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**Appendix A – Pilot Field Study**

**Examining the Professional Prototypes of Sexist Supervisors**

To test the assumption that sexist supervisors hold masculine professional prototypes and more pro-gender diversity supervisors hold balanced professional prototypes, we conducted a correlational survey of supervisors from a large, urban fire department.

**Method**

***Participants***

We invited 101 Chief Officers (i.e., at the ranks of Battalion Chief through Fire Chief) of a large, urban fire department to participate. Seventy-six completed the survey and agreed to allow us to use their responses for research purposes. Our final sample was 92 percent male (the population in the department is 97 percent male) and had an average of 29.32 years of experience (*SD* = 5.6 years) in the fire department.

***Measures***

 **Perceived Trait Importance and Prototype Perceptions.** Following previous methods for assessing firefighter professional prototypes (Danbold & Bendersky, 2020), participants rated 14 traits (physical strength, physical and mental stamina, courage, decisive decision-making, mental resiliency, problem-solving skills, self-discipline, ability to work in teams, team orientation, patience, kindheartedness, warmth, empathy, and compassion) according to “the extent to which [they] think the following traits are relatively more or less essential to being a successful, modern firefighter” (1 = somewhat essential to 7 = absolutely essential; “*trait importance”*).In order to determine the degree to which the prototype is balanced or masculine, we administered a separate pilot study (on Amazon Mechanical Turk with 304 participants) to measure the gender stereotypicality of these same traits (1 = extremely feminine to 7 = extremely masculine; “*trait gender stereotypicality”*). We used these data to represent supervisors’ prototypes by calculating the association between trait gender stereotypicality and trait importance, and looking at how this relationship varies among supervisors with different levels of inclusive and traditional values and diversity attitudes.

**Endorsed Values.** We asked participants to indicate the extent to which they saw the professional value of inclusion as “core to [their] identity as a member of the department” (1 = not at all important to me to 7 = extremely important to me) because values that are core to one’s identity manifest visibly in the way one conducts their job (Skitka, Bauman, & Sargis, 2005). Furthermore, to situate inclusion in the nomological network of related and distinct constructs in this context, we identified seven other values that were relevant to and representative of the fire service based on prior qualitative studies of fire departments (O'Neill & Rothbard, 2017; Pratt, 2017). We measured endorsement of tolerance to establish convergent validity with inclusion, and endorsement of tradition to establish divergent validity with inclusion. We also measured participants’ endorsement of five values that we did not expect to be associated with holding a balanced or masculine prototype: progress, stability, innovation, integrity, and consistency. All values were single-item measures.

**Support for Gender Diversification Efforts.** As an additional test of convergent validity with inclusion, we asked five questions about respondents’ support for departmental gender diversification efforts on 7-point scales from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree, adapted from Danbold and Bendersky (2020) (e.g., “I am concerned that more women in the [department] will make the department less safe” (reverse-coded); “I am optimistic that more women in the [department] will make the department more fair.” *α* = .85).

**Results**

 We present descriptive statistics and inter-item correlations in Table A1. All analyses were conducted in RStudio Version 1.1.463.

***Association Between Prototypes, Values, and Support for Diversification Efforts***

To determine the degree to which supervisors at different levels of endorsed values held a masculine or balanced prototype, we regressed trait importance (i.e., how essential traits are to the prototype) on the interaction between trait gender stereotypicality (i.e., the gender stereotypicality rating of each trait, with higher values indicating more masculine) and, in separate models, each endorsed value. We did the same with the support for gender diversification efforts scale in a separate regression analysis. We report the full results tables for each model in Table A2. We tested the form of each significant interaction to determine at what values of the moderator (endorsed value or gender diversity support) there was a significant positive relationship between trait gender stereotypicality and trait importance, indicating a masculine prototype, and a weak or non-significant relationship, indicating a balanced prototype.

Looking at the total sample, and consistent with the findings of Danbold & Bendersky (2020), we observed a significant positive relationship between trait gender stereotypicality and trait importance such that, on average, our respondents rated stereotypically masculine traits as more important than stereotypically feminine traits (*B* = 0.24, 95% Confidence Interval = [0.14, 0.34], *p* < .001, *η2*= 0.02). This is consistent with our prediction that, at baseline, fire service professionals hold a masculine (as opposed to a balanced) professional prototype.

Endorsement of all of the three values we identified *a priori* as likely associated with holding a balanced prototype significantly moderated the association between trait gender stereotypicality and trait importance. As predicted, both the endorsement of inclusion (interaction term: *B* = -.25, [-0.36, -0.14], *p* < .001, *η2p* = 0.02) and the endorsement of tolerance (interaction term: *B* = -.17, [-0.26, -0.09], *p* < .001, *η2p* = 0.02) significantly attenuated the positive relationship between trait gender stereotypicality and trait importance. Also, as expected, the endorsement of tradition significantly moderated that association, but in the opposite direction (interaction term: *B* = .07, [0.01, 0.14], *p* = .022, *η2p* < 0.01). There was no significant interaction between trait gender stereotypicality and endorsement of any other value. In addition to these three values, support for gender diversity efforts significantly moderated the effect of trait gender stereotypicality on trait importance (interaction term: *B* = -0.16, [-0.22, -0.10], *p* < .001, *η2p* < 0.02).

To better understand the patterns of the significant interactions, we conducted a series of simple slope analyses to identify at which levels of value endorsement and support for gender diversity efforts participants held a balanced or a masculine prototype. Because most of the value endorsement ratings were positively skewed (the median scores for inclusion and tolerance were 6 and the median score for tradition was 5), we examined the slope of the relationship between trait gender stereotypicality and trait importance at more meaningful, specific levels of the moderators rather than at ± 1 SD from the mean (Dawson, 2014). Based on the scale anchors, we coded ratings of 3 as low, 5 as medium, and 7 as high. As can be seen in Figure A1, we observed a balanced prototype (i.e., a null relationship between trait gender stereotypicality and importance) when endorsement of inclusion was high (*B* = .03, SE = .07, *p* = .643), endorsement of tolerance was high (*B* = .06, SE = .07, *p* = .359), when support for gender diversity efforts was high (*B* = -.13, SE = .10, *p* = .162), and when endorsement of tradition was low (*B* = .09, SE = .08, *p* = .251). We observed a masculine prototype (i.e., a significant and positive relationship between trait gender stereotypicality and importance) when endorsement of inclusion was low (*B* = 1.04, SE = .18, *p* < .001), when endorsement of tolerance was low (*B* = .75, SE = .13, *p* < .001), when support for gender diversity efforts was low (*B* = .52, SE = .07, *p* < .001), and when endorsement of tradition was high (*B* = .40, SE = .08, *p* < .001).

**Discussion**

Consistent with our predictions, we observed that sexist supervisors (i.e., those low in the endorsement of inclusion and tolerance, high in the endorsement of tradition, and low in support for gender diversification efforts) were indeed those who held masculine professional prototypes. The opposite was true for pro-gender diversity supervisors (i.e., those at the opposite ends of the spectra for values and support for gender diversification efforts). These findings support our prediction that if subordinates infer the professional prototype of sexist supervisors to be masculine (and then make prototype alignment judgments based on this), they are doing so relatively accurately.

**Table A1**

*Supervisor Pilot Study Descriptives And Inter-Item Correlations.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Inclusion | Tolerance | Tradition | Progress | Innovation | Stability | Consistency | Integrity | Support for Gender Diversification |
| MeanSDSkewness | 6.170.87-0.81 | 5.961.16-1.39 | 4.951.49-0.49 | 6.290.80-1.02 | 5.921.06-0.99 | 5.971.03-1.10 | 6.390.80-1.42 | 6.910.29-2.77 | 4.631.42-0.41 |
| Inclusion | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tolerance | .55\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tradition | -.09 | .11 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progress | .43\*\* | .40\*\* | .10 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Innovation | .25\* | .31\*\* | .02 | .58\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |
| Stability | .03 | .19 | .41\*\* | .19 | .07 | - |  |  |  |
| Consistency | .04 | .02 | .35\*\* | .11 | .10 | .48\*\* | - |  |  |
| Integrity | .06 | .07 | -.01 | .12 | -.11 | .12 | -.01 | - |  |
| Supp. for Gender Div. | .29\* | .36\* | -.32\*\* | .04 | -.06 | -.14 | -.21† | .04 | - |

*Note.* † *p* < .100; \* *p* < .050; \*\* *p* < .010

**Table A2**

*Predicting Trait Importance by Trait Masculinity x Value Interaction*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Trait Importance | *B* (SE) |
| (Intercept) | -2.10 (1.51) |
| **Inclusion** | 1.18\*\* (.24) |
| Trait Masculinity | 1.79\*\* (.36) |
| Inclusion \* Trait Masculinity | -0.26\*\* (.06) |
| (Intercept) | 0.21 (1.10) |
| **Tolerance** | 0.83\*\* (.18) |
| Trait Masculinity | 1.25\*\* (.26) |
| Tolerance \* Trait Masculinity | -0.18\*\* (.04) |
| (Intercept) | 6.91\*\* (.74) |
| **Tradition** | -0.35\* (.14) |
| Trait Masculinity | -0.18 (.18) |
| Tradition \* Trait Masculinity | 0.08\* (.03) |
| (Intercept) | 1.39 (1.68) |
| **Progress** | 0.60\* (.27) |
| Trait Masculinity | 0.81\* (.40) |
| Progress \* Trait Masculinity | -0.10 (.06) |
| (Intercept) | 4.50\*\* (1.20) |
| **Innovation** | 0.11 (.20) |
| Trait Masculinity | 0.11 (.29) |
| Innovation \* Trait Masculinity | 0.02 (.05) |
| (Intercept) | 5.29\*\* (1.25) |
| **Stability** | -0.02 (.21) |
| Trait Masculinity | 0.17 (.30) |
| Stability \* Trait Masculinity | 0.01 (.05) |
| (Intercept) | 3.26† (1.71) |
| **Consistency** | 0.30 (.27) |
| Trait Masculinity | 0.57 (.41) |
| Consistency \* Trait Masculinity | -0.06 (.06) |
| (Intercept) | -5.51 (5.05) |
| **Integrity** | 1.55\* (.73) |
| Trait Masculinity | 2.47\* (1.20) |
| Integrity \* Trait Masculinity | -0.33† (.17) |
| (Intercept) | 1.53\* (.72) |
| **Support for Gender Diversification Efforts** | 0.77\*\* (.15) |
| Trait Masculinity | 0.99\*\* (.17) |
| Support for Gender Diversification Efforts \* Trait Masculinity | -0.17\*\* (.04) |

*Note.* † *p* < .100; \* *p* < .050; \*\* *p* < .010

**Figure A1**

*Relationship Between Trait Importance and Trait Gender Stereotypicality at Levels of Value Endorsement and Support for Gender Diversification Efforts*



*Note.* Flat slopes (i.e., null relationships) indicate balanced prototypes; positive slopes indicate masculine prototypes.

**Appendix B – Study A & B Prototype Manipulation**

*Introductory Video Transcript:*

“Hello, I’m [author identified]. I’m conducting a research project about modern day firefighting in the United States. The fire service has changed dramatically in the last few decades thanks to improvements in fire safety and changes to our nation’s medical response system. Today, less than 5% of the calls firefighters respond to involve putting out fires. In contrast, about 70% of the situations firefighters respond to are medical emergencies.

My colleagues and I have been asking firefighters what they think are the most important characteristics for modern firefighters to have in order to succeed in the fire service given these changes to the job. We have recorded videos of several of them reading their answers to this question. On the next screen, you will watch one of these videos, selected at random, and then answer questions about your own impressions of modern-day firefighting. Please pay close attention to what the firefighter in the video you watch says as you may be surprised by some of their answers.”

*Prototype Balancing Manipulation Video Transcript – Balanced Prototype Condition:*

“Question 1: Please tell us who you are and your current rank in the fire service.

I’m [firefighter name], Captain, Paramedic and Arson Investigator for the Culver City fire department in Southern California.

Question 2: Modern firefighting is a very complex job and firefighters are required to respond to many different kinds of emergency situations that call for a wide variety of skills. What do you think are the most important characteristics of successful firefighters today?

In my experience, the most important characteristics to be successful as a firefighter, in order of importance, are: compassion, team orientation, and physical strength.

First and foremost, a firefighter needs to have a lot of compassion. We often interact with people in the worst situations of their lives, and effective firefighters understand and respect what the victims and their families are going through. Being able to calm people down under those circumstances and show them empathy is an important part of being a true firefighter.

The second most important trait is team orientation. Firefighters need to be able to live and work together harmoniously and effectively. A good firefighter is someone who is able to get along with everyone and willing to contribute tirelessly to the team.

The third most important trait for firefighters to have is physical strength. This is a physically demanding job and firefighters need to be strong enough to handle it. The important thing for me is knowing that the other firefighters are strong enough to get me out safely if I go down in a fire.

Again, a true firefighter is someone who excels in compassion, has solid team orientation, and is able to bring physical strength to the job.”

In summary, the fire service values strong bodies and minds and cohesive teams, but compassion is key. Simply put, the heart is a firefighter's most valuable asset.

Using the space below, please write a few sentences about why compassion could be considered the most important trait of a successful firefighter, above all other traits.

*Prototype Balancing Manipulation Video Transcript – Masculine Prototype Condition:*

“Question 1: Please tell us who you are and your current rank in the fire service.

I’m [firefighter name], Captain, Paramedic and Arson Investigator for the Culver City fire department in Southern California.

Question 2: Modern firefighting is a very complex job and firefighters are required to respond to many different kinds of emergency situations that call for a wide variety of skills. What do you think are the most important characteristics of successful firefighters today?

In my experience, the most important characteristics to be successful as a firefighter, in order of importance, are: physical strength, team orientation, and compassion.

First and foremost, a firefighter needs to have a lot of physical strength. This is a physically demanding job and firefighters need to be strong enough to handle it. The most important thing for me is knowing that the other firefighters are strong enough to get me out safely if I go down in a fire.

The second most important trait is team orientation. Firefighters need to be able to live and work together harmoniously and effectively. A good firefighter is someone who is able to get along with everyone and willing to contribute tirelessly to the team.

The third most important trait for firefighters to have is compassion. We often interact with people in the worst situations of their lives, and effective firefighters understand and respect what the victims and their families are going through. Being able to calm people down under those circumstances and show them empathy is an important part of being a true firefighter.

Again, a true firefighter is someone who excels in physical strength, has solid team orientation, and is able to bring compassion to the job.”

Please think about what this firefighter just told you about what it means to be a true firefighter.

Using the space below, please write a few sentences about why physical strength could be considered the most important trait of a successful firefighter, above all other traits.

**Appendix C – Study A & B Supervisor Manipulation**

*Sexist Supervisor*

Imagine that you are a firefighter who has just been assigned to work on a crew that reports to Captain Jones. Please read the following description of Captain Jones.

Captain Jones is just over six feet tall, White, middle-aged, and has strong facial features and an athletic build. He is deeply religious and politically identifies as a conservative, but is not extreme in either belief. In these and many other ways, Captain Jones has a lot in common with most other firefighters.

In his interactions with you and the other firefighters, you recognize that Captain Jones is very focused and disciplined. He emphasizes the entire crew performing to the best of their ability at all times. He makes sure that everyone is always training and conducts rigorous drills regularly in the fire station.

Another thing you notice about Captain Jones is that he’s not the most warm and supportive person you’ve ever met. He acts professionally with both the crew and the community members you serve, but he rarely engages in, or encourages, friendly conversations about anything other than the essential elements of the job.

One day, you hear Captain Jones talking about recent efforts to increase gender diversity in the fire service. His stance is that efforts to increase the number of women firefighters are well-intentioned but **misplaced**. He notes that, “a lot of people think that only men can be firefighters and that’s not true. **However, at the end of the day, firefighting is fundamentally a masculine profession.**” He adds, “**it should not shock people that we see so few women in the fire service**."

*Pro-Gender Diversity Supervisor*

Imagine that you are a firefighter who has just been assigned to work on a crew that reports to Captain Jones. Please read the following description of Captain Jones.

Captain Jones is just over six feet tall, White, middle-aged, and has strong facial features and an athletic build. He is deeply religious and politically identifies as a conservative, but is not extreme in either belief. In these and many other ways, Captain Jones has a lot in common with most other firefighters.

In his interactions with you and the other firefighters, you recognize that Captain Jones is very focused and disciplined. He emphasizes the entire crew performing to the best of their ability at all times. He makes sure that everyone is always training and conducts rigorous drills regularly in the fire station.

Another thing you notice about Captain Jones is that he’s not the most warm and supportive person you’ve ever met. He acts professionally with both the crew and the community members you serve, but he rarely engages in, or encourages, friendly conversations about anything other than the essential elements of the job.

One day, you hear Captain Jones talking about recent efforts to increase gender diversity in the fire service. His stance is that efforts to increase the number of women firefighters are well-intentioned and **worth-supporting**. He notes that, “a lot of people think that only men can be firefighters and that’s not true. **At the end of the day, firefighting is not necessarily a masculine profession**.” He adds, “**it should shock people that we see so few women in the fire service**."

**Appendix D – Study A & B Scale Items**

**Perceived Professional Prototype Alignment**

*Developed by the authors*

Please take a moment to think about the following question -- what does it mean to be a true or ideal firefighter? Now think about how Captain Jones would answer that question and the extent to which your beliefs are similar.

Now, using the scale provided, please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements about Captain Jones.

1) Captain Jones generally agrees with my beliefs about what makes a great member of my profession.

2) Captain Jones shares my opinion about what is important in a member of my profession.

3) Captain Jones’ perceptions of what matters to being a successful member of my profession largely overlap with mine.

**Supervisor Endorsement**

*Adapted from Platow and van Knippenberg (2001) to refer to Captain Jones*

Now please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about Captain Jones.

1) If I could choose to follow any Fire Captain I would choose Captain Jones.

2) Captain Jones is an excellent Fire Captain.

3) I do not think Captain Jones is a good Fire Captain.

**Perceived Value Congruence**

*Adapted from Hayibor, et al. (2011) to refer to Captain Jones*

Please think about the values Captain Jones holds and how they compare with yours.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about Captain Jones?

1) My basic beliefs about what is important in life are identical to Captain Jones'.

2) I deeply believe in the same ultimate values as Captain Jones does.

**Group Prototypicality**

*Adapted from van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg (2005) to refer to Captain Jones*

Please think about the various traits that Captain Jones possesses and how they compare to the traits of other firefighters.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about Captain Jones?

1) Captain Jones is a good example of the kind of people that are firefighters.

2) Captain Jones represents what is characteristic of firefighters.

3) Captain Jones has a lot in common with firefighters.

**General Leader Prototypicality**

*Adapted from van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg (2005) to mirror Group Prototypicality items above, but measuring the prototypicality of leaders in general*

Please think about the various traits that Captain Jones possesses and how they compare to the traits of other leaders in general (not just those in the fire service).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about Captain Jones?

1) Captain Jones is a good example of a leader.

2) Captain Jones represents what is characteristic of leaders in general.

3) Captain Jones has a lot in common with other leaders.

**Supervisor Likeability**

*Adapted from Johnson, et al. (2008) to refer to Captain Jones*

Now please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about Captain Jones.

1) I like Captain Jones.

2) Captain Jones is likable.

3) I would enjoy working with Captain Jones.

**Appendix E – Construct Validation Study**

Before testing our full model in an experimental setting, we conducted a measurement validation study. We aimed to show discriminant validity between the scale we developed to measure PPPA and three conceptually related mechanisms of supervisor endorsement – perceived value congruence, general leader prototypicality, and group prototypicality.

**Method**

***Participants***

499 US-based participants recruited through Mechanical Turk completed our study. Participants were eligible to participate only if they had previously indicated that they were actively employed as part of CloudResearch (previously TurkPrime; Litman et al., 2017) panel demographics. Participants were paid $1.00. Forty-seven percent were women, they were 39.71 years old on average (SD = 10.66), and 77 percent were White Americans.

***Procedures***

Because our measures refer to a specific supervisor, we asked participants to think about their past experience working for a supervisor and “choose one specific leader and think about them for the duration of this survey.” To focus participants, we asked them some basic information about this supervisor (e.g., the nature of their relationship, their supervisor’s basic demographics) before moving onto our primary measures.

***Measures***

**Perceived Professional Prototype Alignment.** We measured participants’ perceptions of the degree to which they felt their professional prototype was aligned with the professional prototype held by their supervisor using three items. We framed the scale measures with the following text, “Take a moment to think about the following question – what does it mean to be a true or ideal member of your profession? Now think about how your leader would answer that question and the extent to which your beliefs are similar.” We then asked participants to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the following statements (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree): 1) “My leader generally agrees with my beliefs about what makes a great member of my profession,” 2) “My leader shares my opinion about what is important in a member of my profession,” 3) “My leader’s perceptions of what matters to being a successful member of my profession largely overlap with mine.” (α = .91, *M* = 5.23, *SD* = 1.27, *Skewness* = -1.13).

**Perceived Value Congruence.**We measured participants’ perceptions of the degree to which they felt their values were congruent with their supervisor’s by adapting a two-item scale of subjective value congruence developed by Hayibor, et al. (2011). We framed the scale items with the following text, “Please think about the values your leader holds and how they compare with yours.” We then asked participants to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the following statements (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree): 1) “My basic beliefs about what is important in life are identical to my leader’s,” 2) “I deeply believe in the same ultimate values as my leader does.” (*r* = .84, *p* < .001, *M* = 4.61, *SD* = 1.47, *Skewness* = -.64).

**General Leader Prototypicality.**We measured participants’ perceptions of the degree to which they felt their supervisor was representative of their general leader prototype. For simplicity, rather than using the multi-item measures typically used to study implicit leadership theories (e.g., Epitropaki & Martin, 2004), we adapted the measures we used for Group Prototypicality, but shifted the benchmark against which the leader was being evaluated to be subordinates’ general leader prototypes. We framed the scale items with the following text, “Please think about the various traits that your leader possesses and how they compare to the traits of other leaders in general.” We then asked participants to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the following statements (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree): 1) “My leader is a good example of a leader,” 2) “My leader represents what is characteristic of leaders in general,” 3) “My leader has a lot in common with other leaders.” (α = .90, *M* = 5.08, *SD* = 1.40, *Skewness* = -.96).

**Group Prototypicality.**We measured participants’ perceptions of the degree to which they felt their supervisor was representative of their general professional prototype using three previously validated items adapted from van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg (2005). We framed the scale items with the following text, “Please think about the various traits that your leader possesses and how they compare to the traits of other members of your profession.” We then asked participants to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the following statements (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree): 1) “My leader is a good example of the kind of people that are members of my profession,” 2) “My leader represents what is characteristic of my profession,” 3) “My leader has a lot in common with members of my profession.” (α = .92, *M* = 5.16, *SD* = 1.29, *Skewness* = -.96).

**Results**

We first examined the interitem correlations between our four scales. As reported in Table E1, we observed significant positive correlations between all pairs of our constructs. We then ran four different confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) with all observations included in the same set of measured variables. In the first model, we treated each of our four scales as separate latent factors that we allowed to covary. Our second model included three latent factors with PPPA combined with perceived value congruence. Our third model also included three latent factors but combined PPPA with group prototypicality. Finally, our fourth model had three latent factors with PPPA combined with general leader prototypicality.

Results of our four CFA models are shown in Table E2. Using several indicators of model fit (Kenny, 2020), we observed that our predicted model with four latent factors was a better fit than the other three models. This suggests that, as predicted, PPPA is best treated as a separate construct from perceived value congruence, general leader prototypicality, and group prototypicality.

**Table E1**

*Interitem Correlations*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Perceived Professional Prototype Alignment | Group Prototypicality | General Leader Prototypicality | Perceived Value Congruence  |
| Perceived Professional Prototype Alignment | - |  |  |  |
| Group Prototypicality | .68\*\*\* | - |  |  |
| General Leader Prototypicality | .71\*\*\* | .72\*\*\* | - |  |
| Perceived Value Congruence | .68\*\*\* | .60\*\*\* | .64\*\*\* | - |

**Table E2**

*Construct Validity Comparative CFA results*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | χ2 (*df*), *p* – value | CFI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| Four latent factors | 138.06 (38), <.001 | .980 | .073 | .026 |
| Three latent factors: PPPA with Perceived Value Congruence | 448.81 (41), <.001 | .918 | .144 | .047 |
| Three latent factors: PPPA with Group Prototypicality | 623.61 (41), <.001 | .883 | .169 | .056 |
| Three latent factors: PPPA with General Leader Prototypicality | 462.81 (41), <.001 | .916 | .144 | .046 |

**Appendix F – Study A & B Total Effects**

Although in this paper we do not hypothesize total effects of our experimental conditions on supervisor endorsement, we present the results here. In Study A, we observed a marginally significant main effect of our prototype manipulation (*B* = -0.24, 95% Confidence Interval = [-0.50, 0.02], *p* = .067, *η2p* < 0.01), a significant main effect of our supervisor manipulation (*B* = 0.90, [0.67, 1.13], *p* < .001, *η2p* = 0.16), and a marginally significant interaction between the two (*B* = 0.31, [-0.03, 0.64], *p* = .072, *η2p* < .01). Planned contrasts revealed that participants evaluating the sexist supervisor scored marginally significantly lower endorsement when in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 4.17, *SE* = 0.10) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 4.41, *SE* = 0.08, *p* = .067, *d* = 0.17). There was no difference between participants evaluating the pro-gender diversity supervisor when in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 5.38, *SE* = 0.07) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 5.31, *SE* = 0.08, *p* = .539, *d* = 0.06).

 In Study B, we observed a non-significant main effect of our prototype manipulation (*B* = -0.19, 95% Confidence Interval = [-0.42, 0.04], *p* = .111, *η2p* < 0.01), a significant main effect of our supervisor manipulation (*B* = 0.82, [0.62, 1.01], *p* < .001, *η2p* = 0.13), and a non-significant interaction between the two (*B* = 0.18, [-0.10, 0.47], *p* = .210, *η2p* < .01). Planned contrasts revealed no difference between participants evaluating the sexist supervisor when in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 4.47, *SE* = 0.09) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 4.66, *SE* = 0.08, *p* = .111, *d* = 0.13). Participants evaluating the pro-gender diversity supervisor also scored no differently in endorsement when in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 5.47, *SE* = 0.06) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 5.48, *SE* = 0.07, *p* = .968, *d* = .01).

Given the theorized and observed relationship between supervisor endorsement and likeability (i.e., sexist supervisors face a large likeability penalty compared to pro-gender diversity supervisors, likely for going against current pro-diversity norms; Bell & Hartmann, 2007), we reran these analyses controlling for likeability. In Study A, we observed a marginally significant main effect of our prototype manipulation (*B* = -0.14, 95% Confidence Interval = [-0.29, 0.01], *p* = .065, *η2p* < 0.01), a significant main effect of our supervisor manipulation (*B* = 0.20, [0.04, 0.36], *p* = .015, *η2p* = 0.05), a significant main effect of likeability (*B* = 0.69, [0.65, 0.73], *p* < .001, *η2p* = .60), and a significant interaction between the two condition variables (*B* = 0.24, [0.03, 0.45], *p* = .024, *η2p* = .01). Planned contrasts revealed that participants evaluating the sexist supervisor scored marginally significantly lower endorsement when in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 4.58, *SE* = 0.05) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 4.72, *SE* = 0.05, *p* = .065, *d* = 0.18). There was no difference between participants evaluating the pro-gender diversity supervisor in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 5.02, *SE* = 0.05) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 4.91, *SE* = 0.06, *p* = .181, *d* = 0.13).

Controlling for likeability in Study B, we observed a marginally significant main effect of our prototype manipulation (*B* = -0.13, 95% Confidence Interval = [-0.26, 0.01], *p* = .064, *η2p* < 0.01), a non-significant main effect of our supervisor manipulation (*B* = 0.10, [-0.03, 0.23], *p* = .138, *η2p* = 0.01), a significant main effect of likeability (*B* = 0.69, [0.65, 0.73], *p* < .001, *η2p* = .62), and a significant interaction between the two condition variables (*B* = 0.19, [0.01, 0.36], *p* = .039, *η2p* < .01). Planned contrasts revealed that participants evaluating the sexist supervisor scored marginally significantly lower endorsement when in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 4.85, *SE* = 0.05) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 4.98, *SE* = 0.05, *p* = .064, *d* = 0.15). There was no difference between participants evaluating the pro-gender diversity supervisor in the balanced prototype condition (*M* = 5.14, *SE* = 0.04) than in the masculine prototype condition (*M* = 5.08, *SE* = 0.05, *p* = .327, *d* = 0.08).