"Mobilising Men and Women in Support of Workplace Gender Equality: Does Leader Gender Matter?"

Stephanie Lucinda Hardacre BPsych(Hons I) (Newcastle)

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology

May 2020

This research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship

Statement of Originality

I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the work embodied in the thesis is my own work, conducted under normal supervision. The thesis contains no material which has been accepted, or is being examined, for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made. I give consent to the final version of my thesis being made available worldwide when deposited in the University's Digital Repository, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968 and any approved embargo.

Signed:

Name of Student: Stephanie Hardacre

Date: 13.12.2019

Acknowledgement of Authorship

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis contains published paper/s/scholarly work of which I am a joint author. I have included as part of the thesis a written declaration endorsed in writing by my supervisor, attesting to my contribution to the joint publication/s/scholarly work. I have also included a copy of the publication in the Appendix.

Signed:

Name of Student: Stephanie Hardacre

Date: 13.12.2019

By signing below I confirm that as the publication's first author, Stephanie Hardacre made a relative contribution of 65%, and assisted with the design, recruitment, analysis, and interpretation of both experiments, and additionally drafted and finalised the manuscript for the paper/publication entitled "Whose issue is it anyway? The effects of leader gender and equality message framing on men's and women's mobilization toward workplace gender equality". As the second author and primary supervisor of Stephanie, Dr Emina Subašić provided a relative contribution of 35%. She assisted with the design, analysis, and interpretation of both experiments, and additionally provided theoretical and practical feedback on several drafts of the manuscript.

Signed (Primary Supervisor):

Name of Supervisor: Dr Emina Subašić

Date: 13.12.2019

Acknowledgements

My sincere gratitude goes to my principal PhD supervisor, Emina Subašić, for her exceptional guidance, reassurance, intellect, challenges, time, and constructive feedback. Without her knowledge and occasional (necessary) pep talks, this thesis would not have been made possible. I am grateful to Mark Rubin, my PhD co-supervisor, for his statistical advice and fresh eyes when it came to feedback. And to my RHD panel: Martin Johnson, Michelle Kelly, Stefania Paolini, Elise Kalokerinos – thank you for your suggestions and feedback throughout my PhD journey. Each of you have served as role models to me in one way or another. My thanks also go to my examiners – Professor Belle Derks and Dr Helena Radke. Your reviews greatly enhanced the quality of this work, and I am grateful for your time, effort, and insight.

Special thanks go to my parents for their support, encouragement, and belief in me. I hope to have made them proud with my efforts. My heartfelt thanks go to Jay and Blair, for distracting and entertaining me when I most needed it, and for keeping me grounded through every research-related breakdown with your advice and rallying cries of "Dr Stefi, Dr Stefi!" You two always believed in me, especially when I didn't quite believe in myself.

To my colleagues who became the dearest of friends to Me (representing Uniqueness): Monica (representing Nerve), Olivia (representing Talent), and Romany (representing Charisma). The first eight months of my PhD were spent in an office on my lonesome, struggling over research-related questions big and small. But this all changed as of October 2016 when I moved into your office, aka W325C. The shallow and deep conversations we've had in this room over the past three years have been immeasurably valuable – they kept me sane and reassured me that I was not alone when my research didn't quite take the path that I had expected it to. I have no doubt that my PhD journey would have been very different if it weren't for you and the special friendship that I share with each of you. Thank you for the post-meeting debriefs, for the laughter, the lunches, the gossip, and of course Cake Wednesdays! I'll miss your daily company,

but here's to many more years of friendship and boardgame nights, albeit with a little less stress and angst over "I should be writing".

My gratitude goes to Danielle Storey for her support in all administrative- and timesheet-related matters, and for always being happy to see me despite it usually involving a curly question about funding or conference travel logistics. I would also like to thank the thousands of individuals who participated in my research experiments – it is greatly appreciated.

This thesis is dedicated to my father, Geoff, the greatest man on earth, and one who is without doubt a true champion of change. Dr Hardacre Jr has a nice ring to it, right dad?! And to my mother, Marco, whose strength and warmth of character is reflected in all those around her. I admire you so. And finally, to my nana Hendrika – the first female barber in the whole of the Netherlands, and the world at large. You always said you regretted not having the opportunity to study further, so I hope you can rest easy knowing that I've made the most of the opportunities presented to me.

This thesis was made possible by the financial support of the Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship, and the School of Psychology's Higher Degree Research funding scheme. I would also like to thank the Society of Australasian Social Psychology, the European Association of Social Psychologists, and Sofia University St Kliment Ohridski for their financial support which allowed me to travel extensively throughout my PhD journey. My three months as an Erasmus exchange student in Bulgaria will stay with me for life.

"Since men are the primary agents maintaining and supporting sexism and sexist oppression, they can only be successfully eradicated if men are compelled to assume responsibility for transforming their consciousness and the consciousness of society as a whole."

(bell hooks, 1984, p. 83)

"Gender equality is not just a women's issue, it's a human rights issue."

(HeForShe, 2016, para. 1)

Table of Contents

Statement of Originality ix
Acknowledgement of Authorship x
Acknowledgements xi
Table of Contents xiii
List of Figures xvi
List of Tables viii
Abstract ix
Chapter 1 Introduction: Who Run the World? ...Girls? 11
The Question 11
Overview of Chapters 20
Chapter 2 At the Intersection of Gender (In)Equality, Collective Action, Social Identity, and Leadership: A Review of the Literature 23
A Brief History: Workplace Gender (In)Equality and the Importance of Addressing it 26
If it Ain't Broke…But What if it is? Traditional Approaches to Dealing with Gender (In)Equality 29
The Hidden Power of Social Identity: The Social Identity Theory of Social Change 37
The Importance of Leadership in the Context of Gender (In)Equality: The Social Identity Theory of Leadership 43
The Politics of Solidarity: The Political Solidarity Model of Social Change 56
The Intersection of Leadership and Solidarity Processes: Framing Gender Equality as a Common Cause 66
Chapter Summary 72
Chapter 3 Mobilising Men and Women in Support of Gender Equality: A Theoretical and Empirical Overview 73
Rethinking the Lay of the Land: Key Theoretical and Conceptual Contributions of the Thesis.. 74
Dotting the i's and Crossing the t's: Empirical Framework of the Thesis and Overview of the Experiments 76
Entangling Relations: Key Dependent Variables and Their Relationships to One Another 78
Beyond the Scope of This Thesis: Constraints and Qualifications 87
Chapter Summary 94
Chapter 4 Whose Issue is it Anyway? The Effects of Leader Gender and Equality Message Framing on Mobilisation Toward Gender Equality 95
Experiment 1 97

Method 101
Results 108
Discussion 119
Experiment 2 124
Method 130
Results 137
Discussion 158
Chapter 5 All for One or One for All? The Effects of Subgroup and Superordinate Identity Framing on Men's Mobilisation Toward Equality 169
Experiment 3 170
Method 178
Results 181
Discussion 198
Experiment 4 202
Method 207
Results 212
Discussion 223
Chapter 6 A Man's World: Positioning Gender (In)Equality as the Shared Burden of Men 232
Experiment 5 233
Method 239
Results 241
Discussion 251
Experiment 6 260
Method 269
Results 275
Discussion 288
Chapter 7 Where to From Here? A General Discussion of the Key Theoretical Insights and Empirical Findings of The Thesis 296
Leader Gender Matters…Sometimes: Male Leaders Achieve Greater Mobilisation than Female Leaders 301
The Importance (or Not) of Equality Message Framing: Solidarity-Based Messages as a Starting Point for Mobilisation 311

It Matters Not Only Who is Speaking, but Also What They are Saying: The Intersection of Leader Gender and Message Framing Toward Gender Equality 317
The Gender Effect: Women are More Heavily Invested Than Men in Addressing Gender Inequality 322
Don't Throw the Baby Out With the Bath Water: Limitations and Future Directions 324
The Shape of Things to Come: Conclusions and Implications 332
References 339
Appendices 388
Appendix A: Notices of Ethical and Methodological Approval 388
Appendix B: Information Sheets and Debriefing Statements 391
Appendix C: Manipulation Vignettes 395
Appendix D: Questionnaire and Dependent Measures 428
Appendix E: Write-Up of Experiment 1 Interactions Split by Leader Gender 438
Appendix F: Write-Up of Experiment 2 Interactions Split by Message Framing 440
Appendix G: Write-Up of Experiment 3 Interactions Split by Leader Gender 447
Appendix H: Write-Up of Experiment 4 Interactions Split by Leader Gender 452
Appendix I: Write-Up of Experiment 5 Interactions Split by Leader Gender 454
Appendix J: Write-Up of Experiment 6 Interactions Split by Message Framing 455
Appendix K: First Author Publication by Stephanie Hardacre 457

List of Figures

Figure 4.1. Mean perceived threat to men's gender group as a function of leader gender and participant gender..……..……..……

Figure 4.13. Mean benevolent sexism as a function of participant gender, leader gender, and message framing..…….....…….159

Figure 5.1. Mean perceived leader prototypicality as a function of message framing and leader gender..…….…….…….…...…….186

Figure 5.2. Mean perceived leader legitimacy as a function of message framing and leader gender. ……..……..……..……..……...…187

Figure 5.3. Mean perceived leader influence as a function of message framing and leader gender...189

Figure 5.4. Mean perceived relational leadership identification as a function of message framing and leader gender..…….…....….190

Figure 5.5. Mean perceived transformational leadership as a function of message framing and leader gender.…….....…...…..…191

Figure 5.6. Mean sense of common cause as a function of message framing and leader gender.....193

Figure 5.7. Number of participants who agreed to sign the online petition (behavioural measure) as a function of collective action intentions scale item 3 (behavioural intention)…….….196

Figure 5.8. Mean hostile sexism as a function of message framing and leader gender..……..…..198

Figure 5.9. Number of Participants who agreed to sign the online petition (behavioural measure) as a function of collective action intentions scale item 3 (behavioural intention)…….....….221

Figure 5.10. Mean National identification as a function of message framing and leader gender..... 221

Figure 5.11. Mean Perceived threat to men's gender groups as a function of leader gender, superordinate identity salience, and message framing..…….....….....…..…...…..…..222

Figure 6.1. Number of Participants who agreed to sign the online petition (behavioural measure) as a function of collective action intentions scale item 3 (behavioural intention).....248

Figure 6.2. Mean Feelings of blame as a function of message framing and leader gender.....251

Figure 6.3. Mean perceived leader legitimacy as a function of message framing and participant gender.……..…..…..…….281

Figure 6.4. Mean sense of common cause with men as a function of message framing and participant gender.…….…..…..……...…..….285

Figure 6.5. Number of participants who agreed to sign (or not sign) one of the online petitions (behavioural measure) as a function of message framing condition.…….286

Figure 6.6. Number of male and female participants who agreed to sign (or not sign) one of the online petitions (behavioural measure).…….…..…..…….…..….287

List of Tables

Table 4.1 *Participant exclusion distribution rates and final participant gender distribution numbers by condition, based on participants who failed the leader gender manipulation check*……...112

Table 4.2 *Participant exclusion distribution rates and final participant gender distribution numbers by condition, based on participants who failed the leader gender manipulation check*……...140

Table 5.1 *Participant exclusion distribution rates and final participant gender distribution numbers by condition, based on participants who failed the leader gender manipulation check*…….....183

Table 5.2 *Participant exclusion distribution rates and final participant gender distribution numbers by condition, based on participants who failed the leader gender manipulation check*.....214

Table 6.1 *Participant exclusion distribution rates and final participant gender distribution numbers by condition, based on participants who failed the leader gender manipulation check*……...243

Table 6.2 *Participant exclusion distribution rates and final participant gender distribution numbers by condition, based on participants who failed the leader gender manipulation check*..……...277

Abstract

The burden of achieving gender equality is typically placed on women, limiting men's involvement in the movement. In contrast to work focusing on women's experiences as targets of discrimination, we propose a solidarity-based approach positioning men and women as *agents of change,* which relies on two key processes: leadership – particularly leadership as a form of influence based on shared identities among leaders and followers; and political solidarity as a way to mobilise the silent majority (men) to work as allies beside a minority (women) and embrace equality as a common cause for *both* groups.

This thesis examines how to mobilise a broader audience for gender equality, and how leadership and social identity dynamics affect that mobilisation. Three empirical programs (totalling six experiments) investigate how best to increase women's and men's support for equality. Key independent variables of interest are leader gender, message framing, and social identity. Program 1 examines whether solidarity-based frames are more effective than traditional frames which focus on either fixing (Experiment 1; $N = 338$) or blaming women (Experiment 2; $N = 336$). Program 2 investigates how emphasising different levels of subgroup and superordinate identities (Experiment 3; $N = 251$; Experiment 4; $N = 319$) affects men's mobilisation. Program 3 investigates whether positioning men as being responsible for gender inequality (Experiment 5; $N = 258$), or being fellow victims of gender inequality (Experiment 6; $N = 543$) affects their mobilisation.

Our findings suggest men are doubly advantaged in mobilising followers because they possess a shared identity with male and female followers: shared gender identity and ingroup membership with men, and shared cause (in the form of equality) with women. We also demonstrate that leaders' ability to mobilise followers goes beyond gender to encompass the

rhetoric they adopt when discussing (in)equality. Essentially, solidarity-based message frames are an effective starting point for increasing individuals' receptivity to leaders but may not be sufficient for mobilising support.

Keywords: gender equality, leadership, solidarity action, social change, social identity, collective action, message framing