Electronic Supplementary Material 2:
Results of multi-group analysis for gender effects

To examine whether the relationships predicted by H1-3 differ between females and males, we conducted a multi-group analysis and compared the χ^2 value of the unconstrained model (i.e., the model in which all paths are allowed to vary among females and males) with that of the constrained model (i.e., the model in which equality constraints were placed on all paths; Byrne, 2004). The chi-square difference test failed to produce a significant change ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1.59$, df = 10, p = .998). The finding that regression weights in the model as a whole for females and males were not invariant suggests that there was no moderating effect of gender. To further examine whether any path differs between the female and male groups, we compared each path in Figure 1 between the two groups. ESM 4 presents the table of standardized regression weights and critical ratios for differences between parameters in each gender group. None of the critical ratio values was larger than 1.96 (Byrne, 2009), indicating that the regression weights for any of the paths were significantly different between the female and male groups.

Standardized Regression Weights and Critical Ratio for Differences between Parameters between female and male groups

	Female (n = 119)	Male (n = 81)	Critical ratio
Similarity condition → Goal attainability	β = .04 (p = .640)	β = .07 (p = .485)	-.22
Dispositional optimism → Goal attainability	β = .36 (p < .001)	β = .36 (p < .001)	-.07
Goal attainability → Inspiration	β = .26 (p < .01)	β = .14 (p = .206)	.78
Similarity condition → Inspiration	β = .28 (p < .001)	β = .21 (p < .05)	.53
Dispositional optimism → Inspiration	β = .09 (p = .299)	β = .22 (p < .05)	-.95