

BIAS INTERRUPTERS *small steps big change*

BIAS INTERRUPTERS FOR HIRING & RECRUITING

Identifying Bias in Hiring Guide

The five patterns below describe *tendencies not absolutes*. Here's what to watch out for:

Prove-It-Again! ("PIA") — Groups stereotyped as less competent often have to prove themselves over and over. "PIA groups" include women, people of color, individuals with disabilities,¹ members of the LGBTQIA+ community,² older employees,³ and first-generation professionals.⁴

1. **Higher standards.** Despite having identical resume qualifications, "Jamal" needed eight additional years of experience to be considered as qualified as "Greg",⁵ and "Jennifer" was offered \$4,000 less in starting salary than "John."⁶ A queer woman received 30% fewer callbacks than a straight woman⁷ and a gay man had to apply to 5 more jobs than a straight man in order to receive a positive response.⁸
2. **"He'll go far;" "She's not ready."** Majority men tend to be judged on their potential, whereas PIA groups tend to be judged on what they have already accomplished.⁹
3. **Casuistry: education vs. experience.** When hiring for a job that required both education and experience, participants justified selecting the man over the woman by weighing the man's qualifications more. When the man had more experience, participants ranked experience as essential. When the woman had more experience, participants still chose the man — saying that education was key.¹⁰
4. **Elite school bias.** Over-reliance on elite educational credentials hurts first-generation professionals and candidates of color, who are more likely to attend schools close to home with more modest reputations.¹¹ Education shouldn't be used as a proxy for intelligence: top students from lower ranked schools are often as successful as students from elite schools.¹²
5. **PIA groups get horns; others a halo.** Horns=one weakness generalized into an overall negative rating. Halo=one strength generalized into a global positive rating.¹³
6. **"We applied the rule—until we didn't."** Objective requirements often are applied rigorously to PIA groups—but leniently (or waived entirely) for majority men.¹⁴ This means that some groups are left out: for example, desk jobs that require applicants to be able to lift 25 pounds may weed out employees with disabilities.¹⁵
7. **Do only the superstars survive?** Superstars may escape PIA problems that affect others.¹⁶

Tightrope — A narrower range of workplace behavior often is accepted from women¹⁷, people of color¹⁸, and members of the LGBTQIA+ community¹⁹ ("TR groups"). First-generation professionals and modest or introverted men can face Tightrope problems, too.

1. **Leader or worker bee?** TR groups face pressure to be "worker bees" who work hard and are undemanding...but if they comply, they lack "leadership potential."²⁰
2. **Modest, helpful, nice; dutiful daughter, office mom?** Prescriptive stereotypes create pressures on women to be mild-mannered team players. "Ambitious" is not a compliment for women and "niceness" may be optional for men but required of women.²¹
3. **Direct and assertive—or angry and abrasive?** Behavior seen as admirably direct, competitive, and assertive in majority men may be seen as inappropriate in TR groups — "tactless," "selfish," "difficult." Assertiveness that's accepted in majority men may be seen as inappropriate in TR groups.²²
4. **"She's a prima donna"; "He knows his own worth."** The kind of self-promotion that works for majority men may be seen as off-putting in TR groups. Modest men may encounter bias that reflects assumptions about how "real men" should behave. Also, strong modesty norms can make first-generation professionals, people of Asian descent, and women uncomfortable with self-promotion.²³

5. **LGBTQIA+ employees** may be stereotyped as “too feminine,” “too masculine,” or just “too gay.”²⁴ These kinds of judgement signal illegal discrimination under federal and state law.

The Parental Wall can affect parents of all genders—as well as employees without children.

1. **“He has a family to support.”** Fathers face expectations that they will not—or should not—take time off for caregiving, or that they should get jobs because they are breadwinners.²⁵
2. **“Gaps in her resume.”** People take time off for many reasons. Be consistent. If you don’t penalize for military service, don’t do so for taking time off for children either.²⁶
3. **“Her priorities lie elsewhere” (or should!).** Mothers are stereotyped as less competent and committed. In one matched-resume study, a mother was 79% less likely to be hired than an identical candidate without children.²⁷
4. **“I worry about her children.”** Mothers who work long hours tend to be disliked and held to higher performance standards. Taxing jobs may be withheld on the assumption that mothers will not—or should not—want them.²⁸

Tug of War — Sometimes bias creates conflict within historically excluded groups.²⁹

1. **Tokenism.** It’s important to make sure there is more than just one “token” historically excluded group member in the applicant pool.
2. **Strategic distancing and the loyalty tax.** People from historically excluded groups on a hiring committee may feel they need to distance themselves from applicants of their group, or align with the majority against their own group, in order to get ahead.
3. **Passthroughs. PIA:** People from historically excluded groups may hold members of their own groups to higher standards because, “That’s what it takes to succeed here.” **Tightrope:** Women or LGBTQIA+ employees may fault each other for being too masculine—or too feminine. People of color may fault each other for being “too white”—or not “white” enough.³⁰ **Parental wall:** Parents may fault each other for handling parenthood wrong—taking too much time off or too little.³¹

Racial Stereotypes — People of Asian descent are often stereotyped as passive and lacking in social skills; Black people as angry or too aggressive; Latino/a people as hotheaded or emotional.³²

Eight Powerful Bias Interrupters

1. Decide in advance what factors are important for the job.
2. Give each candidate a separate rating for each factor, then average the ratings to identify the highest ranked candidates.
3. Don’t just hire friends of friends unless your networks, your org, or both, are diverse. Consider candidates from multi-tier schools, not just elite institutions.
4. Make sure to give everyone—or no one—the benefit of the doubt.
5. If you waive objective requirements, do so consistently and require an explanation.
6. Don’t insist on likeability, modesty, or deference from some but not others.
7. Don’t make assumptions about what mothers—or fathers—want or are able to do. Directly ask candidates about “gaps in their resume” during their interview.
8. If you comment on “culture fit,” “executive presence,” or other vague concepts, start with a clear definition and keep track to ensure such concepts are applied consistently.

- ¹ Ameri, M., Schur, L., Adya, M., Bentley, F. S., McKay, P., & Kruse, D. (2018). The disability employment puzzle: A field experiment on employer hiring behavior. *ILR Review*, 71(2), 329-364. doi: [10.1177/0019793917717474](https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793917717474)
- ² Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Employment discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(2), 586-626. doi: [10.1086/661653](https://doi.org/10.1086/661653)
- ³ Cuddy, A. J. C., Norton, M. I., Fiske, S. T. (2005). This old stereotype: The pervasiveness and persistence of the elderly stereotype. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(2), 265-283. doi: [10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00405.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2005.00405.x)
- ⁴ Kraus, M., Torrez, B., Park, J. W., & Ghayebi, F. (2019). Evidence for the reproduction of social class in brief speech. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. DOI:[10.1073/pnas.1900500116](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1900500116); Williams, J. C. (2010). *Reshaping the work-family debate: Why men and class matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ⁵ Bertrand, M. & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991-1013. doi: [10.1257/0002828042002561](https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828042002561)
- ⁶ Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474-16479. doi: [10.1073/pnas.1211286109](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109)
- ⁷ Mishel, E. (2016). Discrimination against queer women in the US workforce: A résumé audit study. *Socius*, 2, 2378023115621316.
- ⁸ Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Employment discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117(2), 586-626.
- ⁹ Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444. doi:[10.1111/0022-4537.00126](https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126); Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self-representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 83-93. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.83](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.83); Hewstone, M. (1990). The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup casual attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(4), 311-335. Doi: [10.1002/ejsp.2420200404](https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420200404)
- ¹⁰ Norton, M.I., Vandello, J.A., & Darley, J. (2004). Casuistry and social category bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 817-831. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.817](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.817)
- ¹¹ Williams, J.C. (2017) *White Working Class: Overcoming Class Cluelessness in America*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
- ¹² Dale, S. B., & Krueger, A. B. (2002). Estimating the payoff to attending a more selective college: An application of selection on observables and unobservables. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(4), 491-1527. doi: [10.1162/003355302320935089](https://doi.org/10.1162/003355302320935089) Dale, S., & Krueger, A. B. (2014). Estimating the return to college selectivity over the career using administrative earnings data. *Journal of Human Resources*, 49(2), 323-358. doi:[10.3368/jhr.49.2.323](https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.49.2.323)
- ¹³ Thorndike, E.L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), 25-29. Doi: [10.1037/h0071663](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0071663)
- ¹⁴ Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444. doi:[10.1111/0022-4537.00126](https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00126); Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self-representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 83-93. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.83](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.1.83); Hewstone, M. (1990). The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup casual attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(4), 311-335. Doi: [10.1002/ejsp.2420200404](https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420200404)
- ¹⁵ Lu, W. (2019). This Is How Employers Weed Out Disabled People From Their Hiring Pools. *HuffPost*.
- ¹⁶ Fleming, M. A., Petty, R. E., & White, P. H. (2005). Stigmatized targets and evaluation: Prejudice as a determinant of attribute scrutiny and polarization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(4), 496-507. doi: [10.1177/0146167204271585](https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271585); Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(12), 1323-1334. doi: [10.1177/01461672972312009](https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672972312009); Heilman, M.E., Martell, R.F. & Simon, M.C. (1988). The vagaries of sex bias: Conditions regulating the undervaluation, equalvaluation, and overvaluation of female job applicants. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 41(1), 98-110. doi: [10.1016/0749-5978\(88\)90049-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(88)90049-0); Jussim, L., Coleman, L. M., & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes: A comparison and integration of three theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 536-546. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.536](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.536); Linville, P. W., & Jones, E. E. (1980). Polarized appraisals of out-group members. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 38(5), 689-703. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.38.5.689](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.5.689); Scherer, R. F., Owen, C. L., & Brodzinski, J. D. (1991). Rater and ratee sex effects on performance evaluations in a field setting: A multivariate analysis. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 5(2), 174-191. doi: [10.1177/0893318991005002002](https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318991005002002); Weber, R., & Crocker, J. (1983). Cognitive processes in the revision of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(5), 961-977. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.45.5.961](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.5.961)
- ¹⁷ Bowles, H. R., Babcock, L., & McGinn, K. L. (2005). Constraints and triggers: Situational mechanics of gender in negotiation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 951-965. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.951](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.951); Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can angry women get ahead? Gender, status conferral, and workplace emotion expression. *Psychological Science*, 19(3), 268-275. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02079.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02079.x); Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J., & Pascale, L. (1975). When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11(6), 520-30. doi: [10.1016/0022-1031\(75\)90003-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(75)90003-7); Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56(2), 109-118. doi: [10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.2.109); Haselhuhn, M.P., & Kray, L.J. (2012). Gender and negotiation. In B. Goldman & D. Shapiro (Eds.), *The Psychology of Negotiations in the 21st Century Workplace* (pp. 293-318). New York, NY: Routledge.; Heilman M. E., & Chen J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship. *Behavior Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 431-441 doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431); Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male gender-typed tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 416-427. doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.416](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.416); 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 content of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 26(4), 269-281. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00066;
- Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: the role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 157-176. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157; Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743-762. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00239;
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743-762. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00239; Taylor, S.E. (1981). A Categorization Approach to Stereotyping. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior* (pp. 83-114). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- ¹⁸ Berdahl, J. L., & Min, J. A. (2012). Prescriptive stereotypes and workplace consequences for East Asians in North America. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18(2), 141-152. doi: 10.1037/a0027692; Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 61-149. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(07)00002-0 Fiske, S. T., Xu, J., Cuddy, A. C., & Glick, P. (1999). (Dis)respecting versus (dis)liking: Status and interdependence predict ambivalent stereotypes of competence and warmth. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 473-489. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00128; Livingston, R., & Pearce, N. A. (2009). The teddy-bear effect: does having a baby face benefit black chief executive officers? *Psychological Science*, 20(10), 1229-1236. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02431.x
- ¹⁹ Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2018). *A Workplace Divided: Understanding the Climate for LGBTQ Workers Nationwide*.
- ²⁰ Williams, J.C., Li, S., Rincon, R., & Finn, P. (2016). Climate Control: Gender and Racial Bias in Engineering? Center for WorkLife Law. UC Hastings College of the Law. Available at: <https://worklifelaw.org/publications/Climate-Control-Gender-And-Racial-Bias-In-Engineering.pdf>
- Heilman M. E., & Chen J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship. *Behavior Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 431-441 doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431
- ²¹ Allen, T. D. (2006). Rewarding good citizens: The relationship between citizenship behavior, gender, and organizational rewards. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(1), 120-143. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00006.x; Heilman M. E., & Chen J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship. *Behavior Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 431-441 doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431; Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965-990. doi: 10.1086/226425; Williams, J. C., & Dempsey, R. W. (2014). *What works for women at work: Four patterns working women should know*. New York, NY: New York University Press.; Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological review*, 94(3), 369-389. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.369
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965-990. doi: 10.1086/226425
- ²² Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2005). Attitudes toward traditional and nontraditional parents. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(4), 436-445. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00244.x; Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). Can angry women get ahead? Gender, status conferral, and workplace emotion expression. *Psychological Science*, 19(3), 268-275. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02079.x; Judge, T. A., Livingston B. A., & Hurst, C. (2012). Do nice guys--and gals--really finish last? The joint effects of sex and agreeableness on income. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(2), 390-407. doi: 10.1037/a0026021; Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: the role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 157-176. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.157
- ²³ Daubman, K.A., Heatherington, L., & Ahn, A. (1992). Gender and the self-presentation of academic achievement. *Sex Roles*, 27, 187-204. Doi: 10.1007/BF00290017; Gould, R. J., & Slone, C. G. (1982). The "feminine modesty" effect: A self-presentational interpretation of sex differences in causal attribution. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8(3), 477-485. doi: 10.1177/0146167282083014; Heatherington, L., Daubman, K. A., Bates, C., Ahn, A., Brown, H., & Preston, C. (1993). Two investigations of "female modesty" in achievement situations. *Sex Roles*, 29(11), 739-754. doi: 10.1007/BF00289215; Phelan, J. E., Moss-Racusin, C. A., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Competent yet out in the cold: Shifting criteria for hiring reflect backlash toward agentic women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(4), 406-413. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00454.x
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 629-645. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.629; Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: the hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(5), 1004-1010. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.1004; Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743-762. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00239; Hall, E. V., & Livingston, R. W. (2012). The hubris penalty: Biased responses to "Celebration" displays of black football players. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(4), 899-904. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2012.02.004; Lubrano, A. (2004). *Limbo: Blue-collar roots, white-collar dreams*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; Williams, J. C. (2010). *Reshaping the work-family debate: Why men and class matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ²⁴ Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2018). *A Workplace Divided: Understanding the Climate for LGBTQ Workers Nationwide*.
- ²⁵ Wang, W., Parker, K., & Taylor, P. (2013). *Breadwinner Moms Mothers Are the Sole or Primary Provider in Four-in-Ten Households with Children; Public Conflicted about the Growing Trend*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.
- ²⁶ Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(5), 1297-1338. doi: 10.1086/511799
- ²⁷ Benard, S., & Correll, S. J. (2010). Normative discrimination and the motherhood penalty. *Gender & Society*, 24(5), 616-646. doi: 10.1177/0891243210383142; Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(5), 1297-1338. doi: 10.1086/511799; Crosby, F. J., Williams, J. C., & Biernat, M. (2004). The maternal wall. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(4), 675-682. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00379.x; Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2004). When professionals become

mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(4), 701-718. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00381.x; Fuegen, K., Biernat, M., Haines, E., & Deaux, K. (2004). Mothers and fathers in the workplace: How gender and parental status influence judgments of job-related competence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(4), 737-754. doi: 10.1111/j.0022-4537.2004.00383.x; Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2008). Motherhood: A potential source of bias in employment decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 189-198. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.189

²⁸ Benard, S., & Correll, S. J. (2010). Normative discrimination and the motherhood penalty. *Gender & Society*, 24(5), 616-646. doi: 10.1177/0891243210383142

²⁹ Derks, B., Van Laar, C., Ellemers, N., & de Groot, K. (2011). Gender-bias primes elicit queen-bee responses among senior policewomen. *Psychological Science*, 22(10), 1243-1249. doi: 10.1177/0956797611417258; Duguid, M. (2011). Female tokens in high-prestige work groups: Catalysts or inhibitors of group diversification? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116(1), 104-115. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.05.009; Duguid, M. M., Loyd, D. L., & Tolbert, P. S. (2012). The impact of categorical status, numeric representation, and work group prestige on preference for demographically similar others: A value threat approach. *Organization Science*, 23(2), 386-401. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0565; Ellemers, N., van den Heuvel, H., de Gilder, D., Maass, A., & Bonvini, A. (2004). The underrepresentation of women in science: Differential commitment or the queen bee syndrome? *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(3), 315-338. doi: 10.1348/0144666042037999; Ely, R. J. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2), 203-238. doi: 10.2307/2393234; Parks-Stamm, E. J., Heilman, M. E., & Hearn, K. A. (2012). Motivated to penalize: women's strategic rejection of successful women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(2), 237-245. doi: 10.1177/0146167207310027; Van Laar C., Bleeker D., Ellemers N. and Meijer E. (2014), Ingroup and outgroup support for upward mobility: Divergent responses to ingroup identification in low status groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(6), 563-577, doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2046; Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965-990. doi: 10.1086/226425

³⁰ Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2013). *Acting white?: Rethinking race in post-racial America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

³¹ Benard, S., & Correll, S. J. (2010). Normative discrimination and the motherhood penalty. *Gender & Society*, 24(5), 616-646. doi: 10.1177/0891243210383142

³² Williams, J. C., & Dempsey, R. W. (2014). *What works for women at work: Four patterns working women should know*. New York, NY: New York University Press.; Livingston, R. W., Rosette, A. S., & Washington, E. F. (2012). Can an agentic Black woman get ahead? The impact of race and interpersonal dominance on perceptions of female leaders. *Psychological Science*, 23(4), 354-358. doi: 10.1177/0956797611428079 Williams, J.C., Phillips, K.W., & Hall, E.V. (2014) (2014). *Double jeopardy? Gender bias against women of color in science*. WorkLife Law, UC Hastings College of the Law. San Francisco, CA. Available at: https://worklifelaw.org/publications/Double-Jeopardy-Report_v6_full_web-sm.pdf