

BIAS INTERRUPTERS *small steps big change*

BIAS INTERRUPTERS FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS *Identifying Bias in Performance Evaluations 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 older employees,² members of the LGBTQIA+ community,³ and first-generation professionals.⁴

1. **"He'll crush it"; "They're not ready."** PIA groups are judged on performance; others on potential.⁵
2. **"He's skilled; she's lucky."** PIA groups' successes attributed to luck, majority men's successes attributed to skill.⁶
3. **"It could happen to anyone"; "She blew it."** PIA groups' mistakes tend to be noticed more and remembered longer, whereas majority men's mistakes tend to be written off.⁷
4. **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. In addition, mistakes by one PIA group member may reinforce negative group stereotypes.⁸
5. **"We applied the rule—until we didn't."** Objective requirements applied rigorously to PIA groups—but applied leniently or waived for majority men.⁹
6. **Little white lies.** Women, people of color and people with disabilities tend to receive less specific and less honest feedback — meaning they aren't given the opportunity to improve.¹⁰
7. **Do only the superstars survive?** Superstars may escape PIA problems that affect others.¹¹

Tightrope — A narrower range of workplace behavior often is accepted from women¹², people of color,¹³ and members of the LGBTQIA+ community¹⁴ ("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."¹⁵
2. **Modest, helpful, nice; dutiful daughter, office mom?** Prescriptive stereotypes create pressures on women to be modest, mild-mannered team players—so "ambitious" is not a compliment for women and niceness may be optional for men but required of women.¹⁶
3. **Direct and assertive—or angry and abrasive?** Direct, competitive, and assertive in majority men may be seen as inappropriate in TR groups — "tactless," "selfish," "difficult," "abrasive." Anger that's accepted from majority men may be seen as inappropriate or even threatening in TR groups.¹⁷
4. **Office housework vs glamour work.** TR groups report less access to career-enhancing opportunities and more "office housework"—planning parties & cleaning up; taking notes & arranging meeting times; mentoring & being the peacemaker.¹⁸
5. **"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 about how "real men" should behave. Strong modesty norms can make first-generation professionals, people of Asian descent, and women uncomfortable with self-promotion.¹⁹
6. **LGBTQIA+ employees** may be stereotyped as "too feminine," "too masculine," or just "too gay."²⁰ 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. They may be seen as deserving more pay or promotion because of their presumed family role.²¹
2. **“Her priorities lie elsewhere.”** Mothers are stereotyped as less competent and committed, are held to higher performance and punctuality standards—and are half as likely to be promoted as identical candidates without children.²²
3. **“I worry about her children.”** Mothers who work long hours tend to be disliked and held to higher performance standards.²³
4. **“It’s not a good time for her.”** Opportunities or promotions may be withheld on the assumption that mothers will not—or should not—want them.
5. **“No life.”** Employees without children may face the assumption that they can always pick up the slack because they have “no life.”²⁴

Tug of War — Sometimes bias creates conflict within historically excluded groups.²⁵

1. **Tokenism.** If there is only one “token” woman or person of color on a team, they might be treated like they are only in the room to provide diversity, not expertise. Then, when it comes times for performance evaluations, they will get dinged for not having completed as many impressive assignments.
2. **Strategic distancing and the loyalty tax.** People from historically excluded groups may feel they need to distance themselves from others of their group, or align with the majority against their own group, in order to get ahead. In performance evaluations, this might mean giving a lower rating to your own group members to avoid being accused of favoritism.
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.²⁶ **Parental wall:** Parents may fault each other for handling parenthood the wrong way—for taking too much time off or too little.²⁷

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.²⁸

Seven Powerful Bias Interrupters

1. Give 3 pieces of evidence (from the evaluation period) to explain and back up your rating.
2. Make sure to give everyone—or no one—the benefit of the doubt.
3. If you waive objective rules, do so consistently.
4. Don’t insist on likeability, modesty, or deference from some but not others.
5. Don’t make assumptions about what mothers—or other caregivers—want or are able to do.
6. 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.
7. Give honest feedback to everyone who is evaluated—otherwise some groups won’t get notice of problems in time to correct them.

- 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
- ² 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
- ³ 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
- 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; Williams, J. C. (2010). *Reshaping the work-family debate: Why men and class matter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- ⁵ 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; 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; Hewstone, M. (1990). The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(4), 311-335. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420200404
- ⁶ Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. (1974). Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29(1), 80-85. doi: 10.1037/h0035733; Fiske, S. T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In: S. T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (pp. 357-411). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles*, 55(1), 51-61. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9068-1; Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasuraman, S. (1993). Job performance attributions and career advancement prospects: An examination of gender and race effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55(2), 273-297. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1993.1034; Igbaria, M., & Baroudi, J. J. (1995). The impact of job performance evaluations on career advancement prospects: An examination of gender differences in the IS workplace. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 19(1), 107-123. doi: 10.2307/249713; Kulich, C., Trojanowski, G., Ryan, M. K., Alexander Haslam, S., & Renneboog, L. D. (2011). Who gets the carrot and who gets the stick? Evidence of gender disparities in executive remuneration. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(3), 301-321. doi: 10.1002/smj.878; Swim, J. K., & Sanna, L. J. (1996). He's skilled, she's lucky: A meta-analysis of observers' attributions for women's and men's successes and failures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(5), 507-519. doi: 10.1177/0146167296225008; Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual bases of person memory and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(7), 778-793. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.36.7.778
- ⁷ Bauer, C. C., & Baltes, B. B. (2002). Reducing the effects of gender stereotypes on performance evaluations. *Sex Roles*, 47(9), 465-476. doi: 10.1023/A:1021652527696; Bowles, H. R., & Gelfand, M. (2010). Status and the evaluation of workplace deviance. *Psychological Science*, 21(1), 49-54. doi: 10.1177/0956797609356509; Fyock, J. & Stangor C. (1994). The role of memory biases in stereotype maintenance. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(3), 331-343. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01029.x; Rothbart, M., Evans, M., & Fulero, S. (1979). Recall for confirming events: Memory processes and the maintenance of social stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 15(4), 343-355. doi: 10.1016/0022-1031(79)90043-X
- ⁸ Thorndike, E. L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), 25-29. doi: 10.1037/h0071663
- 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; 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; Hewstone, M. (1990). The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(4), 311-335. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420200404
- ¹⁰
- ¹¹ 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; 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; Heilman, M.E., Martell, R.F. & Simon, M.C. (1988). The vagaries of sex bias: Conditions regulating the undervaluation, equivaluation, and overvaluation of female job applicants. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 41(1), 98-110. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(88)90049-0; 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; 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; 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
- ¹² 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; 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; 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; 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; 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; 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; 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., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(1), 165-179. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008
- 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.
- ¹³ 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
- ¹⁴ Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2018). *A Workplace Divided: Understanding the Climate for LGBTQ Workers Nationwide*.
- ¹⁵ 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>
- ¹⁶ 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
- ¹⁷ 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
- ¹⁸ 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; 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>
- ¹⁹ 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.

- ²⁰ Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2018). *A Workplace Divided: Understanding the Climate for LGBTQ Workers Nationwide*.
- ²¹ 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.
- ²² 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
- ²³ Benard, S., & Correll, S. J. (2010). Normative discrimination and the motherhood penalty. *Gender & Society, 24*(5), 616-646. doi: 10.1177/0891243210383142
- ²⁴ Berdahl, J. L., & Moon, S. H. (2013). Workplace mistreatment of middle class workers based on sex, parenthood, and caregiving. *Journal of Social Issue, 69*(2), 341-366. doi: 10.1111/josi.12018; 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;
- ²⁵ 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, 38*(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
- ²⁶ Carbado, D. W., & Gulati, M. (2013). *Acting white?: Rethinking race in post-racial America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- ²⁷ Benard, S., & Correll, S. J. (2010). Normative discrimination and the motherhood penalty. *Gender & Society, 24*(5), 616-646. doi: 10.1177/0891243210383142
- ²⁸ 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