r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 yr. ago
lightning_palm

                                                                                                                                          •••

On the Gender Empathy Gap and its correlates: a comprehensive collection of resources (Part II)

`resource`

- **[Part 1](#)**
- Part 2 (you are here)
- **[Part 3](#)**
- **[Part 4](#)**

Women are Wonderful Effect

According to [Wikipedia — Women-are-wonderful effect](#):

> The women-are-wonderful effect is the phenomenon found in psychological and sociological research which suggests that **people associate more positive attributes with women compared to men**. This bias reflects an emotional bias toward women as a general case. The phrase was coined by Alice Eagly and Antonio Mladinic in 1994 after finding that both male and female participants tend to assign positive traits to women, with **female participants showing a far more pronounced bias**. Positive traits were assigned to men by participants of both genders, but to a far lesser degree. [...] One study found that the effect is mediated by increased gender equality. The mediation comes not from differences in attitudes towards women, but in attitudes towards men. In more egalitarian societies, people have more positive attitudes towards men than in less egalitarian societies. [...] Some authors have claimed the "Women are wonderful" effect is applicable when women follow traditional gender roles such as child nurturing and stay-at-home housewife. However, other authors have cited studies indicating that **the women-are-wonderful effect is still applicable even when women are in nontraditional gender roles**, and the original Eagly, Mladinic & Otto (1991) study discovering the women-are-wonderful effect found no such ambivalence.

[Nursery Rhyme — What Are Little Boys Made Of?](#)

```
What are little boys made of?
What are little boys made of?
  Snakes, snails
  And puppy-dogs' tails
That's what little boys are made of

What are little girls made of?
What are little girls made of?
  Sugar and spice
  And all things nice
That's what little girls are made of
```

In [Are Women Evaluated More Favorably Than Men?: An Analysis of Attitudes, Beliefs, and Emotions (Eagly et al., 1991)](#) the authors state:

> In an experiment in which male and female respondents evaluated the social category of women or men on several types of measures, analysis of respondents' attitudes toward the sexes and of the evaluative content of their beliefs established that they evaluated women more favorably than men. In addition, analysis of respondents' emotional reactions toward women and men did not yield evidence of negativity toward women at the emotional level. Nor did it appear that respondents' very positive evaluations of women masked ambivalence toward them. This research, therefore, provides strong evidence that **women are evaluated quite favorably—in fact, more favorably than men**.

In [People Judge Discrimination Against Women More Harshly Than Discrimination Against Men – Does Statistical Fairness Discrimination Explain Why? (Feess et al. 2021)](#) the authors find that **people judge hiring discrimination against women more harshly than discrimination against men** even when they were told that the man and the woman have worked equally hard in their career, that they would suffer equally badly from not getting the job and that the job is an industry without gender discrimination. There was also an ordering effect, i.e. respondents judge the behavior of the manager in both scenarios more morally wrong if they first saw the scenario with the discriminated woman, suggesting that the participants had a desire to treat each gender fairly, yet reacted more strongly in the scenario that the woman was discriminated against first. They also find that this can only partially be explained by statistical fairness discrimination, a process in which people use the gender of the victim to draw inferences about other characteristics which matter for their fairness judgments.

The authors of [Gender Stereotypes after Thirty Years: A Replication of Rosenkrantz, et al. (1968) (Nesbitt & Penn, 2000)](#) found that:

> In contrast to the participants in the original study, current participants judged the traits they associated with women to be significantly more socially desirable, in general, than the traits they associated with men.

In [Misogyny has no scientific basis of any kind: the evidence is of philogyny – and misandry (Moxon, 2018)](#), the author argues:

> **No published science paper demonstrates misogyny exists.** Data on both implicit and explicit gender attitudes shows males substantially favouring females — philogyny — or, at worst, gender neutrality. This is hidden by elision with the wider notion of sexism; but there's no evidence for hostile sexism, and hypothesised benevolent sexism is fatally flawed in operational definition. The mode whereby sexism supposedly causes harm — stereotyping (stereotype threat) — has been debunked; likewise inter-sexual dominance, removing any theoretical basis. Possible male harm by control is belied in women being found the controlling party. Misogyny / sexism in being defined circularly is unfalsifiable, therefore non-scientific conceptualisation: ideology itself actually hostile sexism(misandry, which is shown to be real but unseen).

According to [Lay misperceptions of the relationship between men's benevolent and hostile sexism (Yeung, 2012)](#), there is a positive association between hostile and benevolent sexism, even though people perceive an illusory negative one. **Males low in benevolent sexism are judged similarly to males high in hostile sexism** as being **"less supportive of female professionals, less good of father and husband, and more likely to perpetrate domestic violence"**. In [Chivalry is far from dead: Misperceiving the link between men's benevolent and hostile sexism (Yeung, 2018)](#) the same author states:

> Although prejudice has traditionally been conceptualized as a univalent antipathy towards a social group, sexist prejudice represents a more nuanced ambivalent attitude that mixes both hostile and benevolent elements. Theory and research on ambivalent sexism indicates that **hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes towards women reinforce one another and function together to perpetuate women's disadvantaged social status [personal note: I disagree with the study author that women have a disadvantaged social status]**. Indeed, at both the individual and population level, **endorsement of benevolent sexism tends to be positively correlated with endorsement of hostile sexism**. However, because benevolent sexism has a positive veneer people may fail to recognize that a person who is high in benevolent sexism is likely to also be high in hostile sexism whereas a person who is low in benevolent sexism is likely to be low in hostile sexism. In particular, I hypothesized that **because benevolent sexism is the dominant cultural model for how men should express their respect for women, a man who rejects benevolent sexism may be at risk of being misperceived as a hostile sexist who disrespects women rather than recognizing that such a man may reject benevolent sexism because he promotes women's independence and equality with men**. By contrast, people may more readily understand that a woman may reject benevolent sexism for such egalitarian reasons. To test these hypotheses I conducted a series of studies in which I experimentally manipulated a target individual's gender and then varied whether this individual endorsed or rejected either benevolent sexist beliefs or hostile sexist beliefs. After participants viewed this target's profile they were asked to estimate the target's levels of the other variety of sexism, their support for female professionals, their qualities as a spouse and parent, and their likelihood of

a male target who endorsed BS and also compared to a female target who rejected BS (Studies 1 and 2). This result suggests that people indeed perceive an illusory negative relationship between men's BS and HS, whereas for women they recognize that low BS can go along with low HS. The results of Study 2 replicated the results of Study 1 and addressed some issues with how endorsement versus rejection was operationalized. Study 3 demonstrated that people's misunderstanding of the relationship between BS and HS in men leads them to evaluate a man who rejects BS more negatively on warmth, agreeableness, interpersonal qualities, and morality. Finally, Study 4 examined the accuracy of participants' judgments of the low BS male target from Studies 1-3 by comparing participants' predictions to the scores of real-life participants whose BS scores matched those of the target. Despite the relative rarity of univalent sexists in real life, participants were much more likely to assume that low BS men were univalent hostile sexists rather than recognizing that it is actually more likely that men who reject BS also reject HS. **Cumulatively these results indicate that people have a fundamental misunderstanding of what a man's endorsement versus rejection of benevolent sexism indicates about his gender-related attitudes and behaviour as well as his broader character. The bias to assume that a man's rejection of benevolent sexism indicates disrespect for women provides insights into the social psychological processes that help to perpetuate benevolent sexist ideology.** The societal implications of these misperceptions and directions, possible moderators and cross-cultural variations, and directions for future research are discussed.

Men tend to be **more frightening and anger-producing than were females in [the] same situations** and females tend to be more frightened towards males, as shown in Gender differences in anger and fear as a function of situational context (Brody et al., 1995).

The authors of Sex Differences in the Ultimatum Game: An Evolutionary Psychology Perspective (Saad & Gill, 2001) found that **males are more likely to be altruistic to females than to males**, while females made equal offers independently of the sex of the recipient. They also state that the reason "male allocators are altruistic towards female recipients and competitive with male recipients is construed as a manifestation of social rules, which evolve from the male pre-disposition to use resources for attracting mates".

The paper The effects of a recipient's gender in a modified dictator game(Saad & Gill, 2001) found that in total in a modified dictator game, females received 75% more from males, while they received 36% more from other females. On average, **females receive roughly 52% more money than do males in the two-person dictator game**. The full results are here:

	male allocator	female allocator
male recipient	$1.23	$1.87
female recipient	$2.15	$2.55

According to the quillette.com article The Myth of Pervasive Misogyny (Clark & Winegard, 2020):

> Ironically, these pro-female preferences may explain why mainstream narratives focus so assiduously on the possibility of anti-female biases: **society cares more about the wellbeing of women than men and is thus less tolerant of disparities that disfavor them**. [...] The mainstream view is that we live in a sexist patriarchy that is persistently unfair toward women and privileges men in nearly all ways. And any claims to the contrary are treated as the protestations of benighted conservatives or other masculinist cranks. A Google Scholar search for misogyny yielded 114,000 results, whereas a search for misandry yielded only 2,340. We suspect this difference in interest in misogyny over misandry reflects not the relative prevalence of each type of prejudice, but rather greater concern for the wellbeing of women than men. **All of the arguments, anecdotes, and data forwarded to support the narrative that we live in an implacably misogynistic society, in fact, may be evidence of precisely the opposite.**

In The most human bot: Female gendering increases humanness perceptions of bots and acceptance of AI (Borau et al., 2021) the authors find people favor female over male bots because female bots are judged as warmer and more likely to experience emotions. **Female chatbots are seen as more human than male ones.**

A study titled Reactions to male-favouring versus female-favouring sex differences: A pre-registered experiment and Southeast Asian replication (Stewart-Williams et al. 2020) found that after participants where presented with fictional popular-science articles showing eithe male- or female-favoured sex differences (e.g. men/women are better at drawing or men/women lie less often) "**[b]oth sexes reacted less positively to the male-favouring differences, judging the findings to be less important, less credible, and more offensive, harmful, [...] upsetting [and more inherently sexist]** [after viewing a fictional popular-science article describing either a male-favouring or a female-favouring sex difference]", concluding that their "results are consistent with the idea that both sexes are more protective of women than men". This pro-female bias was observed among both male and female participants. On the other hand, **if the findings favored women, participants evaluated them as more important, more plausible, and more well-conducted**. This was shown in both a sample of Western participants and with Southeast Asian participants.

According to Do people care if men don't care about caring? The asymmetry in support for changing gender roles (Block et al., 2019), people support more social action to correct female underrepresentation in male-dominated professions than male underrepresentation in female-dominated professions. **This asyemmtrical support for change is predicted by gender distribution, not salary.**

The authors of Discovering and Categorising Language Biases in Reddit (Ferrer et al., 2021) measured different kinds of biases on http://www.reddit.com/ and among that gender bias for which they used data from r/TheRedPill and r/dating_advice. Unsurprisingly, they found a larger gender bias on r/TheRedPill. Do not make the mistake of comparing these two results, as r/TheRedPill is not an ordinary dating subreddit like r/dating_advice which is supposed to be neutral. A better comparison would have been r/TheRedPill and r/FemaleDatingStrategy. Regarding r/dating_advice, the authors state:

> Based on the distribution of biases (following the method in Section 3.1) [in r/dating_advice], we selected the top 200 most biased adjectives towards the 'female' and 'male' target sets and clustered them using k-means (r = 0.15), leaving 30 clusters for each target set of words. The most biased clusters towards women, such as *(okcupid, bumble)*, and *(exotic)*, are not clearly negatively biased (though we might ask questions about the implied exoticism in the latter term). The biased clusters towards men look more conspicuous: *(poor)*, *(irresponsible, erratic, unreliable, impulsive)* or *(pathetic, stupid, pedantic, sanctimonious, gross, weak, nonsensical, foolish)* are found among the most biased clusters. On top of that, *(abusive)*, *(narcissistic, misogynistic, egotistical, arrogant)*, and *(miserable, depressed)* are among the most sentiment negative clusters. **These terms indicate a significant negative bias towards men, evaluating them in terms of unreliability, pettiness and self-importance.**

The authors of Gender bias in clinicians' pathologization of atypical sexuality: a randomized controlled trial with mental health professionals (Fuss et al., 2018) state:

> The psychiatric classifcation of "normal" versus disordered sexual behavior has been a subject of some dispute. Although atypical sexual interests have been viewed traditionally as typically male, epidemiological data indicate its presence in both genders. We examined how gender and sexual orientation infuence whether or not atypical sexual behavior is classified as a mental disorder. Mental health professionals (N=546) were presented with five case vignettes where subjects exhibit paraphilic behaviors; one case with psychotic symptoms served as the control condition. For each vignette we randomly changed the described subject's gender (male/female), sexual orientation (homosexual/heterosexual), and presented diagnostic criteria (fulflled/ambiguous). **Female subjects were signifcantly less pathologized and overall less stigmatized in terms of exhibitionistic, frotteuristic, sexual sadistic and pedophilic behavior.** On the other hand, female sexual behavior that fulflled diagnostic criteria for masochistic disorder was more pathologized. Our results demonstrate that nosologically irrelevant factors, which may be related to different sexual norms for men and women, afect clinicians' decisions regarding atypical sexuality.

In Gendered White Lies: Women Are Given Inflated Performance Feedback Compared With Men (Zayas & Jampol, 2020) the authors show that **people are more likely to assume that manager's feedback towards women is less accurate and upwardly distorted**, that participants adjust their essay ratings upwards when giving feedback to females, and that women do not prefer this 'nicer' but less accurate performance rating. The reason for this might be that **because people have more compassion for women, it increases their likelihood of lying**. In Lying because we care: Compassion increases prosocial lying (Lupoli & Jampol, 2017) it is shown that the emotion of compassion causally increases and positively predicts prosocial lying, and that this was partially motivated by an enhanced importance placed on preventing emotional harm.

In "Do Ideologically Driven Scientific Agendas Impede the Understanding and Acceptance of Evolutionary Principles in Social Psychology?", chapter 2 of "The Politics of Social Psychology" (Hippel & Buss) a survey was emailed to a sample of psychologists, asking them about their attitudes concerning a range of evolutionary psychology claims and discoveries. **The psychologists polled were more inclined to support pro-female results than pro-male ones**; specifically, they were more likely to believe that women could have evolved to be more linguistically talented than males could have developed to be more mathematically talented than women.

The authors of Bad for Men, Better for Women: The Impact of Stereotypes During Negative Campaigns (Fridkin et al., 2008) found that "negative commercials are less effective at depressing evaluations of woman [political] candidates, compared to male [political] candidates".

The research article Stereotypes have changed over time and now more people think women are superior to men than the other way around. (Eagly et al., 2019) is a meta-analysis of 16 national U.S. opinion polls on gender stereotypes (N = 30,093 adults) extending from 1946 to 2018. Traits measured were communion (e.g., affectionate, emotional), agency (e.g., ambitious, courageous), and competence (e.g., intelligent, creative). Respondents indicated whether each trait is more true of women or men, or equally true of both. The authors found that "respondents now ascribe competence in general and intelligence more often to women than men, regardless of college education and birth cohort". Women were also thought of as more communal. The only trait in which men were perceived to be higher than women was agency. "**Contemporary gender stereotypes thus convey substantial female advantage** in communion and a smaller male advantage in agency but also gender equality in competence along with some female advantage."

According to Equalitarianism: A Source of Liberal Bias (Winegard et al., 2018) people who see groups as oppressed and privileged cannot make fair judgments on groups they consider privileged, even if they believe they should. **People evaluate science that suggests that women score higher on IQ tests than men more favorably than science that suggests the opposite.**

In this preprint with the title A Cross-cultural Analysis of Censorship on Campuses (Clark et al., 2020), the authors find that **people would rather censor a book in which it is claimed that men evolved to be better leaders than women than a book in which the opposite is claimed**.

According to Accuracy and Bias in Stereotypes about the Social and Political Attitudes of Women and Men (Diekman et al., 2002), **"participants consistently underestimated men's support for female-stereotypic positions on issues"** and that analysis yielded that "these data suggested that this error rose from perceptions that men would oppose policies that favored women's interests". People underestimated men's support for women.

According to Reactions to affirmative action policies in hiring: Effects of framing and beneficiary gender (Sinclair & Carlsson, 2021) people do not like affirmative action, but even less when the beneficiaries are male.

According to this Master's thesis called Double Standards and Perceptions of Double Standards in Attitudes Toward the Roles of Men and Women (Fortune, 2016), both men and women endorse double standards that favor women, but not men. The author states:

> Female participants endorsed pro-female double standards in five domains; male participants endorsed pro-female double standards in three domains, and no double standards in two domains. Participants believed that overall, the "typical female" endorsed pro-female double standards and the "typical male" endorsed pro-male double standards'.

In National hiring experiments reveal 2:1 faculty preference for women on STEM tenure track (Williams & Ceci, 2015) the authors found:

> Contrary to prevailing assumptions, **men and women faculty members from all four fields [(biology, engineering, economics, and psychology)] preferred female applicants 2:1 over identically qualified males with matching lifestyles (single, married, divorced)**, with the exception of male economists, who showed no gender preference.

Unfortunately, the authors do not take issues with this result but instead seem to celebrate it. They note:

> We hope the discovery of an overall 2:1 preference for hiring women over otherwise identical men will help counter self-handicapping and opting-out by talented women at the point of entry to the STEM professoriate, and suggest that female underrepresentation can be addressed in part by increasing the number of women applying for tenure-track positions.

In a follow up study Women have substantial advantage in STEM faculty hiring, except when competing against more-accomplished men (Ceci & Williams, 2015), the same authors repeat the study but instead of comparing identical candidates, they compare slightly better to slightly worse candidates. In this condition, the slightly better candidate is preferred over the worse candidate irrespective to the genders involved almost every time, suggesting that the pro-female bias detected in the previous study only takes effect in the case that both candidates have identical qualifications.

The authors of Gender Discrimination in Hiring: Evidence from a Cross-National Harmonized Field Experiment (Birkelund et al., 2021) state:

> Our findings suggest that although employers operate in quite different institutional contexts, they regard female applicants as more suitable for jobs in female-dominated occupations, [all other things being equal], while we find no evidence that they regard male applicants as more suitable anywhere.

> [W]e need to update our knowledge of gender discrimination and the belief that women are always the disadvantaged group. This belief might have been correct earlier, but today, at least for the occupations we examined [(cook, receptionist, store assistant, payroll clerk, software developer and sales representative)], we found no evidence of hiring discrimination against female job applicants in any of the six countries included. Rather, we observed hiring discrimination against males in female-dominated jobs, whereas female applicants were favoured in female-dominated occupations and not discriminated in the other occupations we included.

They also explain why this is not at odds with previous findings:

> However surprising, the presented evidence is not at odds with previous research on hiring discrimination. **The key to explaining divergent results likely lies in the occupations studied. For balanced studies, including both female- and male-dominated occupations, and gender-neutral occupations, the aggregate outcome would be close to zero gender discrimination in hiring. For more unbalanced studies, like the GEMM study, which includes two clearly female-typed occupations, and only one strongly male-dominated occupation, we might expect an aggregated pattern showing hiring discrimination against men.** In principle, the same logic should apply for unbalanced studies including a higher proportion of male dominated occupations, but then we would expect an aggregated pattern of hiring discrimination of females. **Yet the findings regarding the male-dominated occupation we included cast doubts on the symmetrical nature of hiring discrimination by gender.** Interestingly, when scholars plan to study gender differences in hiring discrimination, we tend to think about discrimination of women, not men, yet previous experiments seem to include more female- than male-dominated occupations. More research including more occupations is needed.

Similar results can be found in Gender discrimination in hiring: An experimental reexamination of the Swedish case (Ahmed et al., 2021):

> Male applicants were about half as likely as female applicants to receive a positive employer response in female-dominated occupations. For male-dominated and mixed occupations we found no significant differences in positive employer responses between male and female applicants.

In the Pew Research article WOMEN AND LEADERSHIP 2018 — 2. Views on leadership traits and competencies and how they intersect with genders (Horowitz et al., 2018), the authors show that "majority of adults say male and female leaders have different leadership styles, relatively few think one gender has a better overall approach than the other" even though "those who do see a difference between male and female leaders across a range of leadership traits and behaviors perceive women to be stronger in most areas, both in politics and business". Specifically, "[f]emale leaders seen as more compassionate, empathetic than men" and **"[i]n politics, women are much more likely than men to be viewed as better role models; in business more see them as better able to create a safe and respectful workplace"**.

The authors of In-group gender bias in hiring: Real-world evidence (Carlsson & Eriksson, 2019) state:

> We investigate in-group gender bias in real-world hiring decisions by combining administrative data with data from a large-scale field experiment on hiring in which fictitious resumes with randomly assigned information about gender were sent to Swedish employers. **Our results suggest that women (female recruiters or firms with a high share of female employees) favor women in the recruitment process.** In contrast, we do not find much evidence that men (male recruiters or firms with a high share of male employees) favor men.

In-group Bias

Many people may be surprised at the claim that men have little or no in-group preference. The presumption of traditional cultural dominance by men might suggest to some people that men must enjoy considerable in-group preference. This is a key ingredient of patriarchy theory. But a little reflection reveals that this assumption runs counter to what we know about typical male behaviour: men tend to be competitive and hierarchical. If you are competitive, you are more likely to succeed — but it's not because you have been assisted by those against whom you compete. What tends to be forgotten is that, in a competitive environment, there are more losers than winners. Once again we have fallen victim to the identity-group fallacy: perceiving "men" as an undifferentiated class. 'What is regarded as "cultural dominance of men" is actually cultural dominance of a few men, those who have been successful in life's competition. These are not typically the men who are the educational failures, the imprisoned, the homeless, the prematurely dead or those most likely to have been fatherless. Yet even the men who are ultimately disadvantaged tend to be competitive; they merely fail. Roy Baumeister has argued that this competitive and hierarchical social style of men is key to the formation of very large scale human social structures (Baumeister, 2010). The more cooperative, intimate social style favoured by women works well in small groups, but is not conducive to large scale societal cohesion - so Baumeister argues. He is not alone. Vigil for example, concludes: 'Divergent social styles may reflect trade-offs between behaviors selected to maintain large, functional coalitions in men and intimate, secure relationships in women', (Vigil, 2007). Men's strong sexual desire is also their weakness and provides another barrier to men forming sex-specific coalitions to promote their interests (and you will note the evolutionary relationship between the formation of male hierarchies and the sex drive). Quoting Dench (1996) again, "*The more powerful men's sexual impulses are, the stronger the bargaining position of women, and the smaller men's chances of coming together in a mutually regulatory system at the expense of women.*" In this we see the reason for women tending to be against porn and prostitution. It is because alternative outlets for the male sex drive diminish female power. It is also the reason why priests in many religions are required to be celibate. It is to avoid them having two masters: God and wife. Hence, it is reasonable to argue that male hierarchies mitigate against strong in-group preference among men. Having in-group preference themselves, women naturally assume that the same must be true of men. This is a serious misunderstanding of men. It causes women to assume, for example, that the greater number of male than female MPs must mean that men's issues are disproportionately represented in Parliament. But this rests upon the presumption that men will preferentially represent men's issues. In fact, the operation of gynocentrism and the absence of male in-group preference ensures that this is not so. Men tend not to give preference to other men. There is approbation to be had in preferencing women and girls; there is only disapprobation to be had for any politician so brave — or so foolhardy — as to dare to claim equality for men or boys. Hence, it is de rigueur to support explicitly sexist policies such as those relating to violence against women and girls, but there is no political will to do anything about boys' increasingly serious educational failure. Thanks to the operation of gynocentrism, male disposability and lack of male in-group preference, "equality for males" is interpreted as reprehensibly reactionary. In truth it is radical and far more progressive than those who style themselves as progressive whilst clinging to their ancient gendered psychology. But it is too radical for men in power, who steadfastly turn away from addressing the issues of 'men and boys, with only a very few honourable exceptions.

Automatic / implicit biases have been shown to predict discriminatory behavior such as negative speech and body language, despite the fact that explicit cognition has no effect on them. When an individual is exposed to the entities he or she is implicitly biased against, implicit biases are triggered automatically and instantaneously. In some cases, implicit attitudes can guide spontaneous acts and split-second decisions (e.g., police shooter bias). "Just about the only group identity that does not elicit in-group-favoritism is male identity" (Seager et al., 2016). In Gender Differences in Automatic In-Group Bias: Why Do Women Like Women More Than Men Like Men? (Rudman & Goodwin, 2004) the authors show that women have strong automatic in-group preferences, i.e. favoring their own sex, whereas men lack such a mechanism and instead also favor women. **Women were 4.5 times as likely to show an automatic preference for their own gender than men were to show such favoritism for their own gender.** Both male and female participants associated positive words such as 'good', 'happy' and 'sunshine' more often with women than with men, both men and women implicitly favored their mothers, and men showed low pro-male gender attitudes. Only women but not men showed cognitive balance among in-group bias, identity, and self-esteem, revealing that men lack a mechanism that bolsters automatic preference for their own gender. See also this APA article about the same paper.

In The development of implicit gender attitudes (Dunham et al., 2015) the "development course of implicit and explicit gender attitudes between the ages of 5 and adulthood is investigated". The authors state:

> Findings demonstrate that implicit and explicit own-gender preferences emerge early in both boys and girls, but **implicit own-gender preferences are stronger in young girls than boys**. In addition, female participants' attitudes remain largely stable over development, whereas **male participants' implicit and explicit attitudes show an age-related shift towards increasing female positivity**. Gender attitudes are an anomaly in that social evaluations dissociate from social status, with both male and female participants tending to evaluate female more positively than male.

According to Subliminal Gender Stereotypes: Who Can Resist? (Breen et al., 2020), "subliminal exposure to [gender] stereotypes (vs. counter-stereotypes) led women who identify relatively strongly with feminists, but less strongly with women, to (a) persist in a math task, (b) **show increased willingness to sacrifice men in a Moral Choice Dilemma task**, and (c) show implicit in-group bias on an evaluative priming task".

According to Math and language gender stereotypes: Age and gender differences in implicit biases and explicit beliefs (Vuletich et al., 2020):

> **Across all ages, boys showed neither math nor language implicit gender biases, whereas girls implicitly favored girls in both domains.** These findings are counter to cultural stereotypes, which favor boys in math. On the explicit measure, both boys' and girls' primary tendency was to favor girls in math and language ability, with the exception of elementary school boys, who rated genders equally.

↑ 40 ↓   💬 1   🏆   ↗ Share   🏳 Report

Join the conversation

Sort by: Best ⌄   🔍 Search Comments

lightning_palm OP • 3y ago • Edited 3y ago

- **Part 1**
- Part 2 (you are here)
- **Part 3**
- **Part 4**

Please also check out 60 things YOU can do about the gender empathy gap — A call to action!

Log In

Why are these two such huge trends online? Tired of this "Misandry doesn't harm men" BS

199 upvotes · 32 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 5 days ago

How My Algorithm Changed When I Stopped Hating Men

143 upvotes · 68 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 4 days ago

"it's either be creepy to women or not interact with women at all for men".

142 upvotes · 22 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 5 days ago

Ana misses the point about men issues again.

139 upvotes · 49 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 days ago

The terms 'misogyny' and 'misandry' poison discourse. Use 'sexism' instead

138 upvotes · 33 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 days ago

The obsession of "Women-only" immigrant centers in Canada

123 upvotes · 18 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 days ago

New independent press to focus on male writers

114 upvotes · 32 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 1 day ago

My friend believes the left is too misandrist and has fallen for the alt-right.

100 upvotes · 49 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 days ago

Homophobia and Misogyny although linked aren't the same and people who say that think we aren't men.

100 upvotes · 20 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 days ago

Let's make a list of content creators that make fun of male issues.

96 upvotes · 30 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 6 days ago

A Personal Story during #metoo and How that Should Affect MRA Policy

87 upvotes · 6 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 6 days ago

Young Men Voters May Be More Likely To Swing Back (to the Left)

85 upvotes · 48 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 7 days ago

[UK] Government launches call for evidence on men's health; Young men must be taught it's OK to feel and to ask for help, Wes Streeting says

78 upvotes · 14 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 days ago

I think we need to talk about Threat Narratives more

76 upvotes · 10 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 1 day ago

19 Y/O Immigrant Unconstitutionally Deported To El Salvador Because Hes The Wrong Kind Of Dude

73 upvotes · 4 comments

r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 3 days ago

This video is proof that society views women as a protective class.

66 upvotes · 14 comments

🔴   🔍 🟢

Log In

61 upvotes · 1 comment

🟢 r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 2 days ago

Male loneliness or male isolation epidemic?

53 upvotes · 9 comments

🟢 r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 4 days ago

Do you think society has adapted itself to suit women more and has therefore left men out in the cold?

51 upvotes · 36 comments

🟢 r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 2 days ago

What did they get right and what did they get wrong? (Masculinity Debate: Are Dating Apps Creating Incels?! Lonely Men Are More Dangerous Than Ever!)

▶ youtube

35 upvotes · 17 comments

🟢 r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 5 days ago

Do you think we need to do something to become more popular/known?

32 upvotes · 24 comments

🟢 r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 1 day ago

How can I apply my Law Degree to the cause?

16 upvotes · 2 comments

🟢 r/LeftWingMaleAdvocates • 6 days ago

LeftWingMaleAdvocates top posts and comments for the week of April 20 - April 26, 2025

7 upvotes · 1 comment

TOP POSTS

🔴 Reddit

reReddit: Top posts of January 7, 2022

🔴 Reddit

reReddit: Top posts of January 2022

🔴 Reddit

reReddit: Top posts of 2022