

## Strategies to Help Break the Bias Habit®

	What to do	Examples
Stereotype Replacement <sup>1-3</sup>	Recognize when you have a gender-biased stereotypic response or observe the portrayal of one	Assuming that female faculty are less committed to their careers or less interested in leadership opportunities than male faculty  Portrayal of women or girls as poor at math or men as unable to do housework
	Label the characterization as stereotypical and the cognitive processes that may be at work	Expectancy Bias; Role Congruity; Prescriptive Gender Norms
	Identify the precipitating factors	Priming with gender congruent information; all previous occupants of a position were male
	Replace with a non-stereotypic response	“I personally know many successful women who balance career and family”  “Dr. [woman] led the [big responsibility] last year and did an excellent job”
	Challenge the fairness of the portrayal and replace with an egalitarian portrayal	Remind yourself that research indicates that training and experience - but not gender - predict the competence of leaders, scientists, engineers, or doctors
Counter-Stereotypic Imaging <sup>4-5</sup>	Recognize when you have a stereotypic gender-biased response	Envisioning only men when imagining applicants for the new chair or dean position
	Label the cognitive processes that may be at work	Expectancy Bias; Role Congruity; Social Roles; Reconstructing Credentials
	Help regulate response by imagining a counter-stereotype woman in detail	Imagine in detail a strong woman or a strong woman leader (e.g., those you know or public figures)
Individuating (vs. Generalizing) <sup>6-9</sup>	Avoid making a personnel snap decision based on a general impression or sense of “fit”	Consciously make the social category less salient than the qualifications of a specific individual
	Obtain more information on specific qualifications, past experiences, and achievements before making a decision	“I always think of Joe or Henry when these opportunities arise, but if I develop an open application process in which everyone can submit their qualifications, vision, and plan; we might get some fresh ideas and involve more women”
Perspective-Taking <sup>10-12</sup>	Adopt the perspective (in the first person) of a member of the stigmatized group to recognize how that person may be treated unfairly due to social stereotypes	Imagine what it would be like to have your abilities called into question, to be viewed as less committed to your career than colleagues with similar training and effort, or to be forced to ward off unwanted sexual advances at professional meetings  Deliberately think (in the first person) what it is like to be the only or the first woman of color in a department, what would it be like to have someone assume that you are a product of affirmative action  For women with mobility disabilities, you could imagine what it would be like to add the burden of snow to one’s daily routine
Increasing Opportunities for Contact <sup>9, 13-15</sup>	Seek out opportunities for greater interaction with high authority women, women of color, and women with disabilities	Depending on your position, you might meet with women in high authority positions to discuss research, ideas, visions  In compiling membership for committees or speakers lists for conferences, ensure that diverse women are represented

## References:

1. McGlone, M. S., & Aronson, J. (2007). Forewarning and forearmings stereotype-threatened students. *Communication Education, 56*(2), 119-133. doi: 10.1080/03634520601158681
2. Monteith, M. J., Devine, P. G., & Zuwerink, J. R. (1993). Self-directed versus other-directed affect as a consequence of prejudice-related discrepancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(2), 198-210. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.64.2.198
3. Monteith, M. J., Zuwerink, J. R., & Devine, P. G. (1994). Prejudice and prejudice reduction: Classic challenges, contemporary approaches. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, T. M. Ostrum (Eds.), *Social cognition: Impact on social psychology* (pp. 323-346). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
4. Blair, I. V., Ma, J. E., & Lenton, A. P. (2001). Imagining stereotypes away: The moderation of implicit stereotypes through mental imagery. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(5), 828-841. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.828
5. Dasgupta, N., & Asgari, S. (2004). Seeing is believing: Exposure to counterstereotypic women leaders and its effect on the malleability of automatic gender stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(5), 642-658. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2004.02.003
6. Muchinsky, P. M., & Harris, S. L. (1977). The effect of applicant sex and scholastic standing on the evaluation of job applicant resumes in sex-typed occupations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 11*(1), 95-108. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(77)90020-3
7. Heilman, M. E. (1984). Information as a deterrent against sex discrimination: The effects of applicant sex and information type on preliminary employment decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 33*(2), 174-186. doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(84)90019-9
8. Glick, P., Zion, C., & Nelson, C. (1988). What mediates sex discrimination in hiring decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*(2), 178-186. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.55.2.178
9. Lebrecht, L. J. P., Tarr, M. J., & Tanaka, J. W. (2009). Perceptual other-race training reduces implicit racial bias. *PLoS One, 4*(1), e4215. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0004215
10. Galinsky, A. D. (2002). Creating and reducing intergroup conflict: The role of perspective-taking in affecting out-group evaluations. *Research on Managing Groups and Teams, 4*, 85-113. doi: 10.1016/S1534-0856(02)04005-7.
11. Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 708-724. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.708
12. Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G. B., & Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: The mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(4), 455-472. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.163
13. Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65
14. Brown, R., Eller, A., Leeds, S., & Stace, K. (2007). Intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*(4), 692-703. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.384
15. Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.