and be friendlier to other men. Thus, we expect:

*Hypothesis 1*: Males will be more likely to buy more when the requester is male (rather than female).

*Hypothesis 2*: Highlighting male role-models will be more effective than just asking for donations for both male and female sellers.

Additionally, the findings from Study 3 lead me to expect that highlighting male role models will be more effect than just the control. We therefore expect that men will buy more restaurant cards and be friendlier in the role model condition than in the control condition.

*Hypothesis 3*: Males will be more friendly to male sellers than female sellers.

*Hypothesis 4*: Males will be more friendly in the male role model condition than in the control condition.

**Study 4 Method**

To further test whether role-models is a useful strategy for men and women to use to convince women, we extend study 3 into the field. This study utilized a 2 (seller gender: male, female) x 2 (strategy: highlighting male role-models, control) experimental field study.

**Study 4 Participants**

Potential participants were males who were at least 18 who walked past our experiment booth at a festival in the Southern United States. Participants consisted of 1706 men, of those men, 521 (30.5%) were alone, 1028 (60.2%) were with at least one woman, and 157 (9.2%) were with another man.
Study 4 Materials

Confederate Sellers. Sellers were trained in what to say, as well as how to fill out the coding sheet. The sellers consisted of 12 men and 12 women. The sellers sold in same-gender pairs for 2-3 hours. Sellers alternated every 30 minutes between the two conditions (role-models, control). Each shift switched between males and females. All confederates wore jeans and a red shirt that read “Donate to Support Women.” I, the experimenter, was present the entire time to maintain consistency between confederate sellers and to make sure they stayed to their script.

Manipulation Scripts. In the control condition, sellers were trained to say to every male who walked by “Hi sir. Would you like to buy a restaurant card to support women?” In the role-model condition, sellers were trained to say to every male who walked by “Hi sir. Would you like to join these role-model men in supporting women? Want to buy a restaurant card?” In addition to the script used in the role model condition, there was a poster that the seller pointed to. This poster was titled “Men Championing Women” and had pictures of celebrities holding up a “#heforshe” sign (APPENDIX D).

Coding Sheet. A coding sheet was used by the sellers to rate each interaction that they had. Whether they were ignored, told no, or approached by the man and whether they bought a card if they approached was recorded. In addition to this, the confederate sellers also coded the man’s friendliness and rudeness both on a scale of one to seven (1- not at all, 7- very much). They also recorded if they were alone and any additional comments.

Study 4 Procedure

Similar to Study 2, a table was set up in an area with a lot of foot traffic. In this study, the table was a rented booth at the Italian Festival. The booth was in an area with other vendors and maintained heavy foot traffic throughout the 34 hours of the Festival. The table was set up with a
red table cloth. On the table there were flyers and brochures for the Women’s Resource of Greater Houston, the organization which donations were going to support. In addition to the brochures, a 3-foot by 4-foot poster depicting what the Women’s Resource does was hanging at the back of the booth.

In the role-models condition, the before described #heforshe poster was placed in front of the table, so that sellers could point to the poster. When it was the control condition, this poster was out of sight at the back of tent.

There were 12 shifts over four days, lasting a total of 32 hours. Sellers worked for shifts that lasted between 2 and 3 hours. Every shift there were two people selling, these sellers were always paired with someone of the same gender. Each shift, the sellers gender switched. Each day the starting gender would alternate to account for busyness based on the time of day. Each seller wore a t-shirt that was specifically designed for this study. T-shirts were red and on the front said in big black letters “Donate to Support Women.”

During their shift, sellers alternated between role-model and control conditions every 30 minutes. Each selling team spent an equal amount of time in each of the two conditions. Each seller in a selling team were in the same condition at any given time. Starting condition of teams was balanced so that half of each gender started with each the control and the role model condition.

Confederate sellers recorded each interaction on a paper coding sheet that they held on clipboard in front of them. After each interaction, they filled out the line for the interaction. When the passerby would say no or ignore them, sellers recorded that as well as their friendliness and rudeness. When they approached this was also recorded, in addition whether or
not the person bought a restaurant card. In addition to these items, sellers also had a place to record any comments from the interaction.

Sellers always used the same beginning script, but answered individuals based upon what question was asked. All sellers knew about what the Women’s Resource does, as well as how the restaurant cards work. All sellers were able to answer questions.

The experimenter was at the booth for all shifts during the Festival. In order to make sure that the experimenter presence did not affect the experiment, the experimenter sat under the experimental table, hidden by the table cloths. In this position she could hear all interactions to maintain consistency within and between confederate sellers. She also managed transitions between conditions and shifts and was there for troubleshooting throughout.

**Study 4 Results**

Base rates of restaurant cards were very low. Of the 1706 men who passed the table, only 55 bought a restaurant card. The number of restaurant cards bought based on gender of the seller was not significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 55) = 2.36, p = .157$. Buying a restaurant card based on strategy condition also was not significant, $\chi^2(1, N = 55) = 1.04, p = .339$. In addition, the interaction of seller gender and condition was also not significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 55) = 0.953, p = .328$.

Passerby positivity, as rated by the seller, varied significantly with seller gender, as summarized in Table 5, with $F(1, 1691) = 11.09, p = .001, \eta^2 = .007$. Men were more positive to male sellers ($M = 4.59, SE = .06$) than to female sellers ($M = 4.33, SE = .06$). There was also a main effect of strategy on overall positivity, with $F(1, 1691) = 4.92, p = .027, \eta^2 = .003$. Men were more positive in the control condition ($M = 4.55, SE = .06$) than in the role model condition ($M = 4.37, SE = .06$). There was no interaction between seller gender and strategy condition,
with $F(1, 1691) = 2.289$, $p = .130$, $\eta^2 = .001$. Descriptive statistics and correlations of the independent and dependent variables can be found in Table 6.

**Study 4 Discussion**

Hypothesis 1 (a and b), that men would buy more restaurant cards to support the Women’s Resource based on seller gender and strategy condition was not supported. Buying a restaurant card was not shown to be effected by either of these variables or their interaction. However, it is important to note that restaurant cards were bought at a very low rate, only 55 men stopped to buy a restaurant card out of the 1,695 men who passed by. It appears that people did not want to buy restaurant cards at this event. Future research can assess support of women with a higher base rate behavior.

Although there was no difference on frequency of buying restaurant cards, there was a difference in overall friendliness as rated by the sellers of the men that they interacted with. Male sellers experienced more positivity, as measured by the passers friendliness and rudeness. These ratings were based on their short interactions with men, mostly as they told them no. Therefore, hypothesis 2 (a and b) was supported, men were more positive towards male sellers supporting women than female sellers supporting women.

**Overall Discussion**

To summarize this series of studies found that men can play an important role in inducing support from other men on issues of gender equality. In Study 1, we found that men responded more favorably to articles with male authors when the topic pertained to gender related issues than they did to articles written by female authors on these same issues. When articles were unrelated to gender, we did not find this effect. Study 2 took this this premise into the field to look at both attitudes as well as shows of behavioral support.
In Study 2, we found the customers, both male and female, bought more cookies and donated more (both operationalized as shows of behavioral support for women) from male sellers than they did from female sellers. However, we also found that men in general endorsed less favorable attitudes about women and gender equality than did men. Though there was no interaction between buyer gender and seller gender.

Study 3 returned to the online experiment, examining five different strategies that could be used by male allies and female advocates. In Study 3, we found that men endorsed more favorable ratings of articles about gender issues when the articles had a male author. This was consistent with findings from Study 1. We also found that highlighting male role models was the most successful strategies for both male and female authors. To further test the strategy of highlighting male role models, this strategy was used in the field in Study 4.

Study 4 aimed to measure behavioral support and interpersonal friendliness in the field, based on seller gender and the highlighting male role model strategy. In Study 4, we found no differences between purchasing of a restaurant cards (operationalized as behavioral support for women) based on seller gender, strategy condition, or their interaction. However, we found that men responded more positively (more friendly and less rude) to male sellers than they did to female sellers. Additionally, contrary to our hypothesis, men responded more positively to sellers who used the control condition, not those who used the highlighting male role models strategy.

Although not all of our hypotheses were supported, the overall premise that men speaking up about gender equality is a useful method of garnering support of other men for issues related to gender. The use of male allies in this research showed that this was useful in interactions with men, though it had no cost to women. In study 1, where both men and women participants were
used, women endorsed the same amount of support for the gender related articles in both the male and female author conditions. Instead, men endorsed greater support when the author was male rather than female. This is important because this indicates that male allies will likely not damper support from women.

Studies 3 and 4 provide contradictory evidence of the effectiveness of highlighting male role models. This may be because the actual strategy may have differed between studies. In Study 3, highlighting male role models was done by talking about specific men who have publically supported women. In Study 4, because of the setup of the booth, we opted instead to use a poster. We used a poster that had the same headline as that used in Study 3—“Men Championing Women.” However, it was instead pictures of celebrities with the #heforshe sign made popular after Emma Watson’s UN speech. In this condition in Study 4, we wanted to make the fact that we were showing them role models very salient, so sellers asked men if they wanted to be like these role model men in supporting women. In Study 3, we just highlighted that there were already prominent men who were supporting women. This difference should be examined in future studies to determine the most effective way to highlight male role models. Particularly because this strategy showed to be very useful for female advocates, as well as male allies.

This research comes at a time when media and popular culture has begun to embrace men in conversations about gender and gender equity—instead of treating men as the enemy, many women are embracing them as important allies in their quest for a more gender equitable world. This is not to say that there have not been male allies in the past, it is just now they are being recognized as such.

Taken as a whole this research suggests that this method is a successful strategy for reaching gender equality is to include men in the advocacy. Having men stand up for gender
equality will likely have a larger effect on men as a whole, opposed to having women stand up and saying the same thing. This is not to say that all responsibility should be shifted to men, but instead that when men act as allies for gender equality there are important benefits.

Future research should see if this line of research extends to other ally groups, such as Whites, able-bodied, and straight. Additionally, it will be important to determine the most successful strategies that can be used by disadvantaged group members (e.g., women) in reaching out to higher power group members (e.g., men).
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Appendix A

Stimuli for study 1.
US Students still struggle to grasp world geography

By Jill Laster

Even as schools aim to better prepare students for a global workforce, fewer than one in three US students are proficient in geography, with most eighth-graders unable to explain what causes earthquakes or accurately describe the American Southwest, according to a report released yesterday morning.

Overall, high school seniors demonstrated the least proficiency on a 2011 test, the National Assessment of Educational Progress, also known as the nation’s geography report card, with 20 percent found to be proficient or better, compared with 27 percent of eighth-graders and 21 percent of fourth-graders.

The average score for 12th-graders declined to 289 (on a scale of 500) from 294 in 2001 when the test was last given. It was essentially unchanged for eighth-graders in that period, though there were gains among the lowest-performing students. Fourth-graders had the largest gains, with the average score rising five points from 2001.

“Geography is not just about maps,” said David P. Driscoll, chairman of the National Assessment Governing Board, who expressed concern that students were not doing better. “It is a rich and varied discipline that, now more than ever, is vital to understanding the connections between our global economy, environment, and diverse cultures.”

One reason cited for this problem is that there has been a lack of addressing it in the curriculum and some schools have even taken geography entirely out of the curriculum. “Unless proactive steps are taken toward improving our children’s knowledge,” Driscoll cites, “we will continue to disadvantage our U.S. students with more than just deficits in math and science.”

Jill Laster is a Professor at Carnegie Mellon and a guest columnist for the Chronicle of Higher Education.
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US Students still struggle to grasp world geography

By John Laster

Even as schools aim to better prepare students for a global workforce, fewer than one in three US students are proficient in geography, with most eighth-graders unable to explain what causes earthquakes or accurately describe the American Southwest, according to a report released yesterday morning.

Overall, high school seniors demonstrated the least proficiency on a 2011 test, the National Assessment of Educational Progress, also known as the nation’s geography report card, with 20 percent found to be proficient or better, compared with 27 percent of eighth-graders and 21 percent of fourth-graders.

The average score for 12th-graders declined to 289 (on a scale of 500) from 294 in 2001 when the test was last given. It was essentially unchanged for eighth-graders in that period, though there were gains among the lowest-performing students. Fourth-graders had the largest gains, with the average score rising five points from 2001.

“Geography is not just about maps,” said David P. Driscoll, chairman of the National Assessment Governing Board, who expressed concern that students were not doing better. “It is a rich and varied discipline that, now more than ever, is vital to understanding the connections between our global economy, environment, and diverse cultures.”

One reason cited for this problem is that there has been a lack of addressing it in the curriculum and some schools have even taken geography entirely out of the curriculum. “Unless proactive steps are taken toward improving our children’s knowledge,” Driscoll cites, “we will continue to disadvantage our U.S. students with more than just deficits in math and science.”

John Laster is a Professor at Carnegie Mellon and a guest columnist for the Chronicle of Higher Education.
Time Crunch for Female Scientists: They Do More Housework than Men

By Jill Lasner

When the biologist Carol W. Greider received a call from Stockholm last fall telling her she had won a Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine, she wasn’t working in her lab at the Johns Hopkins University. The professor of molecular biology and genetics was at home, folding laundry.

Ms. Greider does many of the household chores, but she isn’t alone.

"It is not just housework. For women with kids, it is all the other stuff: scheduling sports and play dates, play dates, remembering all of the calendar events for the whole family," said Ms. Greider, who has two school-age children.

In my recent study, published in the latest issue of Academe, "Housework is an Academic Issue," we found that female scientists do 54 percent of their home household tasks whereas their male counterparts do about 25% (Paid help and children make up some of the difference). I also found that women worked at their paying jobs about 26 hours a week, almost the same number of hours as men do.

I propose that one possible solution could be for universities to create more flexible benefits packages that allow women (and men) to hire household help. American employers generally have not provided benefits to assist with housework, although some companies in other countries do (e.g., Sony Ericsson in Sweden pays for housecleaning from some service providers).

Clearly, attention to this issue and proactive steps toward addressing it might help reduce unequal pressures on female scientists. [Signature]

Jill Lasner is a Professor at Carnegie Mellon and a guest columnist for the Chronicle of Higher Education.
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"It is not just housework. For women with kids, it is all the other stuff: scheduling sports and play dates, play dates, remembering all of the calendar events for the whole family," said Ms. Greider, who has two school-age children.

In my recent study, published in the latest issue of Academe, "Housework is an Academic Issue," we found that female scientists do 54 percent of their home household tasks whereas their male counterparts do about 25% (Paid help and children make up some of the difference). I also found that women worked at their paying jobs about 26 hours a week, almost the same number of hours as men do.

I propose that one possible solution could be for universities to create more flexible benefits packages that allow women (and men) to hire household help. American employers generally have not provided benefits to assist with housework, although some companies in other countries do (e.g., Sony Ericsson in Sweden pays for housecleaning from some service providers).

Clearly, attention to this issue and proactive steps toward addressing it might help reduce unequal pressures on female scientists.

John Lasner is a Professor at Carnegie Mellon and a guest columnist for the Chronicle of Higher Education.
By Michelle Thompson

The list includes the talk radio host who called a female senator a “prostitute” for cutting a deal to benefit her state, the male challenger who referred to his female rival “attractive” and “probably a good mother,” and the TV host who noted that the candidate’s wife looked like an angry woman.

Those comments and others have been collected by a group of advocates for women running for office who are monitoring what they consider a highly toxic media environment that makes it difficult for female candidates.

The comments were only lightly condemned, said Jehan Goudey, president of the Women’s Media Center, and they keep coming.

“Sexism against women in the media has become normalized and accepted in a way that they would not be if the comments were male,” Goudey said. “It dramatically affects women candidates.”

I have studied those effects at the American University’s Women and Politics Institute. My research has shown that women are less likely than men to consider running for office because they perceive an unfair political environment. The United States ranks 86th in the world for representation of women in political offices. Women make up 9 percent of the nation’s population but hold only 17 percent of the seats in Congress, and 26 percent of the seats in state legislatures. Those numbers are smaller groups that have tried for years to get more women into the political pipeline.

My research shows that a potential candidate’s perceptions of unfairness are shaped by how women who are running in the nation’s most challenging and high-profile races are treated by the media. We have to call attention to the sexism and let people know they can’t speak this way about candidates because those effects trickle down.

Most people wrongly assume that comments that denigrate women because of their gender are a thing of the past. They see this kind of sexism and think it doesn’t happen. They feel like they just have to take it. There is no accountability in the system right now.

Clearly, attention to this issue and proactive steps toward addressing it might help reduce unfair pressures on female political candidates.

Michelle Thompson is a Professor at American University and a guest columnist for The Washington Post.
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By Mike Thompson

The list includes the talk radio host who called a female senator a “prostitute” for cutting a deal to benefit her state, the male challenger who referred to his female rival “attractive” and “probably a good mother,” and the TV host who noted that the candidate’s wife looked like an angry woman.

Those comments and others have been collected by a group of advocates for women running for office who are monitoring what they consider a highly toxic media environment that makes it difficult for female candidates.

The comments were only lightly condemned, said Jehan Goudey, president of the Women’s Media Center, and they keep coming.

“Sexism against women in the media has become normalized and accepted in a way that they would not be if the comments were male,” Goudey said. “It dramatically affects women candidates.”

I have studied those effects at the American University’s Women and Politics Institute. My research has shown that women are less likely than men to consider running for office because they perceive an unfair political environment. The United States ranks 86th in the world for representation of women in political offices. Women make up 9 percent of the nation’s population but hold only 17 percent of the seats in Congress and 26 percent of the seats in state legislatures. Those numbers are smaller groups that have tried for years to get more women into the political pipeline.

My research shows that a potential candidate’s perceptions of unfairness are shaped by how women who are running in the nation’s most challenging and high-profile races are treated by the media. We have to call attention to the sexism and let people know they can’t speak this way about candidates because those effects trickle down.

Most people wrongly assume that comments that denigrate women because of their gender are a thing of the past. They see this kind of sexism and think it doesn’t happen. They feel like they just have to take it. There is no accountability in the system right now.

Clearly, attention to this issue and proactive steps toward addressing it might help reduce unfair pressures on female political candidates.

Mike Thompson is a Professor at American University and a guest columnist for The Washington Post.
Appendix B

1) How many cookies did you buy? ________________________________

2) How much did you donate? ________________________________

3) What are your attitudes towards feminism?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Negative Very Negative Somewhat Negative Neutral Somewhat Positive Very Positive Extremely Positive

4) What are your attitudes towards women?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Negative Very Negative Somewhat Negative Neutral Somewhat Positive Very Positive Extremely Positive

5) What are your attitudes towards gender equity?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Negative Very Negative Somewhat Negative Neutral Somewhat Positive Very Positive Extremely Positive

6) What are your attitudes towards Rice’s Women’s Resource Center?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Negative Very Negative Somewhat Negative Neutral Somewhat Positive Very Positive Extremely Positive

7) What is your attitude towards cookies?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Negative Very Negative Somewhat Negative Neutral Somewhat Positive Very Positive Extremely Positive

8) What is your gender?

Female Male Other

9) What is the gender of the individual selling the cookies?

Female Male

10) Do you know the individual selling the cookies?

Yes No
Appendix C

WORKFORCE WOES: CALLING ON YOUR SENSE OF FAIRNESS

DR. REBECCA GREEN

While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

How can businesses that strive to maintain and project wholesome values continually pay women employees less than their male counterparts? The very principle of unequal pay goes completely against the do-good business values supposedly upheld by so many American companies. Adidas, IMAX, and Google proudly proclaim slogans such as “Impossible is nothing,” “Think big,” and “Don’t be evil.” But how can corporate America encourage the rest of the country to adopt this egalitarian mentality when popular business practices speak otherwise? In order to make positive change in the world, businesses first must treat their own employees fairly. That starts with equal pay for men and women.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

How can a country with a constitution so ingrained in protecting basic human rights remain content with this injustice? Gender inequality is wrong and we a have evolved as a student and person. The more people who realize the immorality of the inequality in our workforce, the more power the gender equality movement can gain. Equality is not a word to be tossed around lightly, but a movement to be spread.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

At the most basic human level, men should want to reduce inequality and be more egalitarian, simply because that is the humane thing to do. In a world riddles with injustices and oppression, those with the most influence and power—men—should aim to effect change for the better of humanity. If we as men cannot uplift the women in the world purely because, like us, they exist and contribute to society, then what have we really gained?

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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WORKFORCE WOES: IMAGINE A DAY IN THE LIFE
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Imagine applying to a new job position and getting offered a position. You and the other new employees (who arrived at the same time and have similar qualifications) were evaluated the same on performance levels. However, when the paychecks arrive, your receive $3,890 while your coworker receives $5,000 for the month (you get 77.8% of their salary). How would you feel?

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It's clear that women's earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Imagine a year in the life of a woman: you put in countless hours at the office and you work hard at your job, but when your paycheck comes, you find it to be significantly less than your male colleagues who hold the same qualifications. Also imagine that it is time for a promotion. Despite your strong work ethic and incredible qualifications, you are not chosen to advance to a higher position, only because of your gender. What would imagining this feel like?

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

How would you feel making 77.8 cents on the dollar of your equally or less qualified co-worker? How would you feel going to work every day knowing that you will earn less money each hour than other employees simply because of your gender? In today’s society, people are told to pursue whatever career path they desire. Men and women alike have been known to overcome adversity and beat the odds. From a young age, children are encouraged to set big goals, work hard, and “reach for the stars.” But how you feel, knowing that you would only ever receive 77.8% of the stars you deserve?

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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WORKFORCE WOES: THINK ABOUT THE IMPORTANT WOMEN IN YOUR LIFE
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Your sister graduates with high honors from Harvard Law School and accepts a job with a prominent and well-respected New York City firm. A few months into the job, she calls you over the phone and relays a frustrating message. Despite her glowing performance reviews and admirable work ethic, your sister receives an annual salary of only $100,000. While this is certainly an impressive sum, a male attorney who graduated without honors from Harvard in the same class as your sister received a starting salary of $120,000 from the same exact firm. What do you tell your sister to encourage her?

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Imagine the women in your life, such as your mother or your sister, and the difficulties she may face in the workforce. Despite her hard work, it goes unrecognized, and in order to advance in her career, she must work significantly harder than her male colleagues. Regardless of her work ethic or contributions to the company, she is paid less and given fewer opportunities to advance only because of her gender.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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Imagine your wife, who earned great grades in high school and graduated Summa Cum Laude from a top University, was offered $65,000 for an introductory job out of college. You later learn your male friend who is slightly less qualified was offered $75,000 for the same position, and that the average starting salary for similar positions is $70,000. You know your wife deserves to make the higher salary, and cannot understand why she was offered less. Your wife's lower salary offer is just one example of gender inequality in the workplace.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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**WORKFORCE WOES: MEN CHAMPIONING WOMEN**
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While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Although it may appear that only women are concerned with gender issues, this is not the case. Men everywhere - of all races, ages, and sexualities - are stepping up alongside women to serve as role models and fight for equality. From famous actors like Ashton Kutcher, to political figures like Prince Harry, to professional athletes like Richard Sherman, men of all backgrounds are not only acknowledging gender issues but are also taking action to fight for gender equity.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.

---

**WORKFORCE WOES: MEN CHAMPIONING WOMEN**

**DR. ROBERT GREEN**

While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Although it may appear that only women are concerned with gender issues, this is not the case. Men everywhere - of all races, ages, and sexualities - are stepping up alongside women to serve as role models and fight for equality. From famous actors like Ashton Kutcher, to political figures like Prince Harry, to professional athletes like Richard Sherman, men of all backgrounds are not only acknowledging gender issues but are also taking action to fight for gender equity.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
WORKFORCE WOES: MEN CHAMPIONING WOMEN

DR. REBECCA GREEN

While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Male leaders in companies and politics in countries such as Sweden, Norway, Spain, Iceland, and France are acting as role models for gender equity. For instance, in Iceland, the male prime minister proposed and passed legislation for fathers to take highly paid paternity leave and not be able to transfer it to the mother. This allowed women to take less time off from their careers after childbirth and share the burden of childcare with their partners. In such countries, cabinet and boardroom seats with 40-50% women because they’ve noticed how a gender mix in teams improves the atmosphere in the office and gives rise to new ideas.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
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Men can serve as role models to help alleviate gender inequality. Current trends show that men are beginning to take a more active role in the movement to level the playing field. These active roles include implementing initiatives and company policies that aim to attract and retain female employees, and eliminate the pay gap. Additionally, male CEOs and other executives are serving to propose councils and boards that ensure institutional changes.
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What I think is amazing is that if men believe that a woman gets equal pay, they think the job may not be as good. Men stand to lose nothing by supporting wage equality. Proponents of wage equality are not asking that male salaries be lowered to match female salaries, but that equally qualified women are offered comparable salaries to their male colleagues—that is essentially it.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.

WORKFORCE WOES: A WIN FOR WOMEN IS A WIN FOR ALL

DR. ROBERT GREEN

While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

What I think is amazing is that if men believe that a woman gets equal pay, they think the job may not be as good. Men stand to lose nothing by supporting wage equality. Proponents of wage equality are not asking that male salaries be lowered to match female salaries, but that equally qualified women are offered comparable salaries to their male colleagues—that is essentially it.

There are stark inequities between men and women in the workforce; women unfairly do not get the same earnings or opportunities that men receive.
WORKFORCE WOES: A WIN FOR WOMEN IS A WIN FOR ALL

DR. REBECCA GREEN

While equal pay among genders has been a part of the law since 1963, as of 2008, women are only making 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men, even after controlling for qualifications, occupation, and tenure. It’s clear that women’s earnings here are not proportional to the amount of work that they do. Yes, women are CEOs and firefighters and are encouraged to be anything and do anything, but recent studies reveal that the glass ceiling is still solid.

Some opponents of Feminism maintain the idea that women want to achieve political power and progress at the expense of men; they believe that, somehow, making women equal will make men unequal. This is not the case. Women can receive fair and equal treatment without having to sacrifice the status of men. It is important to bring women up to equal status, and doing so will not impact the rights of men.
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There is no logical reason women should earn 77.8 cents on the dollar earned by men. This pay difference permeates the idea that women are less valuable than men. Men would not be at a disadvantage if this inequality were fixed. If women and men received equal salaries for the same level of work, nothing would change for men, yet humanity would take a huge step in the right direction for equality.
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Appendix D

Role Model Stimuli for Study 4.
Figure 1
Table 1

Descriptive statistics and correlations (Study 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Number of Cookies</th>
<th>Donated</th>
<th>Positivity</th>
<th>Customer Gender</th>
<th>Seller Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cookies</td>
<td>1.39 (1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated</td>
<td>1.47 (1.8)</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>6.13 (0.7)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Gender</td>
<td>0.37 (.48)</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.277**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller Gender</td>
<td>0.44 (.49)</td>
<td>0.120*</td>
<td>-0.123*</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td>0.25 (.43)</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.116*</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Positivity (measured on 7 point scale), Customer Gender (Male = 1, Female = 0), Seller Gender (Male = 1, Female = 0), Known (1 = known, 0 = not known)

** p < .01, * p < .05
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>ASI Hostile</th>
<th>ASI Benvolent</th>
<th>Author Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASI Hostile</td>
<td>3.03 (1.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI Benevolent</td>
<td>3.19 (1.01)</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Gender</td>
<td>.58 (.49)</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>.116*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Responses</td>
<td>3.40 (1.21)</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.123*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Positivity (measured on 7 point scale), Customer Gender (Male =1, Female = 0), Seller Gender (Male = 1, Female = 0), Known (1 = known, 0 = not known)

** p < .01, * p < .05
Table 3

Analysis of Covariance of Article Ratings (Study 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Adjusted SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article Strategy</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Gender</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>8.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates (adjusted for all effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Sexism</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>14.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Sexism</td>
<td>68.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.36</td>
<td>53.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>418.99</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01.
### Table 4

Adjusted and Unadjusted Mean Article Ratings for Five Strategies (Study 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Unadjusted Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>[2.94, 3.46]</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>[2.85, 3.37]</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>[3.07, 3.62]</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Models</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>[3.45, 4.06]</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Analysis of Variance of Positivity Ratings (Study 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Adjusted SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seller Gender</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>11.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>4.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller Gender x Strategy</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4481.24</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01.
Table 6

Descriptive statistics and correlations (Study 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Seller Gender</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Positivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seller Gender</td>
<td>.49 (.50)</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>.50 (.50)</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.081**</td>
<td>-.055*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity</td>
<td>4.46 (1.63)</td>
<td>.081**</td>
<td>-.055*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>.03 (.17)</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Positivity (measured on 7 point scale), Seller Gender (Male = 1, Female = 0), Purchase (1 yes, 0 = no)

** p < .01, * p < .05