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Abstract

This research examines how men and women react to men who claim to be victims of anti-male bias. While a number of studies have revealed that claiming discrimination is associated with social costs, (Garcia, Reser, Amo, Redersdorff, & Branscombe, 2005; Kaiser & Miller, 2001), other research suggests that group identification increases perceptions of bias against the ingroup (Major, Quinton, & McCoy, 2002) and that strongly identified group members respond particularly positively to ingroup claimants (Abrams, Marques, Bown, & Henson, 2000; Branscombe, Wann, Noel, & Coleman, 1993; Kaiser, Hagiwara, Malahy, & Wilkins, 2009). Therefore, we designed Study 1 to examine how gender identification moderates reactions toward a man who failed to receive a promotion and either claims the outcome was due to anti-male sexism or another external factor. Consistent with previous work, participants in the discrimination claim condition viewed the target significantly less positively than participants in the no-claim condition. Additionally, men in the discrimination claim condition perceived the claimant more positively the more strongly they identified with their gender group. Women, however, showed the opposite pattern: the more they identified with their gender group, the more negatively they perceived the male claimant. Study 2 revealed that, compared to strongly gender-identified men, strongly identified women perceived the claimant as significantly more sexist and reported more negative behavioral intentions toward the claimant. We discuss how this pattern may perpetuate gender inequality.
“The War on Men”
Gendered Reactions to Anti-Male Sexism Claims and the
Moderating Role of Group Identification

“What feminism has delivered is angry women and feminine men. It emerges from this mindset that a lot of women have unfortunately bought into, this destructive idea that men prevent them from being able to achieve their goals. And, from the left, from the politically correct, we have all these attacks on men. It’s a very hard time to be a man in today’s society.”

Nick Adams, Fox News, 2014

This quotation, from author Nick Adams, captures the fervor with which individuals are discussing changing gender dynamics. It also alludes to an increasingly pervasive belief that gender progress comes at men’s expense (Bosson, Vandello, Michniewicz, & Lenes, 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013). Fox News contributor and author of The War on Men, Suzanne Venker, summed up the sentiment succinctly: “The truth is, men have become second-class citizens” (Venker, 2013).

Since the 19th century, feminists in the U.S. have worked to level the playing field for men and women by challenging traditional conceptions of the social hierarchy, where men hold a privileged status over women (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Feminist efforts have influenced affirmative action policies aimed at closing the gender gap (Kohn, 2013; Wise, 1998), encouraged women to enter the top ranks in the workforce (Bryant, 2013), and allowed Hilary Rodham Clinton to emerge as the first viable female presidential candidate.
But where many people see progress in the pursuit of social equality, others perceive threat to social stability and to the precarious status of those at the top of the social hierarchy. A growing body of research reveals that shifts in intergroup status relations are often perceived as threats to high-status groups (e.g., Whites or men) (Wilkins & Kaiser, 2014). Scheepers (2009) found that high-status individuals displayed increased physiological threat responses when perceiving unstable or shifting status relations in the U.S. In another study, male participants, but not females, showed physiological signs of threat (i.e., increased systolic blood pressure and pulse pressure) when discussing changing gender–status relations in society (Scheepers, Ellemers, & Sintemaartensdijk, 2009). The effects were particularly pronounced in men when discussing the topic with women. This research implies that high-status individuals interpret a threat to the stability of the status hierarchy as a direct threat to their group.

A recent study suggests that claiming discrimination may serve as a way for high-status groups to stabilize the threatened status hierarchy. Specifically, Whites who believe they are in direct competition with Blacks claimed to experience greater discrimination (Wilkins & Kaiser, 2014). In other words, Whites who perceive racial progress as threatening to the social hierarchy claim discrimination presumably in an effort to preserve their group’s status. Therefore, we can theoretically expect that as more women enter the workforce (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2010), men who feel they are in competition with women will be increasingly likely to claim discrimination.
While research suggests that perceptions of shifting gender relations will likely increase men’s perceptions of anti-male bias and likelihood of claiming discrimination, few studies to date have explored how people respond to men who claim discrimination. Hence, the purpose of our research is to examine men’s and women’s reactions to anti-male sexism claims.

**Men’s increasing perceptions of anti-male sexism**

While both men and women agree that bias against women has decreased over time, men on average see this change as corresponding to increasing bias against their group (Bosson et al., 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Wilkins, Wellman, Babbitt, Toosi, & Schad, *under review*). Bosson and her colleagues (2012) demonstrated this discrepancy by asking participants to retrospectively estimate the amount of gender discrimination men and women experienced “in American society” during each decade between 1950 and 2000. While men and women agreed that discrimination against women has decreased, only men perceived a significant increase in discrimination against men. Perhaps most striking, men who strongly endorse zero-sum beliefs—the notion that one group’s gains are another group’s losses—actually perceive greater amounts of anti-male bias than anti-female bias in the most recent decade (Wilkins et al., *under review*). These findings illustrate men and women’s increasing disagreement about the present state of gender relations in the U.S.

The increasingly pervasive sentiment of male victimization, or what journalist David Gates (1993) coined “white male paranoia,” is evidenced in a growing number of anti-male discrimination lawsuits (*EEOC v. LA Weight Loss*, 2007; *EEOC v.*
Razzoo's, 2008; Hayes v. Napolitano, 2012; Rudebusch v. Hughes, 2002). For example, in 2008, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission filed a gender discrimination claim against Razzoo’s, a Texas-based restaurant chain, for refusing to hire or promote men to the position of bartender. The company was charged $1 million in fines (EEOC v. Razzoo's, 2008). Similarly, in 2012, James T. Hayes, Jr., a top federal immigration official in New York, received a $175,000 settlement after filing a lawsuit against the agency’s chief of staff, alleging he was “shunted out of a high-level position in the agency in favor of a less-qualified woman because he was a man” (Semple, 2012). These victories suggest that anti-male bias claimants merit legal support in a “society [that] is at war with men” (Smith, 2013).

The growing number of anti-male discrimination lawsuits is consistent with research on increasing perceptions of anti-male bias (Bosson et al., 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Wilkins & Kaiser, 2014) and suggest that men are increasingly likely to claim to be victims of discrimination. Given that these claims are being substantiated in court, it is crucial to understand how men and women perceive them.

**Consequences of claiming discrimination**

Though individuals generally claim discrimination to expose injustice and incite positive social change, claimants often suffer social backlash. To understand what predicts reactions to anti-male bias claims, we must first consider the intergroup and intragroup consequences of claiming discrimination.

**Intergroup consequences of claiming discrimination.** Empirical evidence suggests that intergroup costs of claiming discrimination can be severe. Because low-
status groups (e.g., Blacks and women) have traditionally been the primary targets of discrimination from high-status groups (e.g., Whites and men), most existing research examines reactions to low-status individuals’ bias claims. For instance, participants (approximately 95% White) rated a Black target less favorably and viewed him as more of a complainer when he claimed discrimination relative to when he took personal responsibility for a failing grade (Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003). This pattern held regardless of the likelihood that bias actually occurred.

**Intragroup consequences of claiming discrimination.** According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) and the black sheep effect (Marques, Yzerbyt, & Leyens, 1988), discrimination claims also elicit negative responses from ingroup members. According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), people are interested in preserving the positive image of their social groups. Serving as a motivation to align with group interests, the black sheep effect describes the consequences for group members who tarnish their group’s image (Garcia et al., 2005). For example, while likeable ingroup members are preferred to likeable outgroup members, unlikable ingroup members are evaluated even more negatively than unlikable outgroup members (Marques et al., 1988). So despite intentions to defend the positive identity of the ingroup through claiming discrimination, theory suggests that people negatively evaluate ingroup claimants (Garcia et al., 2005; Marques et al., 1988).

Indeed, Garcia and her colleagues (2005) found evidence that both men and women evaluate ingroup discrimination claimants more negatively than outgroup
claimants. These results suggest that the black sheep holds for both high- and low-status groups, but we suspect this is not always the case. For example, some group members may react more positively or negatively than others. Previous work fails to explore within-group variability that might moderate men’s and women’s reactions to anti-male bias claimants.

**Factors that moderate reactions to discrimination claims**

A variety of individual differences moderate ingroup and outgroup evaluations of discrimination claimants. For instance, endorsing status legitimizing beliefs (SLBs) impacts the way individuals react to discrimination claimants. Specifically, SLB endorsers tend to support claims that reinforce the status hierarchy and derogate claimants who challenge it (e.g., Kaiser, Dyrenforth, & Hagiwara, 2006; Wilkins, Wellman, & Kaiser, 2013). Other work demonstrates that group identification (GID) moderates reactions to claimants such that strongly identified individuals respond particularly positively to ingroup bias claimants (Kaiser et al., 2009). Thus, both SLBs and GID likely moderate reactions to anti-male discrimination claimants.

*Status Legitimizing Beliefs.* Status legitimizing beliefs (SLBs) encompass a set of ideologies—such as meritocracy and Protestant work ethic—that justify the legitimacy of existing status hierarchies. Endorsing SLBs allows people to rationalize social inequality by believing in the fairness of existing systems and in opportunities for social mobility (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Major & O'Brien, 2005a). Anxiety, guilt, dissonance, and fear of uncertainty motivate both high- and
low-status groups to justify and rationalize inequality in social, political, and economic hierarchies (Jost & Hunyady, 2003, 2005).

Because SLBs rationalize social hierarchies, SLB endorsers tend to perceive status-consistent treatment as fair and deserved. For instance, low-status (i.e. Latino Americans and women) SLB endorsers are less likely to perceive discrimination than those who reject SLBs. In contrast, high-status (i.e. Whites and men) SLB endorsers are more likely to perceive themselves as targets of discrimination than SLB rejecters (Major, Gramzow, et al., 2002). These findings suggests low-status SLB endorsers should discourage ingroup discrimination claims, while high-status SLB endorsers will be more receptive to ingroup claims. But to date, research has only confirmed the latter hypothesis (Wilkins et al., 2013).

For high-status groups, claiming discrimination reinforces the existing status hierarchy and protects the group’s status, thus it should elicit positive intragroup responses. Accordingly, the more Whites endorse SLBs, the more positively they respond to anti-White discrimination claimants (Wilkins et al., 2013). In contrast, SLB-endorsing Whites display increased negativity toward Black discrimination claimants (Kaiser et al., 2006). These findings suggest that high-status SLB endorsers provide relatively positive evaluations to ingroup claimants who support the status hierarchy (Wilkins et al., 2013), and provide negative evaluations to outgroup claimants who challenge its legitimacy (Kaiser et al., 2006). Therefore, we expect that male SLB endorsers should show more positive attitudes toward ingroup discrimination claimants than SLB rejecters.
Although there is no empirical research examining how SLBs moderate low-status individuals’ reactions to high-status discrimination claims, existing theory suggests that even low-status SLB endorsers will support claims that justify the status hierarchy and denounce those that challenge it (Brandt, 2013; Jost & Hunyady, 2003, 2005). Thus, both men and women who endorse SLBs should theoretically support anti-male bias claims.

**Group Identification.** In addition to SLBs, group identification also predicts differences in reactions to discrimination claimants. Group identification (GID) refers to how central an individual considers group membership to his or her self-concept (Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Those who strongly identify with a particular group (e.g., Blacks or women) tend to perceive events and behaviors directed toward that group as self-relevant (E. R. Smith, 1993; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, when a group’s positive identity is threatened, highly identified group members are particularly motivated to restore that identity because they consider the group’s identity a direct reflection of their personal identity. In other words, the extent to which individuals identify with their group reflects their commitment to the group’s interests, and in turn, should moderate their reactions to ingroup and outgroup discrimination claims.

Major, Quinton, and Schmader (2003) found that highly identified group members also display a heightened sensitivity to ambiguous indications of discrimination. For example, strongly gender-identified women who were exposed to
ambiguous prejudice cues were more likely to attribute negative feedback to anti-
female discrimination than women who were weakly identified (Major et al., 2003).
Fiske and Operario (2001) found this same pattern in a study examining ethnic
minorities; highly identified Asians, Blacks, and Latinos all displayed an increased
tendency to attribute ambiguous cues to discrimination. This sensitivity to perceived
discrimination indicates that strongly identified group members perceive more group-
based bias, and may be more likely to support ingroup members who claim
discrimination on the group’s behalf.

Indeed, several studies have found strongly identified individuals respond
particularly positively toward ingroup members who confront discrimination,
presumably because they interpret those confrontations as an effort to maintain the
ingroup’s positive identity (Abrams et al., 2000; Branscombe et al., 1993; Kaiser et
al., 2009). For example, highly identified Black and Asian American students
expressed more positive attitudes toward ingroup members who confronted a blatant
incident of discrimination than weakly identified group members (Kaiser et
al., 2009). Because confronting bias is associated with negative intergroup consequences (Dodd,
Giuliano, Boutell, & Moran, 2001; Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003; Shelton & Stewart,
2004; Swim & Hyers, 1999), highly identified group members likely perceive
ingroup discrimination claimants as particularly loyal group members who are willing
to incur social costs for the good of the group. Therefore, we can infer that highly
identified men will likely evaluate ingroup claimants more positively than weakly
identified men.
Until now, research on high-status discrimination claims has neglected to examine the moderating effect of group identification. While SLBs play an important role in predicting reactions to discrimination claims, we know relatively little about how GID affects those reactions. Thus, we focused our attention on GID and how it might differentially motivate men and women’s reactions to anti-male discrimination claimants. We expected GID would interact with group membership (i.e., sex) to highlight gendered differences in reactions to anti-male bias claims and provide a nuanced understanding of the way those claims threaten both group status and group identity.

**Current Research**

Despite increasing perceptions of anti-male discrimination (Bosson et al., 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Wilkins et al., *under review*) to date, no research has empirically examined reactions to anti-male bias claims and what might determine those reactions. In Study 1, we examined how the relationship between group membership and GID predicted participants’ evaluations of a man who claimed anti-male discrimination. In Study 2, we extended our examination to assess participants’ behavioral intentions toward the claimant and their perceptions of the claimant’s bias against women (i.e., sexism). In addition, we explored the differences between how GID and SLB endorsement moderate reactions toward the claimant.

We hypothesized that, on average, reactions toward an anti-male bias claimant would be more negative than reactions to a male non-claimant (Garcia et al., 2005; Kaiser & Miller, 2001, 2003). We suspected that this pattern would be particularly
pronounced among women because women, on average, perceive anti-male discrimination to be a less pervasive issue today relative to men. We also expected that GID would interact with participant sex in predicting reactions toward an anti-male bias claimant. Specifically, we expected strongly identified men to report more positivity toward a male claimant and perceive him as less sexist compared to weakly identified men. In contrast, we expected strongly identified women to report more negative impressions of the claimant and perceive him as more sexist than weakly identified women. Furthermore, we hypothesized gender identification would be associated with more positive behavioral intentions toward the target among men and more negative behavioral intentions among women.

Unlike GID, we expected SLB endorsement would only interact with condition. For both men and women, we expected greater SLB endorsement would predict positive evaluations and positive behavioral intentions toward the male claimant. Furthermore, we predicted SLB endorsement would be associated perceptions of claimant as less sexist.

**Study 1**

We designed Study 1 to test whether group identification moderates men’s and women’s reactions to anti-male bias claimants. We expected a 3-way interaction between sex, GID, and experimental condition such that GID would increase men’s positive evaluations of the claimant and decrease women’s positive evaluations of the claimant in the *discrimination claim* condition (Major et al., 2003; E. R. Smith, 1993; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). We did not expect GID to affect reactions to the target in the
no-claim condition among men or women.

Method

Participants

We recruited 197 individuals (46.7% female; 80.8% White; age: $M = 34.25$, $SD = 11.78$) online through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) (Gosling, Buhrmester, & Kwang, 2011) in exchange for $1. After removing individuals who engaged in random clicking (e.g., selecting a response when asked not to), 179 participants remained.

Procedure

We asked participants to form an impression of a purported participant from a previous study on “career success.” All participants read about a man in his 30’s who failed to receive a promotion at work. After reviewing the man’s demographic information, participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions, which manipulated the target’s attribution for the promotion decision. Specifically, the target indicated that he failed to receive the promotion and a female coworker received the promotion instead. In the discrimination claim condition, the target wrote: “all this stuff about gender equality is just discrimination against men.” In the no-claim condition, the target said he was unsure why he did not receive the promotion and wrote: “I guess it was more competitive than I thought” (see Wilkins et al., 2013). Participants then completed measures assessing their impression of the target and reported their GID.
Measures

We assessed all measures on a 0-6 scale (anchored at strongly disagree and strongly agree).

**Positive Evaluation.** We assessed participants’ positive evaluations of the target with 3 items: “He seems responsible.” “He would be nice to have a conversation with.” “He seems like he has a good personality.” \( \alpha = .87; (M = 3.57, SD = 1.15; \text{range: .67 to 6}). \)

**Gender Identification.** We assessed participants’ GID with 4 items: “Being a (woman/man) has very little do with how I feel about myself.” “Being a (woman/man) is an important reflection of who I am.” “Being a (woman/man) is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.” “In general, being a (woman/man) is important to my self-image” (see centrality subscale: Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; McCoy & Major, 2003), \( \alpha = .90; (M = 3.83, SD = 1.46; \text{range: 0 to 6}). \)

Results

**Analysis Strategy.** In order for GID to serve as a moderator, it is important that experimental condition not affect it. Indeed, condition did not affect GID in this case; claim condition: \( F(1, 175) = .20, p = .65; \) participant sex: \( F(1, 175) = 3.00, p = .09; \) interaction: \( F(1, 178) = 119, p = .27. \)

To test our hypothesis, we entered main effects of GID (mean-centered), participant sex (0=male), and condition (0=discrimination claim) on Step 1 of a hierarchical linear regression. We entered the 2-way interactions (sex \( \times \) GID; sex \( \times \) condition; condition \( \times \) GID) in Step 2, and the 3-way interaction between GID, sex,
and experimental condition on Step 3. See Table 1 for full regression results.

We followed the significant 3-way interaction with an analysis of simple slopes. In order to examine whether there were differences between conditions for individuals high and low in GID, we examined the condition effects separately for male and female participants who were high (1 SD above the mean) and low (1 SD below the mean) in GID (Aiken, West, & Reno, 1991).

Table 1. Model Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses, Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Evaluation</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GID</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim (0=discrimination)</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (0=male)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex × Claim</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GID × Claim</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex × GID</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex × Claim × GID</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive Evaluation.** There was a significant main effect of condition such that participants in the *discrimination claim* condition viewed the target significantly less positively than the participants in the *no-claim* condition, β = .41, p < .01; Step 1: $F(3, 175) = 12.39, p < .001$. This result is consistent with the hypothesis that on average, individuals react negatively to claims of discrimination. As predicted, this
main effect was qualified by a significant 3-way interaction between GID, sex, and condition, Step 3: $F(1, 171) = 4.23, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .02$; Model: $F(7, 171) = 7.27, p < .001, R^2 = .20$. Gender identification moderated both male and female participants’ evaluations of the target within the *discrimination claim* condition.

Men in the *discrimination claim* condition viewed the target more positively the more they identified with their gender, $\beta = .29, p < .05$. We observed no effects of GID among men in the *no-claim* condition, $\beta = .04, p = .78$. There was no significant difference between the *discrimination claim* and *no-claim* condition among high GID male participants, $b = .51, SE = .32, t(93) = 1.61, p = .11$. Low GID men evaluated targets in the *claim* condition significantly less positively than those in the *no-claim* condition, $b = 1.08, SE = .27, t(91) = 3.96, p < .001$. See Figure 1a.

Figure 1a: Male participants’ positive evaluations of the target, Study 1
For women in the *discrimination claim* condition, GID was associated with more negative evaluations of the target, $\beta = -.32, p < .01$. Women in the *no-claim* condition did not evaluate the target differently based on GID, $\beta = -.03, p = .85$. Both high and low GID women viewed the target in the *discrimination claim* condition more negatively than in the *no-claim* condition regardless of their identification; high GID: $b = 1.41, SE = .30, t(81) = 4.76, p < .001$; low GID: $b = .74, SE = .34, t(81) = 2.18, p < .05$. See Figure 1b.

Figure 1b: Female participants’ positive evaluations of the target, Study 1

![Figure 1b](image)

**Discussion**

Study 1 assessed how individuals’ sex and GID predicted reactions to a man who claimed anti-male discrimination. Consistent with our hypotheses, on average participants preferred the non-claimant to the claimant, and male participants reacted more favorably than female participants toward the claimant. Furthermore, the more
men identified with their gender, the more positively they evaluated the anti-male bias claimant. In fact, high GID men viewed the target just as positively as those in the no-claim condition. In contrast, the more women identified with their gender group, the more negatively they evaluated the claimant. High GID female participants evaluated the target significantly less positively in the discrimination claim condition compared to those in the no-claim condition. These findings support the hypothesis that individuals reward ingroup members who reinforce their group’s positive identity (Abrams et al., 2000; Branscombe et al., 1993; Kaiser et al., 2009; E. R. Smith, 1993; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

However, Study 1 did not provide information about why differences between strongly identified men and women were so pronounced. We hypothesized that group membership (i.e., sex) leads to differing perceptions of the target’s motivation to claim discrimination: specifically, perceptions of the target’s sexism. Moreover, Study 1 did not assess how these reactions might affect men’s and women’s behavior toward anti-male bias claimants. We designed Study 2 to address these limitations.

**Study 2**

Study 2 was designed to replicate Study 1 and extend findings to examine differences in men and women’s perceptions of the target’s motivation (i.e., sexism) to claim discrimination. In an effort to examine whether impressions translate into potential behavior, this study also assessed participants’ behavioral intentions toward the anti-male bias claimant. In addition, we measured SLB endorsement to illustrate how beliefs about status legitimacy offer alternative predictions about how people
react to high-status discrimination claimants. Exploring the distinctions between GID and SLBs as moderators gives us a fuller understanding of how men and women respond to anti-male bias claims.

Study 2 also examined the extent to which men and women perceive the target as sexist in an effort to clarify the contrast between high GID men and women’s reactions in Study 1. We expected GID to be associated with greater perceptions of sexism in the target among women. This prediction stems from research demonstrating that individuals perceive discrimination claimants—particularly high-status claimants—as possessing more prejudiced attitudes against outgroups than non-claimants (Blodorn & O'Brien, 2013). Furthermore, high GID women are more likely than low GID women to perceive ambiguous cues of anti-female discrimination (Major et al., 2003). Therefore, because anti-male discrimination claims support the status hierarchy, we speculated that high GID women would perceive the target’s claim as motivated by his bias against women. While we also expected men to perceive the target in the discrimination claim condition as more sexist than the target in the no-claim condition (Blodorn & O'Brien, 2013), we expected that gender identification would moderate those perceptions. Specifically, we hypothesized that high GID men would perceive the claimant as less sexist than low GID men. This prediction was based on evidence that strongly identified group members are more likely to perceive bias against their group and furthermore, see discrimination claims as a legitimate response to real group-threat. Therefore, among men, we expected GID to predict perceptions of the claimant as a loyal group member motivated by
group interests (consistent with previous research: Abrams, Marques, Brown, & Henson, 2000; Biernate, Vescio, & Billings, 1999; Branscombe, Wann, Noel, & Coleman, 1993), more so than his bias against women.

We also expected GID to moderate behavioral intentions toward the anti-male bias claimants. Specifically, we expected behavioral intentions to map onto participants’ evaluations of the target such that the more strongly male participants identify with their gender, the more positive their behavioral intentions toward the claimant. Conversely, the more strongly female participants identify with their gender, the more negative their behavioral intentions toward the claimant.

Because anti-male discrimination claims play a role in justifying the status hierarchy, we also hypothesized that SLB endorsement would moderate reactions toward the claimant (consistent with previous research: Brandt, 2013; Jost & Hunyady, 2003, 2005; Wilkins et al., 2013). Specifically, we predicted that greater SLB endorsement would correspond to lower perceived sexism in the claimant and more positive evaluations of and behavioral intentions toward him. These predictions were based on the previous research that suggests SLB endorsers should provide relatively positive evaluations to high-status claimants who support the status hierarchy (e.g., Wilkins et al., 2013). Because both high- and low-status groups are motivated to endorse SLBs, we did not expect to find gender differences in reactions.

In Study 2, explored the differences between GID and SLB endorsement as individual differences that moderate reactions to anti-male bias claims. We anticipated a 3-way interaction between GID, participant sex, and condition, but only
expected to find a 2-way interaction between SLB endorsement and condition. Therefore, while we acknowledge the important role of SLB endorsement in demonstrating how the claimant’s status impacts reactions to discrimination claims, we aimed to emphasize the novelty of GID as a factor that demonstrates the differences between men and women’s reactions to anti-male bias claims.

**Methods**

**Participants**

We recruited 196 individuals (43.4% female; 84.6% White; age: $M = 36.94$, $SD = 11.88$) online through Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) in exchange for $1. After removing individuals for randomly clicking, 175 participants remained.

**Procedure**

Participants completed GID measures first. Next, they completed the Study 1 procedure. We then asked participants to report how they would behave toward the target and to report the extent to which they believed that the claimant was sexist. Finally, we asked participants to report their SLB endorsement.

**Measures**

We assessed GID, $\alpha = .92$ ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.47$; range: 0 to 6) and positive evaluations, $\alpha = .93$ ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 1.40$; range: 0 to 6) with the same measures used in Study 1.

**Positive Behavioral Intentions.** We assessed positive behavioral intentions toward the target on a 0-6 scale (anchored at not at all and very much) with 3 items: “If this person asked you for help, how likely would you be to help him?” “If you
worked for the same company would you work to make the hiring process more transparent?” “Would you like to get to know this individual?” α = .78 (M = 2.85, SD = 1.41; range: 0 to 6).

**Perceived Sexism.** We assessed the extent to which participants perceived the target as sexist on a 0-6 scale (anchored at not at all and very much) with 4 items: e.g. “How prejudiced against women does he seem?” “How sexist were his comments?” α = .98 (M = 2.90, SD = 2.03; range: 0 to 6).

**Status Legitimizing Beliefs.** We measured SLBs on a 0-6 scale (anchored at strongly disagree and strongly agree) with 11 items (adapted from Levin, Sidanius, Rabinowitz, & Federico, 1998): e.g., “America is a just society where differences in status between groups reflects actual group differences.” “America is an open society where individuals of any one can achieve higher status.” “If people work hard they almost always get what they want.” We averaged these items together to form an SLB composite (Major & O'Brien, 2005b), α = .91 (M = 2.44, SD = 1.11; range: 0 to 5.18).

**Results**

**Analysis Strategy.** To test our hypothesis, we entered the main effects of gender identification (mean-centered), sex (0=male), and condition (0=discrimination claim) in Step 1 of a hierarchical linear regression. We entered the 2-way interactions (sex × GID; sex × condition; condition × GID) in Step 2 and the 3-way interaction between GID, sex, and experimental condition in Step 3. See full regression results in Table 2. We examined significant interactions using the same end-point and simple slopes analyses as described in Study 1.
Table 2. Model Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses, Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Evaluation</th>
<th>Positive Behavioral Intentions</th>
<th>Perceived Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GID</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim (0=discrimination)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (0=male)</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex × Claim</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GID × Claim</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex × GID</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex × Claim × GID</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.34 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive Evaluation. Results replicated those in Study 1. We found a significant main effect of condition such that participants in the no-claim condition viewed the target more positively than the participants in the discrimination claim condition, $\beta = .26, p < .001$; Step1: $F(3, 171) = 7.01, p < .001$. This main effect was qualified by a significant 3-way interaction between GID, sex, and condition, Step 3: $F(1, 167) = 5.41, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .03$; Model: $F(7, 167) = 6.53, p < .001, R^2 = .18$. The interaction revealed that GID moderated positive evaluations of the target in the claim condition.

Among men, GID was positively associated with positive evaluations of the target in the discrimination claim condition, $\beta = .35, p < .001$, and unrelated to evaluations in the no-claim condition, $\beta = .08, p = .66$. There was no significant difference between conditions for high GID male participants, $b = .20, SE = .40, t(95)$
= .50, *p = .61. Low GID men evaluated targets significantly more positively in the no-claim condition than in the discrimination claim condition, \( b = .96, SE = .38, t(95) = 2.50, p < .05 \). See Figure 2a.

Figure 2a: Male participants’ positive evaluations of the target, Study 2

Among women, higher GID was associated with less positive evaluations of the target, \( \beta = -.48, p < .001 \). We found no relationship between GID and positive evaluations for women in the no-claim condition, \( \beta = -.02, p = .90 \). Strongly identified women evaluated the target significantly less positively in the discrimination claim condition than in the no-claim condition, \( b = 1.61, SE = .42, t(72) = 3.79, p < .001 \). There were no condition differences among weakly identified female participants: \( b = .30, SE = .50, t(72) = .58, p = .56 \). See Figure 2b.
Positive Behavioral Intentions. As predicted, there was a significant 3-way interaction between GID, sex, and condition, Step 3: $F(1, 167) = 3.93, p < .05, \Delta R^2 = .02$; Model: $F(7, 167) = 3.93, p < .05, R^2 = .10$. The interaction revealed that gender identification moderated positive behavioral intentions toward the target within the discrimination claim condition.

While men in the discrimination claim condition expressed more positive behavioral intentions the more they identified with their gender, $\beta = .35, p < .001$, there were no effects of GID among men in the no-claim condition, $\beta = .17, p = .36$. We found no significant differences between conditions for either high or low GID male participants; high GID: $b = -.09, SE = .42, t(95) = -.22, p = .82$; low GID: $b = .41, SE = .40, t(95) = 1.01, p = .31$. See Figure 3a.
The more women identified with their gender, the fewer positive behavioral intentions they expressed toward the target, $\beta = -.47$, $p < .001$. We found no differences in behavioral intentions between high and low GID women in the no-claim condition, $\beta = .01$, $p = .94$. Among strongly identified female participants, those in the discrimination claim condition reported significantly fewer positive behavioral intentions than those in the no-claim condition, high GID: $b = 1.23$, $SE = .45$, $t(72) = 2.74$, $p < .01$. There were no significant differences between conditions among weakly identified female participants, low GID: $b = -.13$, $SE = .53$, $t(72) = -.24$, $p = .81$. See Figure 3b.
Perceived Sexism. As predicted, there was a significant 3-way interaction between GID, sex, and condition, Step 3: $F(1, 167) = 10.09, p < .01, \Delta R^2 = .04$; Model: $F(7, 167) = 16.19, p < .001, R^2 = .38$ in predicting participants’ perceptions of the target’s sexism. The interaction revealed that gender identification moderated perceptions of the target’s sexism in the claim condition.

Among men in the discrimination claim condition, those high in GID viewed the target as less sexist than those with low GID, $\beta = -.31, p < .001$. We found no effects of gender identification among men in the no-claim condition, $\beta = .20, p = .66$. Men with both high and low GID reported perceptions of the target as more sexist in the discrimination claim compared to the no-claim condition, high GID: $b = -1.17, SE = .51, t(95) = -2.27, p < .05$; low GID: $b = -3.24, SE = .50, t(95) = -6.55, p < .001$. See Figure 4a.
The more female participants identified with their gender, the more sexist they viewed the target in the *discrimination claim* condition, $\beta = .47$, $p < .001$. We found no differences between high and low GID women’s perceptions of the target as sexist in the *no-claim* condition, $\beta = .10$, $p = .50$. All female participants (regardless of GID) perceived the target as more sexist in the *discrimination claim* condition than in the *no-claim* condition: high GID: $b = -2.86$, $SE = .51$, $t(72) = -5.56$, $p < .001$; low GID: $b = -1.38$, $SE = .61$, $t(72) = -2.26$, $p < .05$. See Figure 4b.

Figure 4a: Male participants’ perceptions of target as sexist, Study 2
**Status Legitimizing Beliefs.** We also examined the extent to which SLBs moderated positive evaluations of the target, behavioral intentions, and perceptions of the target’s sexism. While SLB endorsement interacted with experimental condition, it did not interact with participant sex (see Table 3).³

Consistent with previous work (Brandt, 2013; Wilkins et al., 2013), there was a significant interaction between SLBs and condition on positive evaluations, $F(1, 171) = 3.89, p = .05, \Delta R^2 = .02$; Model: $F(3, 171) = 11.51, p < .001, R^2 = .17$. Examination of the simple slopes demonstrated the more participants in the *discrimination claim* condition endorsed SLBs, the more positively they evaluated the target, $\beta = .39, p < .001$. SLBs were not related to positive evaluations of the target in the *no-claim* condition, $\beta = .10, p = .37$. Similarly, SLB endorsers in the *discrimination claim* condition reported more positive behavioral intentions toward the target than SLB rejecters, $F(1, 171) = 4.07, p = .05, \Delta R^2 = .02$; Model: $F(3, 171)$
\[ \text{Claim: } \beta = .33, \ p < .001; \text{ No-claim: } \beta = .02, \ p = .85. \]

We found a marginal interaction between condition and SLBs in predicting perceived sexism, \( F(1, 171) = 3.40, \ p = .067, \Delta R^2 = .014 \); Model: \( F(3, 171) = 24.94, \ p < .001, \ R^2 = .30 \). The more participants endorsed SLBs, the less sexist they viewed the target in the \textit{discrimination claim} condition, \( \beta = -.26, \ p < .01; \text{ no-claim: } \beta = -.01, \ p = .89 \). These findings are consistent with past research that suggests SLB endorsers will respond more favorably than SLB rejecters to high-status discrimination claimants (Brandt, 2013; Wilkins et al., 2013).  

Table 3. Model Summary of SLB Hierarchical Regression Analyses, Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive Evaluation</th>
<th>Positive Behavioral Intentions</th>
<th>Perceived Sexism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim (0=discrimination)</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (0=male)</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex ( \times ) Claim</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLB ( \times ) Claim</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex ( \times ) SLB</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex ( \times ) Claim ( \times ) SLB</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

Study 2 replicated results from Study 1 and expanded them to demonstrate that GID predicts a divergence between men and women’s behavioral intentions.
toward an anti-male discrimination claimant and perceptions of the claimant’s sexism. We also illustrated the moderating effect of SLB endorsement on reactions to the anti-male bias claimant.

Among women, greater GID was associated with more negative evaluations of the target, fewer positive behavioral intentions, and greater perceptions of sexism. Furthermore, high GID women were more likely to perceive the target as sexist and report negative behavioral intentions in the discrimination claim condition compared to the no-claim condition. Among men, GID was associated with more positive evaluations of the target, more positive behavioral intentions, and perceptions of the claimant as less sexist.

As expected, SLB endorsement predicted more positive reactions to the target in the discrimination claim condition. Both male and female SLB endorsers reported more positive evaluations and behavioral intentions, and perceived the claimant as less sexist than SLB rejecters. We replicated previous findings that suggest both high- and low-status SLB endorsers evaluate high-status discrimination claimants favorably and demonstrated that there are no major differences between male and female SLB endorsers’ reactions to anti-male bias claimants.

Study 2 revealed that, although SLB endorsement plays an important role in moderating reactions to anti-male bias claims, GID captures striking gender differences in those reactions. While SLBs and group identification are consistent motives for men, they are inconsistent for women. Specifically, strongly identified low-status group members are generally seen as challenging or opposing the status
hierarchy (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009). Thus, while high GID women saw an anti-male bias claimant as motivated by sexism—a powerful tool for reinforcing the existing status hierarchy (Mosso, Briante, Aiello, & Russo, 2013)—high GID men perceived the claim as a valid response to group-level threat.

**General Discussion**

Given men’s increasing perceptions of anti-male discrimination (Bosson et al., 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Wilkins et al., *under review*), it is critical to understand how individuals respond to anti-male bias claimants. Across two studies, we examined the differences between men and women’s attitudes and behavioral intentions toward an anti-male bias claimant and how those reactions were moderated by gender identification and SLBs.

We found evidence that SLB endorsement indeed predicts positive reactions toward male (i.e., high-status) discrimination claimants. SLB endorsers, regardless of gender, reacted more positively toward anti-male bias claimants than SLB rejecters.

Using social identity theory as a framework (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), we also explored GID as an alternative mode of assessing reactions to anti-male bias claimants that captures gender differences. Results revealed that men, on average, reacted more positively than women toward an anti-male bias claimant. We found that the gender effect was particularly pronounced among men and women who strongly identified with their gender. The more strongly men identified with their gender, the more positive their reactions to an anti-male bias claimant. In contrast, the
more strongly women identified with their gender, the more negative their reactions to that same claimant.

Furthermore, we demonstrated that GID moderated men’s and women’s perceptions of the claimant’s sexism. That is, the more women identified with their gender, the more sexist they viewed the anti-male bias claimant; the more men identified with their gender, the less sexist they viewed the claimant. We suspect that these gendered perceptions of sexism are motivated by three factors: (1) strongly identified group members are heavily invested in preserving their group’s image (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), (2) they are more sensitive to subtle and ambiguous threats to their group (Major et al., 2003), and (3) they regard discrimination claims a legitimate response to group-level threat (Abrams et al., 2000; Branscombe et al., 1993; Kaiser et al., 2009). Accordingly, we speculate high GID women were threatened in the claim condition because anti-male bias claims support the status hierarchy, which disadvantages women and effectively perpetuates anti-female discrimination. Thus, high GID women perceived that the claimant was motivated by sexism. In contrast, anti-male bias claims threaten high GID men because they imply anti-male discrimination is a real and pervasive issue. Therefore, we suspect high GID male participants perceived that the claimant was motivated to protect and preserve their group’s threatened identity, rather than motivated by sexism (Abrams et al., 2000; Branscombe et al., 1993; Kaiser et al., 2009). In reacting positively toward ingroup claimants and validating anti-male bias claims, strongly identified men offer positive social benefits to those who claim anti-male bias. Those
benefits might theoretically motivate others to perceive and claim discrimination against men.

**Limitations**

Though our results were consistent across multiple studies, they are not without limitations. For example, although we designed these studies to assess how men’s and women’s gender identification predicts reactions to anti-male bias claimants, it is important to acknowledge that GID may covary with other constructs. For instance, group identification is related to self-esteem (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Major et al., 2003), and self-esteem is related to perceptions of discrimination (Kobrynowicz & Branscombe, 1997). Because perceptions of discrimination predict reactions to bias claimants (Wilkins et al., 2013), future research could consider self-esteem as a factor that interacts with GID and moderates gendered reactions to anti-male bias claims.

This study was also limited by our incomplete understanding of the meaning of gender identification (Ashmore et al., 2004; Major & O'Brien, 2005a). Because the tendency to endorse existing social arrangements compromises women’s, but not men’s, positive group identity, we suspect that men and women define and value GID differently. For example, because women are faced with incompatible motivations to endorse the legitimacy of the status hierarchy on one hand, and preserve the positive identity of their group on the other, they often display ambivalence toward their group membership (Burgess & Jost, 2000). Furthermore, the more women perceive discrimination against their group, the more central they regard their gender to their
self-concept, but the less proud they are to be members of their gender group (Major & Eccleston, 2004). In contrast, we found that high GID men were the most willing to stand up to discrimination and driven to preserve their identity by supporting ingroup claimants: perhaps signifying pride in their group membership. Therefore, men and women likely have differing perspectives on the meaning of group identification.

Implications

“We are now going through an amazing and unprecedented moment where the power dynamics between men and women are shifting very rapidly. And in many of the places where it counts the most, women are, in fact, taking control of everything.”

Hannah Rosin, Ted Talks, 2010

In the U.S., perceptions of the social landscape are changing (Bosson et al., 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Wilkins et al., under review). High-status individuals perceive more discrimination against their groups now than ever before; some believe the bias they experience is more severe than bias experienced by low-status groups (Sommers & Norton, 2011; Wilkins et al., under review). These shifting perceptions have caught the attention of the media (Adams, 2014; Coontz, 2012), who often frame women’s progress as a threat to men’s status and identity (e.g. Rosin, 2010; Trop, 2013).

Our research suggests that these shifting perceptions have direct implications for intergroup relations. Discrimination against women remains a pervasive issue according to most metrics: women today make up only 4.6% of Fortune 1000 CEOs (Catalyst, 2014), are still paid only 77% of what their male counterparts earn (Hill,
and constitute 91% of all sexual assault and rape victims in the U.S. (Planty, Langton, Krebs, Berzofsky, & Smiley-McDonald, 2013). Despite these facts, men are increasingly perceiving anti-male bias as a pervasive issue (Bosson et al., 2012; Kehn & Ruthig, 2013; Wilkins et al., under review). These increasing perceptions of discrimination likely lead to ingroup favoritism and outgroup bias (Wilkins et al., under review), which perpetuates existing gender inequality. Therefore, society would benefit from acknowledging the intergroup consequences associated with framing gender progress as a threat to men. It will be difficult to embrace the undisputed social and economic benefits of gender equality (Schwab, Hausmann, Tyson, Bekhouche, & Zahidi, 2013) if men continue to perceive anti-male discrimination as an increasingly pervasive issue.
References


EEOC v. Razzoo's, No. 3:05-CV-0562-P (N. D. Tx. 2008).


Wilkins, C. L., Wellman, J. D., Babbitt, L., Toosi, N., & Schad, K. (under review). You can win but I can't lose: Bias against high-status groups increases their zero-sum beliefs about discrimination.


Demographics

1. What is your age?
   ____

2. What is your gender?
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   ☐ Asian/Asian American
   ☐ Black/African American
   ☐ Latino/Hispanic American
   ☐ Native American/American Indian
   ☐ White/European American
   ☐ Other

4. When it comes to politics, do you usually consider yourself to be liberal, conservative, or moderate?
   0--------1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6
   Very Liberal Very Conservative

5. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
   ☐ Less than 8th grade
   ☐ Some high school
   ☐ High school
   ☐ Some college
   ☐ Associate’s degree
   ☐ Bachelor’s degree
   ☐ Master’s degree
   ☐ Professional degree
   ☐ Prefer not to answer
Gender Identification Measure

0--------1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6
Strongly disagree    Strongly agree

1. Being a (woman/man) has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
2. Being a (woman/man) is an important reflection of who I am.
3. Being a (woman/man) is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.
4. In general, being a (woman/man) is important to my self-image.
Status Legitimizing Beliefs Measure

0--------1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

1. American is a just society where differences in status between groups reflect actual group differences.

2. Differences in status between groups are fair.

3. Differences in status between groups are the result of injustice.

4. It is unfair that certain groups have poorer living conditions than other groups.

5. America is an open society where all individuals can achieve higher status.

6. Advancement in American society is possible for all individuals.

7. Individual members of certain ethnic groups are often unable to advance in American society.

8. If people work hard they almost always get what they want.

9. Most people who don't get ahead should not blame the system; they really have only themselves to blame.

10. In America, getting ahead doesn't always depend on hard work.

11. Even if people work hard, they don't always get ahead.
Purported Participant’s Demographics

**What is your age?**

![Age Selection]

**What is your gender?**

- Male
- Female
- Other / Prefer not to answer

**What is your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply)**

- Asian / Asian American
- Black / African American
- Latino / Hispanic American
- Native American / American Indian
- White / European American
- Other (Please Specify)

**What is the highest level of education that you have completed?**

- Less than 8th grade
- Some high school
- High school
- Some College
- Associate’s degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
- Professional degree
Claim Condition

Please briefly describe a negative experience you have had that impacted your career outcomes.

Last summer I applied for a promotion within the company I work for and didn't get it. I really loved the position and it really would have been ideal for me.

Please describe why you think this occurred.

Who knows. It's always hard to tell in those situations, especially since I thought I was totally qualified. I found out later that one of the women from my department ended up getting the position. No clue how she got it. I definitely feel like I was more qualified than she was. I was probably rejected because I'm a guy. All this stuff about gender equality in the workplace is just discrimination against men.

Control Condition

Please briefly describe a negative experience you have had that impacted your career outcomes.

Last summer I applied for a promotion within the company I work for and didn't get it. I really loved the position and it really would have been ideal for me.

Please describe why you think this occurred.

Who knows. It's always hard to tell in those situations, especially since I thought I was totally qualified. I found out later that one of the women from my department ended up getting the position. No clue how she got it. I definitely feel like I was more qualified than she was. I guess it was just more competitive than I thought.
Positive Evaluation Measure

0-------1-------2-------3-------4-------5-------6
Strongly Strongly
disagree     agree

1. He seems responsible.
2. He would be nice to have a conversation with.
3. He seems like he has a good personality.
Positive Behavioral Intentions Measure

0---------1---------2---------3---------4---------5---------6
Not at all

Very much

1. If this person asked you for help, how likely would you be to help him?

2. If you worked for the same company would you work to make the hiring process more transparent?

3. Would you like to get to know this individual?
**Perceived Sexism Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How prejudiced against women does he seem?
2. How sexist does he seem?
3. How prejudiced were his comments towards women?
4. How sexist were his comments?
Notes

1 One item of this measure was omitted from the survey by mistake.

2 SLBs were examined as a possible covariate in all analyses. SLB covariate: positive evaluations $F(1, 173) = 16.27, p < .001, R^2 = .09$; positive behavioral intentions $F(1, 173) = 8.92, p < .01, R^2 = .05$; perceived sexism $F(1, 173) = 6.20, p < .01, R^2 = .04$. The pattern of results was unchanged when controlling for SLBs. The results presented do not control for SLBs.

3 We explored the possibility that there might be a 4-way interaction between claim, participant sex, GID and SLBs on our dependent variables. The 4-way interactions were not significant for any of the dependent variables in Study 2, all $F$’s < 1.58, $p$’s > .21.

4 GID did not emerge as a significant covariate in these analyses.