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Hiring
Negotiations
Raises
Promotions
U.S. Ideal Worker Norms

• Is self- and success- focused
• Works all the time
• Has natural innate talent
• Has a partner who gives a lot of support
• Does not take time off
• Is assertive, risk taking, and asks for what is needed
Women Underselling their Worth

- Women counter-offered with $7000 LESS to opening bid when negotiating for themselves versus a friend (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010)
  - Reported worry over being “pushy” and “too demanding”
Asked to write a letter for a MUS scholarship

- Write behalf of themselves (application essay) OR
- Write behalf of a friend (letter of reference)
Results: Women who wrote for themselves

- Did not enjoy the experience
- Wrote poorer quality essays: panel of judges awarded their essays $1000 less in scholarship money

\[ M = \$1675.00 \]

\[ M = \$2662.00 \]
Women Underselling their Contributions

- Women unlikely to take credit for their contributions in mixed sex collaborations (Haynes & Heilman, 2013)
Women underselling their contributions

• The average man *self-cites* 56% more often than the average woman (very stable since 1960).
  – Analysis of 1.6 million papers written from 1950 to 2015 in the scholarly database JSTOR. (King et al., 2015)
Backlash Avoidance Model
(Brescoll, 2011; Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010; Rudman, 1998)

“Social and economic penalties for counter-stereotypic behavior” (Phelan & Rudman, 2008)

• Women who promote their own achievements are:
  – Liked Less
  – Hired less
  – Promoted less
Sometimes it does hurt to ask (Bowles et al., 2007)

• IN ONE STUDY... people examined a resume and interviewer “notes” for bank manager position

• IDENTICAL RESUMES and NOTES EXCEPT
  – Gender of the applicant (first name)
  – One line in the notes read: “Candidate asked for more compensation and inquired about other job benefits” OR NOT
Sometimes it does hurt to ask (Bowles et al., 2007)

Results: The negative effects of initiating negotiations on hirability was more than twice as large for women than men.
Where are women’s bragging rights?

What is happening?

• Modesty Norms
• Communal Norms
• Very REAL backlash effects
• Ideal Worker Norms
Ideal Worker and His Job Potential

Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students

Corinne A. Moss-Racusin, John F. Dovidio, Victoria L. Brescoll, Mark J. Graham, and Jo Handelsman

Despite efforts to recruit and retain more women, a stark gender disparity persists within academic science. Abundant research has demonstrated gender bias in many demographic groups, but has yet to experimentally investigate whether science faculty exhibit a bias against female students that could contribute to the gender disparity in academic science. In a randomized double-blind study (n = 427), science faculty from research-intensive universities rated the application materials of a student—who was randomly assigned either a male or female name—for a laboratory manager position. Faculty participants rated the male applicant as significantly more competent and hireable than the (identical) female applicant. These participants also selected a higher starting salary and offered more career mentoring to the male applicant. The gender of the faculty participants did not affect responses, such that female and male faculty were equally likely to exhibit bias against the female student. Mediation analyses indicated that the female student was less likely to be hired because she was viewed as less competent. We also assessed faculty participants’ preexisting subtle bias against women using a standard instrument and found that preexisting subtle bias against women played a moderating role, such that subtle bias against women was associated with less support for the female student, but was unrelated to reactions to the male student. These results suggest that interventions addressing faculty gender bias might advance the goal of increasing the participation of women in science.
Competence, hireability, and mentoring by student gender condition (collapsed across faculty gender).

Moss-Racusin C A et al. PNAS 2012;109:16474-16479
Salary conferral by student gender condition (collapsed across faculty gender).

Moss-Racusin C A et al. PNAS 2012;109:16474-16479
What metrics do you use when determining someone’s salary?

- Leadership ability?
- Post-doc experience?
- Grant writing success?
- Teacher ratings?
- Letters of reference?
- Scholarly contributions?
A glimpse at the evidence...

- Gender bias in evaluations of leadership  Brescoll et al., 2012.
- Gender bias in elite post-doc positions  Sheltzer et al., 2014
- Gender bias in start-up support  Sege et al., 2015
- Gender bias in grant reviews  van Dijk et al, 2014.
- Gender bias in teacher ratings  Boring et al., 2016
- Gender bias in conference speaker invitations  Schroeder et al., 2013
- Gender bias in letters of reference  Trix & Psenka, 2003
- Gender bias in scholarly citations  Maliniak, Powers & Walter, 2013
Intersectionality

- **Race/Ethnicity**: People with typical Black names receive 50% fewer interview callbacks than the same applicant with a White name (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2003) even in “pro-diversity” organizations (Kang et al., 2016)

- **Disability**: Disabled applicants receive significantly less employer interest than the same applicant without a disclosed disability (Ameri et al., 2015)

- **Parenthood**: Mothers are viewed as significantly less competent and less hirable than the same applicant who is a father or a woman without a child (Correll, 2007)

- **Sexual Identity**: Applicants affiliated with an LGBTQ+ organization receive 40% fewer callbacks for a job compared to the same applicant without this affiliation (Tilcsik, 2011)
The (Gender) Gap is Everywhere

• Pay Inequality in USA:
  – Women full time workers in USA make 75.7% of men’s earnings

• In Montana:
  – Montana Women full time workers make 75.0% of Montana Men’s earnings

• At MSU
Fall 2016 MSU Professional and Classified Employee Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average FTE Salary</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,420 a year difference</td>
<td>$47,020</td>
<td>$47,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average FTE Salary</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,420 a year difference</td>
<td>$47,020</td>
<td>$47,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Annual Salary Range</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Avg. Years Since First Hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT 30K</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50K</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60K</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70K</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80K</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100K</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT 100K</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fall 2016 MSU Professional and Classified Employee Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE Annual Salary Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Avg. Years Since First Hire</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% of Females</th>
<th>% of Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT 30K</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50K</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60K</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70K</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80K</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100K</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT 100K</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fall 2016 MSU Professional and Classified Employee Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE Annual Salary Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Avg. Years Since First Hire</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% of Females</th>
<th>% of Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT 30K</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40K</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50K</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60K</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70K</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-80K</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100K</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT 100K</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MSU TT Faculty 2012-2013 AY Salary

Salary

Statistically significant $4000 a year difference

Men

Women
MSU TT Faculty 2013-14 AY Salary

$4920 a year difference

Men

Women

Salary
MSU TT Faculty 2016 Fall Salary

$11,511 a year difference
TT Faculty Salaries

Is this a small difference?
By P&T (7 years later) male assistant professor at MSU has made $17,760 more

Data from MSU OPA; AAUP.org

Assistant Professor
- MSU Men: $66,211
- MSU Women: $63,674
- U.S. PUBLIC UNIV MEN: $66,211
- U.S. PUBLIC UNIV WOMEN: $63,674

Associate Professor
- MSU Men: $87,175
- MSU Women: $87,175
- U.S. PUBLIC UNIV MEN: $87,175
- U.S. PUBLIC UNIV WOMEN: $87,175

Full Professor
- MSU Men: $118,139
- MSU Women: $118,139
- U.S. PUBLIC UNIV MEN: $118,139
- U.S. PUBLIC UNIV WOMEN: $118,139
Processes that influence pay at MSU

• Equity/Market Adjustments
• Merit Raises
• Promotion
Shifting Standards:
She Makes a lot *for a woman*

- **IN ONE STUDY...** people viewed photos of 40 people (20 men 20 women) and asked to estimate *(Biernat et al, 1991; 2003)*
  - How much money in dollars they made
  - How “financially successful” they were
Takes less money for a woman to be judged financially successful compared to men.
Shifting Standards

• Different “anchors” for judgments.
• *Shift the Standard of financial success*
Shifting Standards in Performance Evaluations (Biernat et al., 2011)

• In one study... annual performance evaluations were reviewed from all 268 junior attorneys working at a Wall Street Law firm for:

  – Overall Numerical Rating
  – Open-ended comments:
    • Positive Words (stellar, terrific, excellent, good)
    • Technical competence (Judgment, productivity, efficiency)
Shifting Standards in Performance Evaluations (Biernat et al., 2011)

Results

• *Men lawyers received higher numerical ratings than women*

• *And yet positive words appeared more often in comments about women*

• *Positive comments did not predict women’s ratings, but did predict men’s.*
Shifting Standards

What is happening?

• Different “anchors” for judgments.

• Shift the Standard
  – Women start at lower standard – inflated positivity in inconsequential comments
  – In objective ratings - takes more demonstrations of competence for women to receive high rating
What is happening?

Blatant Sexism?

What comes to mind when you think “Breadwinner”?
Implicit Associations Test
Demo

https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/
Men and Women both Show Unconscious Gender Biases

Association of math = male
arts = female

Association of men = Work
women = Family

Nosek et al. (2002)
Implicit Associations Are Internalized by *Everyone*
What to do?

• If a woman self-promotes she might experience backlash
• If a woman does not self-promote she might not receive valuable resources
Situational Interventions for Pay Equity

- Articulate and make transparent a priori standards of worth (Biernat, 2003)
- Be aware of implicit gender bias – and slow down! (Devine, 2001)
- Support family friendly work policies (Mandel & Semyonov, 2005)
- Normalize self-promotion (Smith et al., 2013)
- Advocate for other women (Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010)
- Actively undo a history of undervaluing women (Lips, 2003)
- Creatively strive for diversity in your unit (McKinsey & Company, 2007)
Take a hard look at your unit

**EQUALITY VERSUS EQUITY**

In the first image, it is assumed that everyone will benefit from the same supports. They are being treated equally.

In the second image, individuals are given different supports to make it possible for them to have equal access to the game. They are being treated equitably.

In the third image, all three can see the game without any supports or accommodations because the cause of the inequity was addressed. The systemic barrier has been removed.