



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

## **Resistance towards Increasing Gender Diversity in Masculine Domains: The Role of Intergroup Threat**

Jones, A., Turner, R., & Latu, I. M. (2022). Resistance towards Increasing Gender Diversity in Masculine Domains: The Role of Intergroup Threat. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 25(3), NP24-NP53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211042424>

**Published in:**  
Group Processes & Intergroup Relations

**Document Version:**  
Peer reviewed version

**Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:**  
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

**Publisher rights**  
Copyright 2021, the Authors.  
This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

**General rights**  
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**  
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).

**Open Access**  
This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>

Resistance towards Increasing Gender Diversity in Masculine Domains:

The Role of Intergroup Threat

Amy Jones

Rhiannon N. Turner

Ioana Latu

Queen's University Belfast, UK

*Keywords:* diversity, gender, threat, identity, resistance

### **Abstract**

Efforts to increase diversity can often be met with resistance amongst high-status groups. Despite this, little is known about majority group responses towards increasing *gender* diversity, and the psychological mechanisms underlying these. Across five studies, we extended the Intergroup Threat Theory to advance understanding of resistance towards gender diversity amongst men in masculine domains (Studies 1-3 & 5) and women in feminine domains (Study 4). Experimental evidence from male STEM students (Study 1) and professionals (Studies 2 & 5) revealed that realistic threats underlie resistance. Experimentally reducing realistic threat ( $N = 165$ ) reduced negative reactions. Whereas realistic threat-based resistance towards increasing gender diversity did not extend to women in female dominated domains (Study 4,  $N = 105$ ), there was a tendency for women high in ingroup identity to show a similar pattern to men. We discuss how we advance theory on diversity resistance, and discuss strategies which may effectively reduce resistance.

## **Resistance to Increasing Gender Diversity in Masculine Domains: The Role of Intergroup Threat**

Recent decades have seen a push for increased gender diversity in male-dominated domains. As a result, organizations are employing a variety of gender diversity initiatives, policies, and programs in an attempt to increase the representation of women within their workforce. Despite their benefits, these initiatives, and the changes they are designed to bring about, are not always well received, especially by men. Such reactions suggest we need to face an uncomfortable truth: increasing gender diversity can be met with resistance amongst men, and in turn create further challenges for women who attempt to enter careers in these fields.

In the current studies, we investigate men's resistance towards increasing gender diversity in masculine domains. We specifically focus on *why* there is resistance to gender diversity, *for whom* this resistance is strongest, and how it can be *reduced*. To do so, we systematically integrate, for the first time to our knowledge, the Intergroup Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan et al., 2009) within the research on reactions towards gender diversity.

### **Resistance towards Gender Diversity: The Potential Role of Threat**

Although previous work has identified the importance of group-based threats in driving diversity resistance amongst high-status racial & ethnic group members (Craig & Richeson, 2014; Craig & Richeson, 2018; Dover et al., 2016; Kaiser et al., 2013; Major et al., 2018; Outten et al., 2012), there is currently no consensus about the specific nature of the threat underlying such reactions. This is especially the case for gender; although some work has suggested that men can display negative outcomes when informed about potential changes to gender status hierarchies

(Anisman-Razin et al., 2018; Kuchynka et al., 2018), little is known about the potential psychological mechanisms underlying such reactions.

Given that increasing gender diversity would challenge the current status hierarchy in masculine domains, we expect such progress to threaten men (Wilkins & Kaiser 2014), due to said hierarchy being perceived as changing or unstable (Scheepers & Ellemers, 2018). There is some evidence that *prototypicality* threat (concern one's ingroup would no longer best represent the community as a whole) underlies resistance towards increased gender diversity amongst men in STEM (Danbold & Huo, 2017). However, as prototypicality threat is primarily identity-based (i.e., involves concerns surrounding the nature & protection of our social identities; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2001), this work does not consider the potential role of other types of concerns in driving gender diversity resistance. Indeed, Danbold & Huo (2017) themselves have called for future work to disentangle how different types of threat may account for resistance towards gender diversity.

The current research answers this call by developing and testing an intergroup threat model of resistance towards gender diversity. In doing so, we go above and beyond past work by applying a well-established theoretical framework to systematically investigate gender diversity in masculine domains. This allows us to not only explicitly differentiate between two distinct forms of group-based threat and investigate their roles in driving resistance, but also investigate for whom these threat perceptions are most consequential, and how they could potentially be reduced.

The ITT offers a helpful theoretical framework because it differentiates between two different types of threat: *realistic* - threats to a group's political power, economic resources, and general welfare, and *symbolic* - threats to a group's values,

belief system or culture (Stephan et al., 2009). This realistic-symbolic threat distinction has been widely used to understand negative attitudes held towards many societal groups, with meta-analytic findings (Riek et al., 2006) suggesting that negative outgroup attitudes correlate with both realistic ( $r = .42$ ) and symbolic threats ( $r = .45$ ). Despite this, the ITT has yet to be applied to aid understanding attitudes towards women and increasing diversity in masculine domains.

In the absence of consistent research on ITT and gender, we develop exploratory hypotheses regarding the roles of realistic and symbolic threat for our first study, which we further explore and replicate in subsequent studies. In terms of *realistic threat*, classical theories have stressed the importance that competition over material resources plays in creating intergroup conflict and hostility (Realistic Group Conflict Theory; Sherif & Sherif, 1969). Therefore, if men perceive their dominance in masculine domains as being legitimate and entitled (Carli, 1999), the prospect of more women entering the field may lead to perceptions of increased competition over the economic resources they have traditionally had monopoly over.

Predictions surrounding realistic threat are also derived from research on gender-based zero-sum thinking – the idea that women’s gains directly correspond to men’s losses (Ruthig et al., 2017) – a tendency that correlates with sexism and reduced support for diversity policies (Kuchynka et al., 2018; Ruthig et al., 2017). Given that realistic resources are tangible, they may be more readily perceived from a zero-sum perspective in comparison to symbolic threats, and thus increasing gender diversity could pose a greater realistic than symbolic threat to men in masculine domains. Finally, models of gender stereotypes that prescribe how men and women should behave (Burgess & Borgida, 1999), suggest that men’s stereotypic agentic traits (e.g., competitiveness, having business sense & leadership abilities; Prentice &

Carranza, 2002) could place a stronger focus on realistic threats, and in turn influence how men perceive increasing diversity.

Although predictions are less strong, they may also be made for the role of *symbolic threat*. Studies investigating gender differences in values, attitudes and beliefs suggest that men and women may pose symbolic threats to one another (Ackelsberg & Diamond, 1987), and Danbold & Huo's (2017) finding surrounding the role of prototypicality threat also suggests that more symbolic, identity-based concerns may underlie resistance towards increasing gender diversity in STEM.

To summarize, we propose that intergroup threat perceptions (realistic and/or symbolic) may underlie resistance towards increasing gender diversity in masculine domains. Specifically, we proposed a model in which intergroup threat *mediates* the relationship between increasing gender diversity and resistance towards women and gender diversity initiatives (GDIs). We believe a systematic investigation of the nature of the threat underlying gender diversity resistance is essential in order to be able to design GDIs that effectively target the relevant type(s) of threat, and in turn successfully reduce resistance amongst men masculine domains.

### **For whom is Resistance Strongest? Ingroup Identity as a Moderator**

Within the ITT, ingroup identity – the extent to which one's group membership is important to the self-concept (Ashmore et al., 2004; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) – tends to moderate responses to threat, such that high identifiers are more likely to both perceive and react to threats (Bizman & Yinon, 2001; Riek et al., 2006; Stephan et al., 2002). Furthermore, highly identified men are more likely to sexually harass women, display more aggressive behaviors, and hold more negative perceptions of female leaders when threatened (Dall'Ara & Maass, 1999; Dresden et

al., 2018; Maass et al., 2003; Wade & Brittan-Powell, 2001), suggesting a relationship between masculine identity, threat, and negative attitudes or behaviors towards women.

We therefore proposed that gender diversity resistance may be moderated by gender identification. Specifically, we proposed a model in which increasing gender diversity has an indirect effect on resistance via perceptions of intergroup threat, with this indirect effect being moderated by ingroup identification (i.e. *moderated mediation*). In other words, we expected that men who were highly identified with their gender would be more susceptible to perceiving increasing gender diversity as a realistic and/or symbolic threat, which in turn would increase their resistance towards these changes (Fig. 1).

### **An Effect Specific to Masculinity?**

Finally, we explore gender as an individual factor by investigating whether our proposed model extends to women in the typically female-dominated area of Nursing. This study addresses a larger theoretical question regarding the potential gendered nature of threat – whether the experience of threat in the face of increasing gender diversity is specific to masculinity, given men’s greater propensity to engage in zero-sum thinking (Ruthig et al., 2017), and their gender stereotypes prescribing a stronger focus on realistic concerns (Prentice & Carranza, 2002), or whether it is the product of a more general ingroup-outgroup dynamic in fields traditionally dominated by one gender.

### **The Present Research**

We conducted 5 experimental studies to investigate the model outlined above amongst men in masculine domains (Studies 1-3 & 5) and women in feminine



domains (Study 4). We used varied samples including male STEM students (Study 1), STEM professionals (Studies 2,3 & 5), and female nursing students (Study 4), and focused both on understanding (Studies 1, 2, 4 & 5) and reducing (Study 3) gender diversity resistance.

Our main manipulation (Studies 1 – 4) was modelled after Danbold & Huo (2017) and consisted of a mock online article discussing a GDI either succeeding or failing at improving gender diversity. The manipulation was not explicit either about realistic threats (participants were not told that jobs, power, or resources were directly affected as a result of the GDI), or symbolic threats (participants were not told that the values, norms, or culture of the community were affected). For a conceptual replication, we used a second experimental manipulation in Study 5, in which threat was more subtly induced via organisational profiles that either did or did not emphasise diversity values. All manipulation checks were successful and are reported in Supplementary Material 1.

### **Study 1: STEM Students**

Study 1 aimed to provide an initial test of the proposed intergroup threat model. We investigated whether male students in masculine domains who perceived the number of women in their domain to be increasing would display increased resistance towards such changes, and whether this relationship would be (1) *mediated* by realistic and/or symbolic threat, and (2) *moderated* by masculine identity. We conceptualised resistance in terms of participants' support for GDIs, and their levels of modern sexism (i.e. the belief that gender discrimination is no longer a problem); both of which could have adverse consequences on women's ability to enter and persist in careers in masculine domains.

## Methods

**Participants.** A minimum sample size of 100 male students was targeted based on a power analysis of previous studies which experimentally manipulated threat (Chen et al., 2017; Danbold & Huo, 2015; Li & Zhao, 2012; Maddux et al., 2008; Major et al., 2018; Florack et al., 2003), deriving an average effect size of  $d = .88$ . It should however be noted that this power analysis was conducted for comparisons between two independent groups, and did not account for our more complex analyses. Post-hoc sensitivity analyses were therefore conducted, the results of which revealed an acceptable level power across all of the significant indirect effects obtained across the current research (see Supplementary Material 2).

After eliminating incomplete responses, our final sample included 178 male students enrolled in male-dominated courses at a large UK University (*STEM Students* = 142, *Business Management Students* = 36; 62.5% Undergraduate, 19.7% Masters, 17.8% PhD students). Participants' ages ranged from 18-48 years ( $M = 21.8$  years,  $SD = 3.46$ ). Greater detail regarding participant demographics across all studies can be found in Supplementary Material 3.

**Procedure and Design.** Participants were invited to participate via email, and were told we were interested in their reactions towards an article discussing future career prospects in their subject area. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. In the Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $n = 88$ ), participants read about a successful GDI in their domain, and were told that women were expected to make up 50% (or just over) of those in UK STEM/Business careers in five years' time (see Appendix A). In the No Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $n = 90$ ), participants were told that the GDI was failing, and that men would therefore remain the majority

group within the domain over the next five years (see Appendix B). After reading the article participants completed the online questionnaire containing the study variables below.

### ***Measures***

*Realistic and Symbolic Threat.* The scales were adapted for gender from validated scales utilized by Stephan et al., (1999; 2000). These scales have been adapted previously to measure threats posed by immigrants (Pereira et al., 2010; Rohmann et al., 2006), political parties (Osborne et al., 2008), social policies (Clifton, 2011), international college students (Charles-Toussaint & Crowson, 2010), and different racial, ethnic and religious groups (Aberson & Gaffney, 2009; Tausch et al., 2009; Velasco González et al., 2008). It should be noted that despite medium to high correlations between realistic and symbolic threats, the two types of threat are conceptually distinct and tend to predict different outcomes (Aberson & Gaffney, 2009, Stephan et al., 2000).

Nine items assessed the extent to which participants perceived women entering their domain as a realistic threat. Items included: “Women have made it more difficult for men to get jobs in my professional field”, and “Women are taking power away from men in my professional field.” Ten items assessed the extent to which participants perceived women entering their domain as a symbolic threat, with items including: “Women should learn to conform to the rules and norms of my professional field.”, and “The increasing number of women in my field is undermining workplace culture.” Participants responded using a scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). Responses were averaged into a single

score for realistic ( $\alpha = .79$ ) and symbolic threat ( $\alpha = .87$ ), with higher scores denoting stronger threat.

*Support for Gender Diversity Initiatives.* A 3-item measure originally developed by Danbold & Huo (2017) assessed participants' support for the GDI discussed in the article. These items were: "I think efforts like the Women in STEM/Business Project are a poor use of resources" (reverse coded), "I think the Women in STEM/Business Project is a good thing" and, "If the Women in STEM/Business Project were up for a vote, I would vote in support of it". Participants responded using a scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). Responses were averaged into a single score ( $\alpha = .92$ ), with higher scores denoting greater support for the GDI.

*Modern Sexism.* The 8-item Modern Sexism Questionnaire (Swim et al., 1995) was used to measure the extent to which participants believed sexism was still an issue in today's society. Items included: "Discrimination against women is no longer a problem" and "Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement." Participants responded using a scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Responses were averaged to obtain an overall score ( $\alpha = .91$ ), with higher scores denoting more modern sexism.

*Ingroup Identity.* The Private and Identity Subscales from Luhtanen & Crocker's (1992) Collective Self Esteem Scale were used to measure the strength of participant's gender identity. We collapsed across the subscales given that previous literature conducted within similar contexts followed this strategy (Dall'Ara & Maass, 2000; Maass et al., 2003) and, additionally, in order to reduce the number of variables in the model, thus increasing its power. The measure had eight items and included

statements such as: “Being male is an important reflection of who I am” and “I feel good about being male.” Participants responded using a scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*). Responses were averaged to obtain an overall score ( $\alpha = .80$ ), with higher scores denoting stronger male ingroup identity.

## Results

**Preliminary Analyses.** The means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations for all variables across all studies can be found in Supplementary Material 4. Analyses were performed across STEM and Business domains, given that there were no significant differences by domain in terms of realistic threat,  $F(1,176) = 0.001$ ,  $p = .86$ ,  $d = .03$ , or symbolic threat,  $F(1,176) = 0.21$ ,  $p = .74$ ,  $d = .06$ . Importantly, the domain did not interact with the experimental condition to predict any of the outcome variables; all  $ps > .29$ . **Mediation Models.** We first tested for the presence of a mediation effect, in which realistic and/or symbolic threat mediated the relationship between increasing gender diversity and resistance. This was achieved using Hayes’ PROCESS Model 4 with 5000 bootstrapped samples to estimate 95% confidence intervals for the proposed indirect effects. The full results of the analyses can be found in Table 1.

**Mediation for Support for GDIs.** Realistic threat acted as a mediator,  $b = -.44$ ,  $SE = .17$ , 95% CI [-.83, -.15], such that men who read about the prospect of increasing gender diversity displayed increased realistic threat, which in turn reduced their support for GDIs. Although a much smaller effect, the indirect effect of condition on support for GDIs through symbolic threat was also significant,  $b = -.14$ ,  $SE = .07$ , 95% CI [-.29, -.02], suggesting symbolic threat also acted as a mediator within the model.

*Mediation for Modern Sexism.* Realistic threat,  $b = -.27$ ,  $SE = .09$ , 95%  $CI$  [.10, .47], mediated the relationship between condition and modern sexism; men who read about the prospect of increasing gender diversity experienced greater perceptions of realistic and in turn displayed increased modern sexism. Symbolic threat did not act as a mediator within the model,  $b = .05$ ,  $SE = .04$ , 95%  $CI$  [-.01, .13].

*Moderated Mediation Models.* Next, we investigated whether those high in ingroup identity were more likely to experience threat and in turn display resistance when primed with the prospect of increasing gender diversity in their domain. Hayes' PROCESS Model 7 was used to test this moderated mediation model (see Fig. 1 for all pathways). This rationale is consistent with previous conceptualisations and empirical work surrounding diversity resistance, which also used Model 7 to test for a potential moderated mediation effect (Danbold & Huo, 2017). The conditional indirect effects obtained from all of the moderated mediation analyses conducted across the current studies can be found in Supplementary Material 5.

*Moderated Mediation for Support for GDIs.* Realistic threat mediated the relationship between increasing gender diversity and reduced support for GDIs amongst those high,  $b = -.48$ ,  $SE = .23$ , 95%  $CI$  [-.98, -.09], but not low,  $b = -.35$ ,  $SE = .21$ , 95%  $CI$  [-.82, .01], in gender identification. However, the index of moderated mediation was contained within a confidence interval that included zero (-.35, .21), suggesting these indirect effects were not significantly different from one another. None of the individual conditional indirect effects or indexes of moderated mediation (-.16, .10) were significant for symbolic threat.

*Moderated Mediation for Modern Sexism.* As with above, although mediation appeared to occur only for only those high in gender identification,  $b = .29$ ,  $SE = .12$ ,

95% CI [.07, .54], the index of moderated mediation indicated that there was no significant difference between the indirect effect at each level of the moderator (-.13, .20). Again, none of the individual conditional indirect effects or the index of moderated mediation (-.04, .06) for symbolic threat were significant.

## **Discussion**

Study 1 provided initial evidence for an intergroup threat model of gender diversity resistance; when men read about the prospect of increasing gender diversity in their domain, they experienced significantly higher amounts of *realistic* threat, which in turn predicted decreased support for GDIs and increased modern sexism. Although evidence for symbolic threat was less strong, it did predict support for GDIs, meaning its role in driving men's resistance towards increasing gender diversity could not be conclusively ruled out at this stage and required further investigation. Furthermore, the potential role of gender identification in moderating men's resistance was also inconclusive at this stage, and therefore required further investigation.

### **Study 2: STEM Professionals**

Study 2 aimed to replicate findings amongst a sample of male STEM *professionals*, and investigate whether our model would extend to additional outcomes (attitudes towards female co-workers, female supervisors & diversity hiring policies), as these are other forms of resistance which could have adverse consequences for women *already in* STEM careers. Furthermore, the inclusion of these measures allowed us to tap into attitudes distinct from our experimental manipulation; as well as measuring their support for the GDI discussed in the article,

we also measured participants' attitudes towards women and diversity policies in their domain on a more general level.

## Methods

**Participants.** Male STEM professionals working full or part-time were recruited using Amazon Mechanical Turk. In total, we received 190 responses. To ensure the sample was representative, we followed recent recommendations and removed responses with duplicate IP addresses (MacInnis, Boss & Bourdage, 2020). We also manually excluded participants whose job title did not come under a STEM field, and those who self-reported they were not currently working in STEM. After excluding these participants, our final sample size was 149. Participants' ages ranged from 20 to 63 years ( $M = 33.6$  years,  $SD = 9.07$ ).

**Procedure and Design.** An identical procedure to Study 1 was implemented; participants were randomly assigned to either read the Prospect of Diversity article ( $n = 76$ ) or the No Prospect of Diversity article ( $n = 73$ ), after which they completed the questionnaire containing the main study variables. As we expected our sample would primarily contain non-UK participants, we altered the online article manipulations so that they referred to the number of women entering STEM domains on a *global* scale, rather than focusing solely on the context of the UK (see Appendices C & D).

**Measures.** In addition to the measures used in Study 1 (realistic threat:  $\alpha = .81$ , symbolic threat:  $\alpha = .93$ , support for GDIs:  $\alpha = .81$ , modern sexism:  $\alpha = .85$ , ingroup identity:  $\alpha = .88$ ), we added an adapted version of the Attitudes towards Diversity Scale (Montei, Adams & Eggers, 1996). The scale consisted of 27 items and three subscales measuring attitudes towards female co-workers ("I find that female workers seem to be less productive on average,"  $\alpha = .86$ ), female supervisors



(“Relative to male supervisors, female supervisors seem to be less effective.”  $\alpha = .92$ ), and diversity hiring policies (“I am against hiring by quotas even when done out of necessity,”  $\alpha = .82$ ). Higher scores on each subscale corresponded to more negative attitudes. Although related, the three subscales focus on different *targets* of men’s resistance, so, we analysed them as three separate outcome variables.

## Results

**Mediation Models.** We once again tested for the presence of our proposed mediation model using Hayes’ PROCESS Model 4. Given that findings was similar across outcome variables, we describe these results together. Path coefficients and indirect effects for each outcome can be found in Table 2. Realistic threat mediated the relationship between condition and each of the outcomes (with the exception of attitudes towards female supervisors), supporting predictions that it plays an important role in driving men’s gender diversity resistance. Symbolic threat did not mediate the relationship between condition and any of the outcomes.

**Moderated Mediation Models.** Moderated mediation analyses using PROCESS Model 7 revealed significant conditional indirect effects on the realistic pathway for all models (with the exception of attitudes towards supervisors) at high levels of gender identification. However, the indexes of moderated mediation were not significant, suggesting no significant differences between the conditional indirect effects. As with Study 1, the index for the symbolic pathway was not significant, and there were no individual significant conditional indirect effects.

## Discussion

The findings of Study 2 provide further support for an intergroup threat model of resistance; when men learned about the prospect of increasing gender diversity in

their domain, they experienced significantly higher amounts of realistic (but not symbolic) threat, and in turn displayed decreased support for GDIs and increased modern sexism. Our findings also extended to two additional outcomes: negative attitudes towards female co-workers and diversity hiring policies.

### **Study 3: Reducing Realistic Threat for STEM Professionals**

In Study 3 we sought to provide further evidence that realistic threat underlies men's resistance towards gender diversity. If realistic threat is, as our previous findings suggest, key to understanding resistance, we proposed that *experimentally reducing* concerns surrounding economic resources and political power (through the addition of a third experimental condition) should reduce men's realistic threat perceptions, and in turn reduce their resistance.

#### **Methods**

**Participants.** Male professionals ( $N = 206$ ) working full or part-time within a STEM domain were recruited using Prolific Academic in exchange for £1.70. As with Study 2, we removed responses from duplicate IP addresses, and excluded participants who self-reported they were not currently working within a STEM field, resulting in a final sample size of 165. Participants' ages ranged from 18 - 64 years ( $M = 34.0$  years,  $SD = 9.46$ ),

**Procedure and Design.** A similar procedure to Studies 1 and 2 was implemented, except a third experimental condition was introduced. Participants were randomly assigned to either the Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $n = 52$ ), the No Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $n = 52$ ), or the new Threat Reduction Condition ( $n = 61$ ). In this condition, participants read about a successful GDI, and were told that gender diversity in STEM was set to greatly increase over the next 5 years. However,

the article also stated that, because of technological advances, the number of jobs in STEM-related fields was expected to increase exponentially, so opportunities for men in the domain would remain the same (see Appendix E). We believed this framing of increasing gender diversity would limit men's ability to interpret it as a zero-sum game, which in turn would reduce their concerns surrounding realistic resources.

After reading the article, participants completed an online questionnaire identical to Study 2 (realistic threat:  $\alpha = .80$ , symbolic threat:  $\alpha = .91$ , support for GDIs:  $\alpha = .90$ , modern sexism:  $\alpha = .88$ , ingroup identity:  $\alpha = .83$ , attitudes towards co-workers:  $\alpha = .87$ , attitudes towards supervisors:  $\alpha = .91$ , attitudes towards hiring policies:  $\alpha = .82$ ).

## Results

*Preliminary Analyses.* Between-subjects ANOVAs were used to assess whether our new experimental condition had a direct effect on participants' levels of realistic and symbolic threat. The analyses indicated a significant difference between the three conditions in terms of realistic threat,  $F(2,162) = 9.86, p < .001$ . Post-hoc Bonferroni Corrections found that those in the Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $M = 3.36, SD = .86$ ) experienced significantly higher realistic threat in comparison to both the No Prospect of Diversity ( $M = 2.70, SD = .80$ )  $t = -4.03, p < .001, d = .80$ , and Threat Reduction ( $M = 2.78, SD = .83$ )  $t = 3.64, p = .001, d = .69$  Conditions. There was no significant difference between the No Prospect of Diversity and Threat Reduction Conditions in terms of realistic threat ( $t = -.47, p = 1.00$ ).

There was no significant difference between the Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $M = 2.87, SD = 1.11$ ), the No Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $M = 2.60,$

$SD = 1.10$ ), and the Threat Reduction Condition ( $M = 2.48$ ,  $SD = .99$ ),  $F(2,162) = 1.94$ ,  $p = .15$ ,  $f = .16$  in terms of symbolic threat.

**Mediation Models.** As with previous studies, Hayes' PROCESS Model 4 was used to conduct mediation analyses, with our independent variable (i.e., experimental condition) being multi-categorical (0 = *No Prospect of Diversity*, 1 = *Prospect of Diversity*, 3 = *Threat Reduction*) and using contrast coding to include comparisons between all three levels of the IV within the model. Path coefficients and indirect effects for each outcome can be found in Table 3.

Significant indirect effects were obtained across all outcome variables; in comparison to those in both the No Prospect of Diversity and Threat Reduction Conditions, those in the Prospect of Diversity Condition displayed increased realistic threat, which in turn predicted more negative outcomes. While symbolic threat was related to some of the outcomes, it did not act as a mediator within the models. Consistent with predictions, the effect of experimental condition on each of the outcome variables was mediated by realistic threat; men in the Threat Reduction Condition showed significant reductions in their realistic threat levels (at a level similar to those who were not told about the prospect of increasing diversity), which in turn predicted increased support for GDIs, reduced modern sexism, and less negative attitudes towards female co-workers, supervisors, and diversity hiring policies.

**Moderated Mediation Models.** We tested whether ingroup identity moderated the indirect effect of condition on resistance, via realistic and/or symbolic threat. Hayes' PROCESS Model 7 was used and, like above, the independent variable was

multicategorical. The analyses produced non-significant indexes of moderated mediations for all models, suggesting that no moderated mediation was taking place.

## **Discussion**

Framing increasing gender diversity in such a way as to explicitly eliminate zero-sum perceptions successfully reduced men's perceptions of realistic threat (regardless of their masculine identity), which in turn increased support for diversity initiatives, reduced modern sexism, and improved attitudes towards female co-workers, supervisors and diversity hiring policies. Besides providing further evidence for our intergroup threat model, these findings point to a potential method of framing increasing diversity to ensure it is well received by men; by removing men's ability to perceive it as a zero-sum game.

### **Study 4: Nursing Students**

We next investigated whether the same psychological mechanism underlies women's resistance towards increasing gender diversity in the female-dominated area of Nursing. We chose to focus on Nursing as we felt it would offer a suitable comparison to the masculine domain of STEM in terms of workforce representation (men in make up 11% of UK Nurses & 24% of the UK STEM workforce are women; Nursing & Midwifery Council, 2020; STEM Women, 2021), and in terms of average salary in the domain (£25,273 for Nursing graduates & £26,023 for STEM graduates in the UK; Payscale. 2021). We felt doing so was important, given that our previous findings highlighted the important of realistic resources in driving resistance.

We proposed two competing hypotheses for the study. First, realistic threat reaction may be specific to men, given their greater propensity to engage in zero-sum thinking (Ruthig et al., 2017), as well as their prescriptive gender stereotypes

prescribing a stronger focus on realistic rather than symbolic threats (Prentice & Carranza, 2002). If this were the case, we would not expect to see realistic threat-based resistance amongst women in feminine domains. Instead, based on the finding of Stephan et al. (2000), who found that women's negative attitudes towards men were predicted by symbolic threat, and the fact that women's stereotypical communal traits (warm, kind, cooperative) prescribe a weaker focus on realistic threats, the prospect of increasing gender diversity could elicit *symbolic* threat and in turn produce resistance amongst women.

Alternatively, our intergroup threat model may be typical of most ingroup-outgroup dynamics in any field typically dominated by one gender. In other words, realistic threat-based resistance may not be specific to masculinity, but instead may be an effect specific to *all* individuals (i.e., both men & women) within domains which have traditionally been dominated by their gender group, and in which their ingroup has therefore had a monopoly over the valued economic resources available. According to this rationale, we would predict a similar pattern for women in Nursing as seen for men in STEM, such that women would experience greater resistance towards increasing gender diversity due to the perception of realistic threats.

## **Methods**

***Participants.*** Female students enrolled in a Nursing course at a large UK university were recruited for the study. In total, we received 123 responses, but after removing incomplete responses, the final sample size was 105. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 50 years ( $M = 27.8$  years,  $SD = 7.72$ ),

***Procedure and Design.*** An invitation to take part in the study was sent via email and social media. An identical procedure to Studies 1 & 2 was implemented;

participants were randomly assigned to either the Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $n = 55$ ) or the No Prospect of Diversity Condition ( $n = 50$ ), and were asked to read an online article discussing a GDI either succeeding or failing to increase the representation of men in Nursing domains.

**Measures.** We used similar measures as those in previous studies (realistic threat:  $\alpha = .73$ , symbolic threat:  $\alpha = .76$ , support for GDIs:  $\alpha = .87$ , ingroup identity:  $\alpha = .75$ ), with a few exceptions. First, items were adapted for use in the context of female students in Nursing domains (e.g., “Men are making it more difficult for women to get jobs in” for realistic threat). Second, we removed the Modern Sexism scale because it was not relevant for measuring attitudes towards men, and the Attitudes Towards Diversity scale because, like Study 1, the current sample was made up of university students (rather than professionals), and therefore the scale was not relevant for use within this particular context.

## Results

**Mediation Model.** Analyses using Hayes’ PROCESS Model 4 (Table 4) revealed that the relationship between increasing gender diversity and support for GDIs was *not* mediated by either realistic,  $b = -.12$ ,  $SE = .12$ , 95%  $CI [-.39, .08]$ , nor symbolic threat,  $b = -.03$ ,  $SE = .06$ , 95%  $CI [-.15, .11]$ . As such, the mediation pattern found amongst men in masculine domains did not extend to the sample of women in Nursing.

**Moderated Mediation Model.** Hayes’ PROCESS Model 7 was used to explore the potential moderating role of gender identification amongst the female sample. As with previous studies, although the indirect effect on support for GDIs via realistic

threat was only significant for high identifiers, the index of moderated mediation indicated no moderation of the mediation effect was taking place (-.56, .03).

## **Discussion**

The findings indicate that realistic threat-based resistance towards increasing gender diversity may be an effect which is specific to masculinity. This is an important initial finding, as it addresses a larger theoretical question regarding the potential gendered nature of gender diversity resistance, and suggests there may be characteristics specific to men (e.g., increased likelihood to engage in zero-sum thinking & prescriptive gender stereotypes) which may result in them perceiving realistic threat, and in turn displaying resistance, when faced with the prospect of increasing gender diversity in masculine domains.

Despite this, although the index of moderated mediation was non-significant, the *individual* indirect effects suggested there may be a tendency for women high in gender identity to show a similar pattern of resistance to men. As such, further research is needed to investigate whether realistic threat-based resistance towards gender diversity is in fact specific to masculinity, or whether it is more typical of an ingroup-outgroup dynamic in a domain traditionally dominated by one gender.

### **Study 5: Organizational Messages**

The primary aim of Study 5 was to replicate our model using a more implicit experimental manipulation. Specifically, we aimed to investigate the effect of a manipulation which made no explicit references to demographic changes within the domain. Instead, we investigated whether the *mere presence* of organisational diversity messages (e.g. diversity values, awards, & initiatives) in company profiles resulted in the realistic threat-based resistance seen across Studies 1-4.



We also included additional outcome variables such as participants' willingness to work/apply for the company, concerns about the company's unfair treatment of employees based on gender, and perceptions of anti-male bias. Given the nature of the study, we also aimed to conduct further analyses to investigate how diversity organisational messages affect female STEM professionals. However, given that our main goal was *replication* of the model established in previous studies, we report the findings of these additional analyses in Supplementary Material 6.

## **Method**

***Participants.*** Male and female STEM professionals working full or part-time within a STEM domain were recruited using Prolific Academic, in exchange for £1.70. In total, we received 369 responses. After removing incomplete responses, those from duplicate IP addresses, and excluding participants who were not currently working within STEM, our final sample size was 263 (163 men). Participants' ages ranged from 19 to 64 years ( $M = 33.8$  years,  $SD = 9.47$ ).

***Procedure & Design.*** A 2 x 2 between subjects experimental design was implemented to investigate how organizational message (diversity vs. no diversity), and gender (male vs. female) affected participants' threat perceptions and resistance. The manipulations were developed based on work by Dover et al., (2016), who successfully used company profiles to elicit cardiovascular threat amongst a high-status group.

As a cover story, we told participants we were interested in their evaluations of a STEM company's recruitment materials. Participants were randomly assigned to a condition in which they read a company profile which had either a pro-diversity organizational message, or which made no reference to diversity (Appendices F & G).

All participants then completed an online questionnaire, similar to Studies 1 – 3 (realistic threat:  $\alpha = .80$ , symbolic threat:  $\alpha = .88$ , support for GDIs:  $\alpha = .95$ , gender identity:  $\alpha = .85$ ). The Support for GDIs measure was adapted slightly for use within this context; given that the company profile manipulation made no explicit reference to a GDI, the measure evaluated participants' support towards initiatives on a more general level (e.g., "I think Gender Diversity Initiatives in STEM are a poor use of resources").

## Results

***Single Moderated Mediation Model.*** Given that the sample included both male and female STEM professionals, moderated mediation analysis was conducted using Hayes' PROCESS Model 7 to investigate whether the indirect effect of condition on support for GDIs (via realistic and/or symbolic threat) was moderated by gender.

As can be seen in Table 5, the analyses revealed that realistic threat mediated the relationship between experimental condition and support for GDIs amongst men ( $b = -.25$ ,  $SE = .13$ ,  $95\% CI [-.54, -.01]$ ), but not amongst women ( $b = .04$ ,  $SE = .12$ ,  $95\% CI [-.19, .27]$ ), such that men who read the pro-diversity profile experienced greater realistic threat and displayed decreased support for GDIs. Symbolic threat did not act as a mediator for either men or women within the model.

***Multiple Moderated Mediation Model.*** Finally, as with previous studies, we once again investigated the potential moderating role of gender identification. As the predicted model involved a 3-way interaction (diversity message x gender x gender identity), Hayes' PROCESS Macro Model 11 was used (see Fig. 2 for all pathways).

Although a significant conditional indirect effect via realistic threat was present for men high in gender identification, the index of moderated mediation suggested there was no difference between each of the indirect effects. The index of moderated mediation and conditional indirect effects were non-significant for the symbolic threat pathway.

## **Discussion**

The use of a more implicit manipulation of diversity in Study 5 adds to the findings of previous studies and further extends our intergroup threat model of resistance. As with previous findings, analyses strongly suggested that the presence of organizational diversity structures and values at a STEM company can elicit realistic threat amongst men, and in turn increase their resistance towards GDIs.

However, it should be noted that there is a potential confound present in the manipulations - the control condition contains a picture of two White men, whereas the diversity message condition contains a photo of a Black woman alongside a White woman. Future work could address this potential limitation by ensuring the racial makeup of both company profiles are matched. Despite this, given that the pattern of findings replicates those of previous studies which exclusively focused on gender diversity, we suspect gender diversity threat played an important role in this study also.

## **Summary Analyses**

Finally, we conducted integrative data analysis (Curran & Hussong, 2009) to test the robustness of the effects obtained across the studies of the current work. Given our data contained unique characteristics that distinguished our participants (e.g., STEM vs. business domains, students vs. professionals), we conducted a one-

step IDA using a fixed effects model. Using this approach, we pooled the data for the Control vs. Diversity Prime comparison and conducted mediation and moderated mediation analyses whilst statistically controlling for study, domain, and sample.

Given that no mediation or moderated mediation effects were present amongst the female sample in Study 4, it was not included in the analyses, meaning overall (conditional) indirect effects were calculated for men in masculine domains only. Support for GDIs was the only variable used across all four studies, it was the only outcome included in the IDA.

## Results

***Indirect Effect of Gender Diversity Primes on Support for GDIs.*** The analyses (Table 6) revealed a significant overall indirect effect of the gender diversity primes on support for GDIs via realistic threat,  $b = -.32$ ,  $SE = .08$ , 95%  $CI [-.48, -.19]$ . The overall indirect effect via symbolic threat was also marginally significant, although this was a considerably smaller effect,  $b = -.06$ ,  $SE = .03$ , 95%  $CI [-.13, -.005]$ .

***Conditional Indirect Effect of Gender Diversity Primes on Support for GDIs.*** The analysis (Table 7) revealed a significant overall effect of the gender diversity primes on support for GDIs, via realistic threat and at the high level of ingroup identity,  $b = -.40$ ,  $SE = .10$ , 95%  $CI [-.60, -.22]$ . The overall effect of condition on support for GDIs was also significant for the low identity/realistic threat pathway,  $b = -.25$ ,  $SE = .09$ , 95%  $CI [-.44, -.08]$ , and the high identity/symbolic threat pathway,  $b = -.08$ ,  $SE = .04$ , 95%  $CI [-.18, -.006]$ , although the effect sizes for these were considerably smaller than that for the high identity/realistic threat pathway.

However, the index of moderated mediation was contained within a confidence interval that included zero for both the realistic threat (-.18, .02), and symbolic threat (-.08, .02) pathway. This suggests that there was *no significant difference* between the indirect effects at different levels of the moderator. In other words, the mediation effects did not depend on gender identification.

## **Discussion**

Taken together, the analysis highlights the robustness of the indirect effects obtained across the current studies. Specifically, findings suggest that realistic threat act as the major driving force behind men's resistance towards GDIs in traditionally masculine domains. In addition, although the index of moderated was not significant, the fact that the indirect effect via realistic threat and at the high level of gender identification was consistently significant across studies *and* that this conditional indirect effect was largest in size in the IDA is important, as it suggests that highly identified individuals may have a greater tendency to display realistic threat and decreased support for GDIs when faced with the prospect of increasing gender diversity in their domain.

### **General Discussion**

The current research took an intergroup threat approach to investigate men's resistance towards increasing gender diversity in masculine domains. Specifically, we aimed to provide a better understanding of *why* resistance towards increasing gender diversity exists, *for whom* it is strongest, and how it can potentially be *reduced*. Our findings provide solid empirical support for a model in which realistic threat underlies men's resistance towards increasing gender diversity. Although evidence was not as strong, the findings also suggest that individuals highly identified with their gender

may have a greater tendency to display this realistic threat-based resistance, however this requires further investigation in future research.

Interestingly, the mediation model did not extend to women within a traditionally feminine domain, suggesting that realistic threat-based resistance may be solely characteristic to men. This finding has important implications, as it addresses a larger theoretical question regarding the potential *gendered* nature of gender diversity resistance, and suggests there may be characteristics specific to masculinity (e.g., zero-sum thinking, prescriptive gender stereotypes) which may result in men being more likely to perceive realistic threat, and in turn display resistance, when faced with the prospect of increasing gender diversity in masculine domains.

These findings advance theory by extending our conceptual understanding of resistance towards gender diversity. Importantly, the research systematically integrates the Intergroup Threat Theory within the gender diversity domain, and highlights the importance of realistic threat in driving gender diversity resistance. Whilst this conclusion is consistent with more general models of stress and stability of social systems, which predict that social progress can threaten high-status individuals due to them perceiving the hierarchy from which they are currently benefitting as changing or unstable (Scheepers & Ellemers, 2018), it also meaningfully extends the ITT to a context it had yet to be applied to.

We also significantly advance theory in the field of majority group reactions towards diversity, by investigating *both* men and women's responses to increasing gender diversity in domains in which they have traditionally dominated – something which has previously been understudied. We answer a previous call to disentangle

different types of threat (Danbold & Huo, 2017), and identify *why* majority group resistance towards gender diversity may be produced.

*Practical Implications.* From a practical standpoint, our findings provide evidence that, when perceived as threatening by majority members of a domain, successful GDIs can produce backlash against the minority members they are designed to help, and in turn serve to maintain hostile atmospheres for minorities within these fields. Given that many women may leave STEM because of these hostile workplace atmospheres (De Welde & Laursen, 2011), this finding is important, as it points to why these atmospheres exist and how they are currently being maintained.

Second, the findings of Study 3 suggest that if increasing gender diversity is framed to limit zero-sum interpretations, it can reduce backlash by ensuring that majority group members are not threatened by potential demographic changes. Thus, when designing initiatives and discussing their success, practitioners should consider framing and explaining increasing diversity from a non-zero-sum perspective in order to attenuate majority group concerns about losing realistic resources.

*Limitations and Future directions.* As mentioned previously, given that initial power analyses were conducted for comparisons between two groups, further analyses were required to ensure studies were adequately powered for our more complex models. However, there is a general consensus in the field that power analyses for moderated mediation models are currently lacking, making such analyses difficult (SPSP Working Group, 2020). As such, whilst post-hoc sensitivity analyses conducted using MedPower indicated that all significant *indirect* effects were adequately powered (see Supplementary Material 2), this still did not account for

potential *moderation* within these models. Therefore, findings should be interpreted with caution, and future research should recruit larger sample sizes to try and attenuate any concerns regarding power.

It should be noted that, although findings consistently indicated that realistic (but not symbolic) threats were a key driving force behind gender diversity resistance, the scale averages for both realistic and symbolic threat across all studies were below the midpoint. Care should therefore be taken when interpreting the findings, as it may be more accurate to conclude that *less* agreement with the threat measures leads to less resistance, rather than greater agreement leading to increased resistance. However, this finding is still important, as it suggests that even small amounts of realistic threat can have a consequential impact on men's responses towards increasing gender diversity.

Future studies should attempt to extend this intergroup threat model of resistance by incorporating other approaches such as the biopsychosocial model of challenge and threat (Blascovich & Mendes, 2010; Scheepers & Ellemers, 2018). This would allow us to understand whether increasing gender diversity *physiologically* threatens or challenges men depending on their level of ingroup identity and will also enable us to differentiate between the types of challenges (realistic vs. symbolic) increasing diversity may bring for their domain. Doing so would be an extremely valuable endeavour, as it would serve to deepen our understanding and provide a unique insight into men's psychological experience of increasing gender diversity in masculine domains.

Although we utilised samples of professionals and future professionals in relevant domains, further studies should replicate this model and derived interventions



in organizations that have encountered *actual* resistance towards increasing gender diversity amongst their employees. These studies could be geared towards both existing employees and their attitudes towards women and diversity structures within their organizations, but also towards potential employees and their willingness to apply for organizations that publicly support diversity, in order to understand the role of threat and ingroup identity in the hiring and selection process.

### **Conclusion**

Progress in achieving gender equality has been slow, despite diversity initiatives and structures being in place for decades. Although uncomfortable, it is important to face the possibility that increasing gender diversity in masculine domains may result in resistance amongst men. Our findings help us understand why and for whom increasing gender diversity can create resistance and suggest ways of reducing such resistance when framing successful initiatives in the future.

## References

- Aberson, C. L., & Gaffney, A. M. (2009). An integrated threat model of explicit and implicit attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(5), 808-830.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.582>
- Ackelsberg, M., & Diamond, I. (1987). Gender and political life: New directions in political science. In M. M. Feree & B. B. Hess (Eds.), *Analyzing gender: A handbook of social science research* (pp. 504-525). Sage.
- Anisman-Razin, M., Kark, R., & Saguy, T. (2018). "Putting gender on the table": Understanding reactions to women who discuss gender inequality. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 21*(5), 690-706.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217744648>
- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological bulletin, 130*(1), 80-114.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.1.80>
- Bizman, A., & Yinon, Y. (2001). Intergroup and interpersonal threats as determinants of prejudice: The moderating role of in-group identification. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 23*(3), 191-196.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324834BASP2303\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324834BASP2303_5)
- Blascovich, J., & Mendes, W. B. (2010). Social psychophysiology and embodiment. In S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of*

*social psychology* (pp. 194–227). John Wiley & Sons.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470561119.socpsy001006>

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be:

Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex

discrimination. *Psychology, public policy, and law*, 5(3), 665-692.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.5.3.665>

Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, interpersonal power, and social influence. *Journal of*

*Social Issues*, 55(1), 81-99. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00106>

Charles-Toussaint, G. C., & Crowson, H. M. (2010). Prejudice against international

students: The role of threat perceptions and authoritarian dispositions in US

students. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(5), 413-428.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2010.496643>

Chen, Y., Zhao, Y., Song, H., Guan, L., & Wu, X. (2017). The neural basis of

intergroup threat effect on social attention. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), 1-12.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/srep41062>

Clifton, J. P. (2011). *The role of intergroup threat in attitudes toward same-sex*

*marriage and its beneficiaries* (Unpublished master's thesis). Humboldt State

University.

Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). On the precipice of a “majority-minority”

America: Perceived status threat from the racial demographic shift affects

White Americans' political ideology. *Psychological science*, 25(6), 1189-

1197. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614527113>

Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2018). Hispanic population growth engenders conservative shift among non-Hispanic racial minorities. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(4), 383-392.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617712029>

Curran, P. J., & Hussong, A. M. (2009). Integrative data analysis: the simultaneous analysis of multiple data sets. *Psychological methods*, 14(2), 81-100.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015914>

Dall'Ara, E., & Maass, A. (1999). Studying sexual harassment in the laboratory: Are egalitarian women at higher risk? *Sex Roles*, 41(9), 681-704.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018816025988>

Danbold, F., & Huo, Y. J. (2015). No longer “all-American”? Whites’ defensive reactions to their numerical decline. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 6(2), 210-218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550614546355>

Danbold, F., & Huo, Y. J. (2017). Men's defense of their prototypicality undermines the success of women in STEM initiatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 72, 57-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.12.014>

De Welde, K., & Laursen, S. (2011). The glass obstacle course: Informal and formal barriers for women PhD students in STEM fields. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, 3(3), 571-595.

<http://genderandset.open.ac.uk/index.php/genderandset/article/view/205>

Dresden, B., Dresden, A., & Ridge, R. (2018). The Boys Club: Engineering a More Positive Environment for Women in Male-Dominated Majors. *Social Sciences*, 7(2), 17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7020017>

- Dover, T. L., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2016). Members of high-status groups are threatened by pro-diversity organizational messages. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 62*, 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.006>
- Florack, A., Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., Balzer, T., & Perzig, S. (2003). Perceived intergroup threat and attitudes of host community members toward immigrant acculturation. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 143*(5), 633-648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540309598468>
- Hayes, A. F. (2009). Beyond Baron and Kenny: Statistical mediation analysis in the new millennium. *Communication Monographs, 76*(4), 408-420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750903310360>
- Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 104*(3), 504-519. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030838>
- Kuchynka, S. L., Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., & Puryear, C. (2018). Zero-Sum Thinking and the Masculinity Contest: Perceived Intergroup Competition and Workplace Gender Bias. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(3), 529-550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12281>
- Li, T., & Zhao, Y. (2012). Help Less or Help More-Perceived Intergroup Threat and Out-Group Helping. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 4*(4), 90-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v4n4p90>

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*(3), 302-318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167292183006>

Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual Harassment under Social Identity Threat: The Computer Harassment Paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*(5), 853–870. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.853>

MacInnis, C. C., Boss, H. C., & Bourdage, J. S. (2020). More evidence of participant misrepresentation on Mturk and investigating who misrepresents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *152*, 109603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109603>

Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., Cuddy, A. J., & Polifroni, M. (2008). When being a model minority is good... and bad: Realistic threat explains negativity toward Asian Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*(1), 74-89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207309195>

Major, B., Blodorn, A., & Major Blascovich, G. (2018). The threat of increasing diversity: Why many White Americans support Trump in the 2016 presidential election. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(6), 931-940. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216677304>

Montei, M. S., Adams, G. A., & Eggers, L. M. (1996). Validity of scores on the attitudes toward diversity scale (ATDS). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *56*(2), 293-303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164496056002010>

Nursing & Midwifery Council. (2020). *Mid-year update: 1 April–30 September 2020*.

<https://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/nmc-register/september-2020/nmc-register-september-2020.pdf>

Osborne, D., Davies, P. G., & Duran, A. (2008). The integrated threat theory and politics: Explaining attitudes toward political parties. In B.P. Reimann (Ed.), *Personality and Social Psychology Research* (pp. 61-74). Nova Science Publishers.

Outten, H. R., Schmitt, M. T., Miller, D. A., & Garcia, A. L. (2012). Feeling threatened about the future: Whites' emotional reactions to anticipated ethnic demographic changes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(1), 14-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211418531>

PayScale. (2021). *Salary Data & Career Research Center*.

[https://www.payscale.com/research/UK/Country=United\\_Kingdom/Salary](https://www.payscale.com/research/UK/Country=United_Kingdom/Salary)

Pereira, C., Vala, J., & Costa-Lopes, R. (2010). From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(7), 1231-1250.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.718>

Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 269-281.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066>

- Riek, B., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup Threat and Outgroup Attitudes: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 336–353. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_4)
- Rohmann, A., Florack, A., & Piontkowski, U. (2006). The role of discordant acculturation attitudes in perceived threat: An analysis of host and immigrant attitudes in Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(6), 683-702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.06.006>
- Ruthig, J. C., Kehn, A., Gamblin, B. W., Vanderzanden, K., & Jones, K. (2017). When women's gains equal men's losses: Predicting a zero-sum perspective of gender status. *Sex Roles*, 76(6), 17-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.06.006>
- Scheepers, D., & Ellemers, N. (2018). Stress and the stability of social systems: A review of neurophysiological research. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 29(1), 340-376. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2018.1543149>
- Schmitt, M. T., & Branscombe, N. R. (2001). The good, the bad, and the manly: Threats to one's prototypicality and evaluations of fellow in-group members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 510-517. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2001.1476>
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1969). Ingroup and intergroup relations: Experimental analysis. In M. Sherif & C.W. Sherif (Eds), *Social psychology* (pp. 221-266). Harper & Row.
- SPSP Power Analysis Working Group (2020). Techniques and Solutions for Sample Size Determination in Psychology: Supplementary Material for “Power to



Detect What? Considerations for Planning and Evaluating Sample Size”.

<https://osf.io/3zv8x/download>

STEM Women. (2021, January 22). *Women in STEM: Percentages of Women in STEM Statistics*. <https://www.stemwomen.co.uk/blog/2021/01/women-in-stem-percentages-of-women-in-stem-statistics>

Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(9), 1242-1254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672022812009>

Stephan, W. G., Diaz-Loving, R., & Duran, A. (2000). Integrated Threat Theory And Intercultural Attitudes Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(2), 240–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022100031002006>

Stephan, C. W., Stephan, W. G., Demitrakis, K. M., Yamada, A. M., & Clason, D. L. (2000). Women’s attitudes toward men: An integrated Threat Theory Approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24(1), 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2000.tb01022.x>

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice toward immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(11), 2221–2237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb00107.x>

- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Rios Morrison, K. (2009). Intergroup Threat Theory. In T.D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 43–59). Psychology Press.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 68(2), 199-214. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., & Roy, R. (2009). The relationships between contact, status and prejudice: An integrated threat theory analysis of Hindu–Muslim relations in India. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 19(2), 83-94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.984>
- Velasco González, K., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47(4), 667-685. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X284443>
- Wade, J. C., & Brittan-Powell, C. (2001). Men's attitudes toward race and gender equity: The importance of masculinity ideology, gender-related traits, and reference group identity dependence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2(1), 42-50. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.2.1.42>


Wilkins, C. L., & Kaiser, C. R. (2014). Racial Progress as Threat to the Status Hierarchy: Implications for Perceptions of Anti-White Bias. *Psychological Science*, 25(2), 439-446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613508412>

## Appendix A

*Online article read by participants in Prospect of Diversity Condition in Study 1*

## Women expected to outnumber men in STEM careers by 2022

Initiatives such as the Women in STEM Project (WISP) are succeeding in increasing the representation of women in STEM careers in the UK



In recent years, some of the largest UK employers in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) have been motivated to address the underrepresentation of women in their field. Thus, several different gender diversity initiatives have been employed in the UK in an attempt to increase the number of women entering STEM careers.

With 2017 marking the 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Women in STEM Project (WISP), a new report has found that this initiative has had a dramatic effect on the number of women entering STEM careers in comparison to men.

"As a result of initiatives like WISP, we're now seeing a much higher proportion of women entering STEM careers in the UK," the report states. "This project has been so successful that we expect the number of women in STEM careers to be equal to, and perhaps even surpass, the number of men within the next 5 years."


This report will be encouraging news for those who have been calling for greater gender equality within the field of STEM for the past decade.

## Appendix B

*Online article read by participants in No Prospect of Diversity Condition in Study 1*

## Women expected to remain underrepresented in STEM careers in coming years

Initiatives such as the Women in STEM Project (WISP) are failing to increase the representation of woman in STEM careers in the UK



In recent years, some of the largest UK employers in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) have been motivated to address the underrepresentation of women in their field. Thus, several different gender diversity initiatives have been employed in the UK in an attempt to increase the number of women entering STEM careers.

However, with 2017 marking the 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Women in STEM Project (WISP), a new report has found that this particular initiative has failed to increase the number of woman entering STEM careers in comparison to men.

"Despite the effort of initiatives like WISP, we are still seeing a consistently higher proportion of men in STEM careers", the report states. "These trends suggest that women will continue to remain underrepresented in STEM domains within the next 5 years, and that men will more than likely hold the majority of these roles for many years to come".


This report will be disappointing news for those who have been calling for greater gender equality within the field of STEM for the past decade.

## Appendix C

*Online article read by participants in Prospect of Diversity Condition in Study 2*

## Women expected to outnumber men in STEM careers by 2023

Initiatives such as the Women in STEM Project (WISP) are succeeding at increasing the representation of women in STEM careers worldwide.



In recent years, some of the largest global employers in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) have been motivated to address the underrepresentation of women in their field. Thus, many different Gender Diversity Initiatives have been employed in an attempt to increase the number of women entering STEM careers across the world.

With 2018 marking the 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Women in STEM Project (WISP), a new report has found that this particular initiative has had a dramatic effect on the number of women entering STEM careers in comparison to men.

“As a result of initiatives like WISP, we’re now seeing a much higher proportion of women entering STEM careers on a global scale,” the report states. “This project has been so successful that we expect the number of women in global STEM careers to be equal to, and perhaps even surpass, the number of men within the next 5 years.”


This report will be encouraging news for those who have been calling for greater gender equality within the field of STEM for the past decade.

## Appendix D

*Online article read by participants in No Prospect of Diversity Condition in Study 2*

## Women expected to remain underrepresented in STEM careers in coming years

Initiatives such as the Women in STEM Project (WISP) are failing to increase the representation of women in STEM careers worldwide.



In recent years, some of the largest global employers in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) have been motivated to address the underrepresentation of women in their field. Thus, many different Gender Diversity Initiatives have been employed in an attempt to increase the number of women entering STEM careers across the world.

However, with 2018 marking the 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Women in STEM Project (WISP), a new report has found that this particular initiative has failed to increase the number of women entering STEM careers in comparison to men.

“Despite the effort of initiatives like WISP, we are still seeing a consistently higher proportion of men entering STEM careers on a global scale”, the report states. “These trends suggest that women will continue to remain underrepresented in STEM domains within the next 5 years, and that men will more than likely hold the majority of these roles for many years to come”.


This report will be disappointing news for those who have been calling for greater gender equality within the field of STEM for the past decade.

## Appendix E

*Online article read by participants in Threat Reduction Condition in Study 3*

## Women expected to benefit from growth in STEM jobs; but **not** at the expense of men

The number of women in global STEM careers is set to greatly increase by 2023. A new report has attributed this rapid rise to a combination of industry growth and the success of initiatives such as the Women in STEM Project (WISP).



In recent years, some of the largest global employers in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) have been motivated to address the underrepresentation of women in their field. Thus, many different Gender Diversity Initiatives have been employed in an attempt to increase the number of women entering STEM careers across the world.

With 2018 marking the 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Women in STEM Project (WISP), a new report has found that this particular initiative has had a dramatic effect on the number of women entering STEM careers.

“As a result of initiatives like WISP, we’re now seeing a much higher proportion of women entering STEM careers on a global scale,” the report states. “This particular project has been so successful that we expect the number of women in global STEM careers to increase exponentially over the next 5 years.”

The report also highlights that, as STEM jobs are currently growing at double the rate of any other occupation, men in STEM will *not* lose out as a result of the success of Gender Diversity Initiatives such as the WISP. As a result, job opportunities for men are estimated to remain at a constant level due to an increasingly high level of demand in these fields.

This report will be encouraging news for those who have been calling for more women to enter careers within the field of STEM for the past decade.



Appendix F

Company profile read by participants in the Diversity Message Condition in Study 5



**About CAST**

- ❖ One of the world's premier employers in today's major STEM markets
- ❖ Several global locations enables collaborative teamwork between employees across geographic boundaries

**About Our Workplace Culture**

- ❖ Believe successful innovation results from cooperation between people with diverse experiences, perspectives, & backgrounds
- ❖ Strive to promote diversity & foster inclusion within our workplaces
- ❖ Pledged to achieve a 50/50 gender balance in our workforce by 2024
- ❖ Recipient of the Inspiring Women in STEM & Top-50 STEM Employer with Workforce Diversity Awards
- ❖ Work with the Women in STEMM Leadership Institute so female employees can develop their leadership skills & achieve top positions within our company

**About Our Field**

- ❖ STEM markets we are invested in are currently going through a period of exponential growth
- ❖ Expect a large number of new positions to become available at CAST in coming years
- ❖ We approach the future with excitement about the important work we are doing & look forward to welcoming many new employees to our organisation



EXPECTED NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE AT CAST

Year	Expected Number of Jobs Available
2018	Low
2019	Low-Mid
2020	Mid
2021	High
2022	Very High

**JOIN US TODAY!**



In accordance with our goals, we aim to hire individuals who understand the importance of improving diversity within our workplace, and who thrive in a corporate culture where inclusive behaviours are valued.

If you think you have the skills and qualities to be successful in a career with us at CAST, then please apply to join us today.

*Applications from women and other minority groups are particularly welcomed.*


[www.casttechnologies.com](http://www.casttechnologies.com)



Appendix G

*Company profile read by participants in the No Diversity Message Condition in Study*

5



**About CAST**

- ❖ One of the world's **premier employers** in today's major STEM markets
- ❖ Several global locations enables collaborative teamwork between employees across geographic boundaries


**About Our Workplace Culture**

- ❖ Believe successful innovation results from cooperation between people with unique qualifications, perspectives & talents
- ❖ Respect all of our employees for their unique & individual contributions to our company
- ❖ Strive to inspire our employees to become **experts** and **leaders** in their field
- ❖ Recipient of the Inspiring Leaders in STEM & Top-50 STEM Employer Awards
- ❖ Work with the **STEM Leadership Center** so employees can develop their leadership skills & achieve top positions within our company

**About Our Field**


- ❖ STEM markets we are invested in are currently going through a period of exponential growth
- ❖ Expect a large number of new positions to become available at CAST in coming years
- ❖ We approach the future with excitement about the important work we are doing & look forward to welcoming many new employees to our organisation

EXPECTED NUMBER OF JOBS AVAILABLE AT CAST



Year	Expected Number of Jobs Available at CAST
2018	Low
2019	Low-Mid
2020	Mid
2021	High
2022	Very High

**JOIN US TODAY!**



In accordance with our goals, we aim to hire individuals who understand the various demands of a global marketplace, who contribute to our organization, and who thrive in a corporate culture where individuality is valued.

If you think you have the skills and qualities to be successful in a career with us at CAST, then please apply to join us today.

[www.casttechnologies.com](http://www.casttechnologies.com)

