A Data-Driven Approach to Winning the War for Talent During the Great Resignation: Ending Silos Between DEI, Culture and Anti-Sexual Harassment Initiatives.

by Joan C. Williams, J.D., Janine Yancey, J.D., Leann Pereira, Ed.D., Rachel Korn, Ph.D., Elvir Causevic, J.D.,D. Sc.., Robert Todd, and Laraine McKinnon

Abstract

A novel cross-sectional analysis of two large DEI and workplace culture datasets supports the hypothesis that inclusion, respect, bias, and sexual harassment are closely linked. We present a detailed analysis of recent workplace data methodically collected from 22,000 employees across different industries in 2019-2021. The data and analysis were provided by Emtrain, a Silicon Valley workplace technology company that engages, measures, and improves workplace culture, and the Center for WorkLife Law at the University of California - Hastings, a pioneer in workplace equity. Findings demonstrate that bias accounts for 41%, 53%, and 26% of the variation in reports of belonging, respect, and career prospects, respectively. We offer strategic recommendations for implementing an integrated, metrics-driven, legally relevant, and inclusive approach to building a culture that will attract, engage and retain top talent.

Background and Need

Our research and experience indicate that organizations tend to manage harassment, inclusion, and respect in different functional silos: human resources teams select anti-harassment training and learning & development teams deploy it, legal teams manage discrimination and harassment claims to protect the organization from financial and reputation risk, and diversity leaders are tasked with building inclusion, many of them in newly created positions across leading companies. This siloed approach is flawed: because these issues are linked, organizations committed to creating lasting change need to address respect, inclusion, respect, bias, and harassment holistically.

Ample research documents how inclusion enhances organizational effectiveness. A 2020 McKinsey report on diversity in companies found that those in the top 25% for racial diversity among managers were 36% more likely to have financial returns above their industry mean; those in the top quartile for gender diversity in management were 25% more likely.[1] Research also shows that collective intelligence is more than twice as important as individual team members' intelligence in determining team performance and that gender-diverse teams are smarter than those that are not gender-diverse.[2] Racially diverse teams avoid groupthink, make fewer errors in recalling relevant information, and work harder.[3]

[1] Dixon-Fyle, S., Coldan, K., Hunt, V., & Prince, S. (2020). Diversity wins: How inclusion matters. McKinsey & Co. Retrieved from: https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/diversity-wins-how-inclusion-matters

[2] Williams, J.C. (2021). Bias Interrupted: Creating Inclusion For Real and For Good. Harvard Business Review Press.

[3] For studies on the benefits of racially diverse teams, see: Williams, J.C. (2021). Bias Interrupted: Creating Inclusion For Real and For Good. Harvard Business Review Press.

Outside of academic circles, people are increasingly aware that knowledge is social in nature. It stands to reason that the more diverse the contributors, the more profound and more relevant the knowledge. In recent years, because of the #MeToo and the Black Lives Matter movements, businesses have learned this in theory, yet they still struggle in practice. The Great Resignation signals that employee engagement is lower than employee dissatisfaction. Attracting and retaining diverse teams seems to be an ever-increasing challenge. Both our organizations try to help. Emtrain focuses on developing and measuring workplace respect and inclusion; WorkLife Law focuses on eliminating bias. This brief reports on our research and provides evidence to support the idea that organizations that address respect, bias, discrimination, and sexual harassment holistically will be more effective than organizations that focus on them as separate and unrelated entities.

This paper draws upon two independent streams of work; both focused on a particular problem domain of creating inclusive, just, and rewarding work experiences for all:

1) Emtrain's Workplace Social Capital Indicators™[4] is a framework to measure, score, and benchmark core competencies of respect and inclusion, flag leading indicators of risk, and identify skills and behaviors to improve pro-social relationships and culture of respect across the organization, and

2) WorkLife Law's Bias Interrupters is an industry-leading evidence-based model that provides solutions to interrupt the constant transmission of bias in basic business systems, leading to more diverse and better performing workplaces

[4] https://emtrain.com/workplace-social-indicators/

Purpose

This research is the first to link respect, inclusion, bias, and sexual harassment to a statistically significant degree. Our study confirms the importance of taking a holistic and integrated approach to these issues and advances practice addressing intersectionality.[5] For example, women of color consistently (though not invariably) report the highest levels of bias and the lowest levels of respect. This facet of their workplace experience should be addressed by employee relations and legal initiatives *in conjunction* with inclusion and diversity and talent management initiatives.

This study also demonstrates convergent validity between independent research streams; by Emtrain on respect and inclusion indicators and WorkLife Law's research on constructs of bias (prove-it-again bias[6], tightrope bias[7]) and their impact on career development.

Methodology

Emtrain collected data from 19,252 participants at a healthcare organization as part of a large-scale workplace training in 2021. WorkLife Law data draws from three datasets from 2019 and 2020. This includes 1,346 architectural professionals, 1,770 employees at a large STEM organization, and 216 individuals in computing.

Matching Concepts of Respect, Inclusion, and Bias

Emtrain and WorkLife Law each conduct research to understand the interplay between employees and organizational processes that create sub-optimal outcomes in the workplace. These outcomes are felt at the individual level, by groups that are historically underrepresented

[5] Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *u. Chi. Legal f.*, 139.; Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality*. John Wiley & Sons.

[6] Individuals in some groups have to prove themselves repeatedly to get the same amount of respect and recognition automatically given to other groups.

[7] Some groups have to navigate more complicated office politics to be successful in the workplace.

in the workplace, and by the organization itself in terms of lost productivity and missed revenue or growth targets.

Most organizations are familiar with tracking diversity metrics, but it is essential to highlight the difference between outcome metrics and process metrics. Outcome metrics focus on the end result: for example, how many women and people of color are in leadership positions in a company. In contrast, process metrics focus on what is happening to get to the outcomes: for example, whether women and people of color are forced to prove themselves over and over again in order to get promotions. Process metrics are critical for diagnosing exactly where in the process bias creeps in, which maps to our strategic recommendations presented at the end of the paper.

We investigated our hypothesis that Emtrain and WorkLife Law data show similar patterns and thus allow us to draw inferences linking bias, respect, and sexual harassment. We created matching bias scales from the Emtrain data using a conceptual approach: We mapped WorkLife Law's underlying prove-it-again and tightrope concepts to Emtrain's model of social capital indicators of inclusion and respect. We selected questions from the Emtrain dataset that fit WorkLife Law concepts. More information on scale development is available in the appendix.

Description of key factors analyzed

Respect. Respect represents a core set of behaviors and competencies that, when practiced and developed, create a pro-social environment while minimizing financial and reputational risk related to employee relations claims for harassment and discrimination. To create a respectful workplace culture, leaders within organizations can become more aware of levels of power and take care to wield it effectively.[8] They can support anti-discriminatory practices by using gender

[8] Khatri, N. (2009). Consequences of power distance orientation in organizations. *Vision*, *13*(1), 1-9.

pronouns that match chosen identities.[9] Such actions demonstrate respect in today's workplace and can positively impact retention.[10] The Emtrain respect scale consists of six subscales. To compare datasets, new subscales were created from Emtrain respect questions to simulate Worklife Law bias scales. (See Appendix)

Inclusion. Inclusion represents competencies that would increase innovation, diversity, employee engagement, and overall well-being.[11] For example, organizations can institutionalize behaviors that mitigate bias by using structured decision-making processes in candidate recruitment[12]. Companies can demonstrate that they value differences by increasing business partnerships and operations to include diverse communities.[13] Leaders within organizations can take purposeful actions to increase their demographic experience by increasing the diversity of their own personal and professional social networks.[14] The Emtrain inclusion scale is made up of six subscales. To compare datasets, new subscales were created from Emtrain inclusion questions to simulate Worklife Law bias scales. (See Appendix)

Prove-it-again Bias. Prove-it-again bias occurs when some groups need to consistently provide more evidence of competence than others in order to be seen as equally competent.[15] This stems

---

[9] Dietert, M., & Dentice, D. (2009). Gender identity issues and workplace discrimination: The transgender experience. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, *14*(1).

[10] McGuire, M., Houser, J., Jarrar, T., Moy, W., & Wall, M. (2003). Retention: it's all about respect. *The health care manager*, *22*(1), 38-44.

[11] Roberts, L. W. (2020). Belonging, respectful inclusion, and diversity in medical education. *Academic Medicine*, *95*(5), 661-664. Fine, C., Sojo Monzon, V., & Lawford-Smith, H. (2020). Why does workplace gender diversity matter? Justice, organizational benefits, and policy. Steele, R., & Derven, M. (2015). Diversity & Inclusion and innovation: a virtuous cycle. *Industrial and Commercial Training*.

[12] Pogrebtsova, E., Luta, D., & Hausdorf, P. A. (2020). Selection of gender-incongruent applicants: No gender bias with structured interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *28*(1), 117-121.

[13] Blount, I., & Li, M. (2021). How buyers' attitudes toward supplier diversity affect their expenditures with ethnic minority businesses. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, *57*(3), 3-24.

[14] Ibarra, H. (1995). Race, opportunity, and diversity of social circles in managerial networks. *Academy of management journal*, *38*(3), 673-703.

[15] Foschi, M. (2000). Double standards for competence: Theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 21-42. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.21 Biernat, M., & Kobrynowicz, D. (1997). Gender- and race-based standards of competence: Lower minimum standards but higher ability standards for devalued groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(3), 544-557. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.544; Foschi, M., Lai, L., & Sigerson, K. (1994). Gender and double standards in the

from descriptive stereotyping: we're expecting people to conform to stereotypes we hold about their groups.[16] Some groups, including women,[17] Black people,[18] Latinx people,[19] and people from lower class-origin backgrounds[20] are stereotyped as less competent, so they have to consistently work harder than others in order to prove their competence in the workplace (while white men from college-educated families are naturally assumed to be competent).

Prove-it-again bias stems from two different mechanisms: in-group favoritism and lack of fit. In-group favoritism reflects that dominant-group members (like white men from college-educated families in professional-managerial jobs) tend to favor those like them, giving them the benefit of the doubt and the best career-enhancing opportunities.[21] The end result is that women and people of color are given less access to those opportunities, and held to higher standards.[22]

Lack of fit occurs when a person's role doesn't align to their strengths or personal and professional growth needs. Lack of fit reflects the unspoken (and often unconscious) assumption

---

assessment of job applicants. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 326-339.; Foschi, M. (1996). Double standards in the evaluation of men and women. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*(3), 237–254. doi: 10.2307/2787021; Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford University Press. Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V. V., Galvez, S. M. N., He, B., Jurafsky, D., & McFarland, D. A. (2020). The diversity–innovation paradox in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *117*(17), 9284-9291.

[16] 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.

[17] Biernat, M., & Kobrynowicz, D. (1997). Gender- and race-based standards of competence: Lower minimum standards but higher ability standards for devalued groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(3), 544–557. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.544; Foschi, M., Lai, L., & Sigerson, K. (1994). Gender and double standards in the assessment of job applicants. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 326-339.; Foschi, M. (1996). Double standards in the evaluation of men and women. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*(3), 237-254. doi: 10.2307/2787021

[18] Biernat, M., & Kobrynowicz, D. (1997). Gender- and race-based standards of competence: Lower minimum standards but higher ability standards for devalued groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(3), 544-557. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.544

[19] Weyant, J. M. (2005). Implicit stereotyping of Hispanics: Development and validity of a Hispanic version of the Implicit Association Test. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *27*(3), 355-363.

[20] Rivera, L. A., & Tilcsik, A. (2016). Class advantage, commitment penalty: The gendered effect of social class signals in an elite labor market. *American Sociological Review*, *81*(6), 1097-1131.

[21] Brewer, M.B. (1996). *In-Group Favoritism: The Subtle Side of Intergroup Discrimination. Behavioral Research and Business Ethics*, 160-170. Russell Sage, New York.

[22] Heilman, M. E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The Lack of Fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 5,* 269-298. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1984-10927-001

that high-powered professionals will be white and male; hence employees who don't fit that description are seen as less qualified for more desirable and rewarding jobs than white males. As a result, they need to prove themselves again and again to advance in their careers.

Women and people of color tend to report having to work harder to get the same level of recognition and getting less respect for the same quality of work. On the ground, this appears as Black applicants needing 8 more years of experience to get called back for interviews at the same rate as white applicants,[23] or women's ideas being ignored, but when a man brings up that same idea, it's suddenly "brilliant",[24] or women of color being assumed to be administrative or custodial staff, regardless of any context clues in the workplace.[25]

Tightrope Bias. Tightrope bias means that some groups face more complicated office politics than others. Tightrope bias stems from prescriptive stereotypes about how people should behave.[26] One result of tightrope bias is the likeability vs. competence tradeoff: women have to navigate a tightrope between being seen as too aggressive, and therefore risk being disliked, or

[23] 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

[24] 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.

[25] Williams, J.C., Phillips, K.W., & Hall, E.V. (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

[26] Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5(3), 665. 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., 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

too complying, and therefore risk not being respected.[27] Typically, to get ahead at work, you have to be both liked and respected.[28]

When women act assertively at work, they often face pushback. Men are expected to be authoritative, ambitious leaders, but women are expected to be nice, communal team-players.[29] This leads to a penalty for women who break the mold.[30]

Research shows that the tightrope is triggered by race as well as gender; in fact, all groups seen as lower in status are often expected to be deferential.[31] Because people of color are

---

[27] 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., Cuddy, A. J., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(2), 77-83.; 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; Heilman, M. E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *10*(4), 3.; Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of social issues*, *57*(4), 657-674.; Heilman, M. E., & Okimoto, T. G. (2007). Why are women penalized for success at male tasks?: the implied communality deficit. *Journal of applied psychology*, *92*(1), 81.; Porter, N., & Geis, F. (1981). Women and nonverbal leadership cues: When seeing is not believing. In *Gender and nonverbal behavior* (pp. 39-61). Springer, New York, NY.; 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; Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. Research in organizational behavior, 28, 61-79.

[28] Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *11*(2), 77-83.; 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

[29] Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5(3), 665. 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

[30] 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; Okimoto, T. G., & Brescoll, V. L. (2010). The price of power: Power seeking and backlash against female politicians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(7), 923-936.; 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., & 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. (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; 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

[31] Ridgeway, C. L., & Nakagawa, S. (2017). Is deference the price of being seen as reasonable? How status hierarchies incentivize acceptance of low status. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *80*(2), 132-152.

commonly stereotyped as lower in status, they, too, walk a tightrope between being authoritative and approachable. Thus Black men don't have the same freedom to act assertively in the workplace as white men,[32] nor do Asian-Americans of either sex.[33]

Tightrope bias means that while members of the dominant group are seen as a natural fit for leadership roles,[34] members of other groups are seen as only fit to be "worker bees" who keep their heads down, don't complain, and just get the work done.[35] Bias also impacts who can express anger in the workplace – expressing anger tends to benefit white men, but it's a poor career move for anyone else.[36] Interruptions are similar – white men tend to interrupt because it is socially acceptable, but women and people of color are expected to be quiet and deferential.[37]

Another aspect of tightrope bias concerns work opportunities. Women of all races face pressure to do the "organizational citizenship" work that makes you a good citizen but doesn't count when it comes time for promotions.[38] There are several different types of office housework, but the underlying point is that women tend to get stuck with less-valued work

---

[32] 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; Rosette, A. S., Koval, C. Z., Ma, A., & Livingston, R. (2016). Race matters for women leaders: Intersectional effects on agentic deficiencies and penalties. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *27*(3), 429-445.

[33] 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.

[34] Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford University Press.; Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Harvard Business Press.; Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(5), 685.

[35] Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public policy, and Law*, 5(3), 665. 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

[36] 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; Rosette, A. S., Koval, C. Z., Ma, A., & Livingston, R. (2016). Race matters for women leaders: Intersectional effects on agentic deficiencies and penalties. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *27*(3), 429-445.; Wingfield, A. H. (2007). The modern mammy and the angry Black man: African American professionals' experiences with gendered racism in the workplace. *Race, Gender & Class*, 196-212.

[37] Smith-Lovin, L., & Brody, C. (1989). Interruptions in group discussions: The effects of gender and group composition. *American Sociological Review*, 424-435. Zimmermann, D. H., & West, C. (1996). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series 4* (pp. 211-236).

[38] 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.

because they are supposed to be good team players. The result is that women carry the extra load of "invisible work"[39] and have less time for their actual job duties.

Results

Pattern of experiences

When we examined the means of our composite and single-item measures in the Emtrain and WorkLife Law datasets, we saw a pattern: white men were consistently reporting the best experiences, women of color were reporting the worst experiences, and white women and men of color tended to fall in between those groups. To further examine these patterns, we ran one-way ANOVAs and conducted post-hoc Tukey HSD tests.

When we constructed an Emtrain prove-it-again scale, it showed a significant difference in the experiences of prove-it-again bias by demographic group. White men reported the least bias (M = 3.06), and women of color the most (M = 3.32). White women (M = 3.21) and men of color (M = 3.21) fell in between, significantly different from both white men and women of color. A closer look at women of color showed that Black women (M = 3.39) and Multiracial women (M = 3.40) reported levels of bias that were slightly higher than average for women of color.

This is the same pattern we typically see in WorkLife Law data as well. In data set after data set, white men (Ms = 2.06-2.11) tend to report the least amount of prove-it-again bias, and women of color report the most (Ms = 2.81-4.01). Men of color (Ms = 2.40-2.69) tend to fall slightly closer to white men, and white women (Ms = 2.65-2.94) tend to fall slightly closer to women of color. Furthermore, Black men (Ms = 3.10-3.12) and Black women (Ms = 3.16-3.21)

[39] Daniels, A. K. (1987). Invisible Work. Social Problems, 34(5), 403–415. https://doi.org/10.2307/800538

tend to report even more prove-it-again bias than other groups of people of color, although this varies somewhat by industry.

The Emtrain data showed a significant difference in the experiences of tightrope bias by demographic group as well. White men (M = 3.09) and white women (M = 3.12) reported significantly less bias than men of color (M = 3.26) and women of color (M = 3.36), with women of color reporting significantly more bias than men of color. A more nuanced look also showed that Black women (M = 3.44) and Multiracial women (M = 3.43) reported slightly more bias than average for women of color.

WorkLife Law data shows a clear pattern when it comes to tightrope bias: white men report the least (Ms = 2.24-2.26), and women of color the most (Ms = 2.66-3.55). White women (Ms = 2.61-3.05) fall close to women of color, and men of color (Ms = 2.32-2.62) fall closer to white men but still higher than them, although this is somewhat dependent on industry. Black women (Ms = 2.87-3.34) and multiracial women (Ms = 2.84-3.19) tend to report even more bias on average than other women of color, although this pattern varies depending on which aspects of tightrope bias we focus on.

This is one area where the Emtrain data and the WorkLife Law data diverged slightly. The Emtrain tightrope scale that was constructed for this study does not reflect the types of bias that are most impactful for white women, so we see white women's experiences are falling closer to those of white men. WorkLife Law tightrope scale reflects more on the competence vs. likeability tradeoff, and so that scale tends to highlight large differences between the experiences of white women and white men – the data typically shows that all women have experiences closer to each other than to men of any race.

For the one-item respect scale, we see the hypothesized pattern in the Emtrain data: white men reported feeling respected more than all other groups (M = 5.45), with women of color feeling the least respected (M = 5.19). White women (M = 5.32) and men of color (M = 5.32) fell in between, significantly different from both white men and women of color. Again, Black women (M = 5.11) and multiracial women (M = 5.12) reported feeling slightly less respected than average for women of color, with multiracial men reported slightly less respect than average for men of color (M = 5.11).

WorkLife Law data does not contain a measure of feeling respected in the workplace. However, some of our studies do contain a question about feeling disrespected, demeaned, or humiliated in the workplace. We find that white men report less disrespect than all other groups (M = 1.77), while women of color (M = 2.42) report the most. White women (M = 2.24) and men of color (M = 1.95) fall in between. Black women (M = 2.66), Latinx women (M = 2.90), and East Asian women (M = 3.90) report worse experiences than women of color on average, depending on the industry.

The Emtrain authenticity and belonging scale showed the same directional pattern as the other variables; white men reported the highest sense of authenticity and belonging (M = 4.85), followed by white women (M = 4.82), men of color (M = 4.81), and finally women of color (M = 4.69). However, the differences between white men, white women, and men of color were not statistically significant. Women of color are the only group that stood out as significantly different from all other groups. Again, Black women (M = 4.58) and Multiracial women (M = 4.65) reported a lower sense of authenticity and belonging than average for women of color, and Multiracial men (M = 4.65) reported a lower sense of authenticity and belonging than other men of color.

WorkLife Law data contains a belonging scale that shows the same pattern: white men report the highest level of belonging (*Ms* = 4.45-4.64), with women of color reporting the lowest levels of belonging (*Ms* = 3.37-4.12). White women (*Ms* = 4.04-4.31) and men of color (*Ms* = 4.16-4.27) fall in between, closer to white men in some industries and closer to women of color in others.

Our final shared variable of interest, confidence in career development, showed a pattern that is directionally the same as other variables: white men had the highest scores (*M* = 5.04), followed by men of color (*M* = 5.00), white women (*M* = 4.99), and finally women of color (*M* = 4.88). However, white men, white women, and men of color all had scores that do not differ significantly from each other, while women of color had scores that differ significantly from all other groups. On this variable, we still saw Black women (*M* = 4.80) and Multiracial women (*M* = 4.82) with the lowest scores, while Multiracial men also showed lower scores than the average for men of color (*M* = 4.84).

WLL data also includes a career development variable. In datasets across different industries, we see the same pattern of results as the Emtrain data: white men report feeling the most ability to advance their careers (*Ms* = 3.77-4.68), with women of color reporting the least (*Ms* = 3.33-3.94). White women (*Ms* = 3.67-4.16) and men of color (*Ms* = 3.77-4.14) fall in between, closer to white men in some industries and closer to women of color in others.

Table 1. Workplace Experiences by Demographic Group and Dataset[40]

	White Men		White Women		Men of Color		Women of Color	
Variable	EM	WLL	EM	WLL	EM	WLL	EM	WLL
Prove-it-again Bias	3.06	2.11	3.21	2.94	3.21	2.69	3.32	4.01
Tightrope Bias	3.09	2.26	3.12	3.05	3.26	2.62	3.36	3.55
Respect/ Disrespect[41]	5.45	1.77	5.32	2.24	5.32	1.95	5.19	2.42
Career Dev Outlook	5.04	4.68	4.99	4.16	5.00	4.14	4.88	3.94
Belonging	4.85	4.64	4.82	4.31	4.81	4.27	4.69	4.12

Finally, WLL data contains a sexual harassment variable. This measure asks whether respondents have experienced any of a wide range of behaviors ranging from sexual comments, jokes, or stories to unwanted attention and physical contact. Rates of sexual harassment varied across industries, although women consistently report more sexual harassment than men. Rates ranged from 12%-42% for white men, 16%-46% for men of color, 38%-68% for women of color, and 42%-71% for white women.

Across multiple measures, there was also a difference in the base rates of reporting each experience. The Emtrain data tended to skew slightly more positive, with most groups reporting fairly positive experiences on the whole. This may be because the Emtrain questions were paired

[40] Multiple datasets were used to inform this study. Although means differ for each variable across datasets the highest recorded values are reported here. Emtrain uses a 7-point scale and WLL uses a 6-point scale.

[41] This variable is respect for Emtrain data, but disrespect for WLL, so the values are reversed but depict similar trends across demographic groups.

with videos of workplace scenes that anchor the self-assessments within the context of workplace experiences. The WorkLife Law questions come in a simple survey format without an anchoring mechanism. Another possible reason for the difference in magnitude between Emtrain and WLL scores is that Emtrain used 7-point scale and WLL uses a 6-point scale. However, base rates are only one piece of the entire story: the patterns are the most valuable clue to what is really going on.

We saw very similar patterns in the Emtrain and WorkLife Law data, but what made this so interesting is that the datasets contained questions that ask about our core concepts in opposite ways. The Emtrain questions tended to be framed positively, and focused more on good experiences in the workplace (like having your ideas valued). The WorkLife Law questions are more likely to be framed negatively, given that they focus on bias in the workplace (like having your ideas stolen). Organizations are often concerned about asking negative questions for a variety of reasons. But the conjunction of our data makes it clear that you can expect to find the same pattern no matter how you are asking the questions. For organizations that care deeply about DEI and workplace culture, this might be welcome news – there is no need to shy away from asking negative questions out of a worry that it will prime employees to think differently about their experiences.

Bias is linked to inclusion and respect

To investigate the connections between the bias constructs and key outcome variables, we began by calculating correlation coefficients. Using the Emtrain data, we found strong negative correlations between the prove-it-again and tightrope bias constructs and respect, meaning that higher levels of bias are linked to lower levels of respect: $r = -.61$ and $r = -.53$, respectively. We also found a strong negative correlation between the inclusion subscale of authenticity and

belonging at work and both prove-it-again (r = -.64) and tightrope bias (r = -.68). Feeling confident about your ability to develop your career at your current organization and bias were moderately negatively correlated: r = -.46 for prove-it-again and r = -.47 for tightrope.

Table 2. Correlations between Emtrain Indicators (Restructured to Simulate WLL Variables)

	Prove-it-again	Tightrope	Respect	Authenticity & Belonging
Prove-it-again	-			
Tightrope	.62	-		
Respect	-.61	-.53	-	
Authenticity & Belonging	-.64	-.68	.59	-
Career Dev	-.46	-.47	.39	.58

WorkLife Law data shows a remarkably similar pattern. Belonging and prove-it-again showed strong negative correlations ranging from r = -.55 to r = -.67, while belonging and tightrope also showed strong negative correlations from r = -.51 to r = -.64. Bias was also negatively correlated with feeling that there is a clear path for advancement for you at your organization: correlations ranged from r = -.40 to r = -.52 for prove-it-again, and from r = -.46 to r = -.54 for tightrope.

Next, we sought to examine whether the bias constructs are responsible for a meaningful amount of variance in the outcome variables. We conducted regression analyses for our outcome

variables using prove-it-again and tightrope bias as predictors. Emtrain data revealed that 41% of the variance in feeling respected at your organization can be attributed to bias. The inclusion subscale of authenticity and belonging was even more influenced by bias: 53% of the variance in feeling a sense of authenticity and belonging at your organization can be attributed to bias. Lastly, 26% of the variance in feeling confident about your ability to develop your career at your current organization can be attributed to bias.

Table 3. Expected Variance in Experiences Attributable to Bias in Emtrain Data

Bias composite	Respect	Inclusion	Career Development Confidence
PIA and TR	41%	53%	26%

The Emtrain regression analysis data provides an important piece of evidence that higher levels of bias are linked to lower levels of respect and inclusion in the workplace. WorkLife Law data allows us to take a step further to examine the overall impact of multiple forms of bias, including prove-it-again and tightrope but also including maternal wall, tug of war, and bias based on racial stereotypes. WorkLife Law data shows that 33%-48% of the variance in belonging can be attributed to the 5 patterns of bias. Similarly, 27%-38% of the variance in feeling like you have the ability to develop your career at your current organization can be attributed to bias.

Harassment is linked to bias and belonging

Finally, we sought to examine whether WLL sexual harassment data is linked to other key variables of interest. We conducted t-tests to investigate whether levels of bias, feelings of

belonging, and ability to develop your career were different for people who reported sexual harassment compared to those who did not report sexual harassment. Across the different datasets, we found consistent links between sexual harassment and our key variables. Levels of prove-it-again bias were .71-.93 points higher on the 5-point Likert scale for people who reported sexual harassment than for those who didn't. Tightrope bias showed a similar pattern: those who had been sexually harassed reported levels of bias .69-.84 points higher. Feelings of belonging were .39-.62 points lower for those who had been sexually harassed, and feeling able to advance your career was .46-.89 points lower for those who had been sexually harassed.

The takeaway message here is clear: respect, authenticity and belonging, and confidence in career development opportunities are all impacted by workplace bias. Furthermore, sexual harassment is strongly linked to bias, belonging, and confidence in career development opportunities. Both Emtrain and WorkLife Law data show strong connections between bias and outcomes, even though the two organizations took different approaches to examining workplace experiences.

Implications

Emtrain's data set and WorkLife Law's were collected entirely independently and without coordination, so the fact that specific key findings emerged in both contexts is striking. Across several different variables in both of our datasets, a clear pattern emerges: white men have a different, better workplace experience than all other groups, and typically the experience of women of color diverges the most from white men's, with men of color and white women in between. Organizations often want to keep their DEI efforts focused on one issue in the

workplace: inclusion. But that's not really how things work. Respect, belonging, and career development prospects are intrinsically linked with bias.

These findings mirror other research documenting the ways in which respect, inclusion, and bias are intertwined. Michèle Lamont has found that more than two-thirds of US African American respondents reported disrespect, at a level dramatically higher than was reported by Black Brazilians. This evidence suggests that bias against African Americans is more likely to be expressed as disrespect than in Brazil and other countries (Lamont also had data on Arab Palestinians, who also reported lower levels of disrespect than Black Americans).[42]

A 2013 study also found that modern bias and discrimination is often expressed as "selective incivility," defined as "rude and discourteous behavior ."[43] The study found that both women and people of color reported incivility, which is also experienced as microaggressions, more than men did, which in turn predicted intent to leave their jobs, particularly for African Americans. Mirroring the findings of our study, they found that African American women reported a larger effect than any other group.

Strategic Recommendations

All of this shows the importance of addressing harassment, respect, bias and inclusion holistically if organizations are going to achieve their goals. A simplified set of initial principles based on our data and experience in the field is as follows:

[42] Lamont, M., Silva, G. M., Welburn, J., Guetzkow, J., Mizrachi, N., Herzog, H., & Reis, E. (2016). Getting respect: Responding to Stigma and Discrimination in the United States, Brazil, and Israel. Princeton University Press.
[43] Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. Journal of management, 39(6), 1579-1605.

- **Coordinate across silos.** Anti-harassment and inclusion initiatives are best measured, designed, and delivered in conjunction with each other, because the issues are intrinsically linked.
- **Measure sentiments *and* behaviors as they pertain to business operations.** Don't analyze harassment claims data separate from diversity and inclusion or culture-related data.
- **Train holistically.** Anti-harassment training, inclusion and diversity training, and employee engagement programs are different dimensions of the same set of challenges and they share common roots. Focus training on skill building for the attitudes and behaviors that help teams identify and mitigate bias and foster inclusion.

Coordination. Coordination across silos is key to success. For starters organizations can stand behind their commitment to inclusion and diversity by synchronizing their approaches, metrics, and actions across the functions tasked with addressing these issues. Bring employee relations, diversity and inclusion, employee engagement, and training teams together. Then, as the practice deepens, organizations can more flexibly re-examine their operations and align them to next-generation standards of inclusion and employee well-being.

Measurement. Start with the right metrics. In practice this means that the adoption of "process" metrics before outcomes metrics is critical. Process metrics are data that describe the nature of the social interactions that create respect, bias, or inclusion as they occur in the business processes, such as team-based workflows or hiring processes. Outcome metrics, like headcount, are too downstream – there is simply not enough information in the "body count" of how many women, people of color and other groups are present in an organization at year end to help drive change. Instead, we need to measure the nature of attitudes and interactions between people as they interact within operational processes. Is bias creeping in when someone writes an advertisement for a position, screens resumes, assesses candidates' responses, introduces someone during onboarding, chooses who to give the "plum" assignment to, or decides who to promote to first-line manager? How about when someone decides who gets consulted on a

decision, or who will present in a meeting? Bias can be detected by implementing metrics at each process stage. Such an approach needs to be taken at the organization-level because it is important to look for patterns in attitudes, knowledge, and behaviors across operational processes.

Training. Constant, smart, bite-size, asynchronous, engaging, and realistic trainings provide the positive reinforcement required to learn new practices. Realistic training builds situational awareness of bias and bias mitigation practices within the workflow of everyday life. The overarching learning objective is to increase employees' knowledge and skill in naming and mitigating bias when faced with these challenges in the workplace. The cumulative effect of training over time is that learners practice the skills taught and advance the workplace culture.

In an era of cultural change and uncertainty, organizations are tasked with redefining "how things get done". If they wish to attract, engage and retain the talent they want, leaders must measure the right things and enable employees and organizations to meet the challenges of the future.

About Emtrain

Emtrain is an innovative leader in helping employers create healthier organizations by developing peoples' skills and strengthening the social fabric of their workforce using its AI based workplace culture platform, a new type of online training that embeds dialogue-based research tools and diagnostic approach enables leadership, and employees to identify issues, find common ground and change behaviors to build stronger teams.

About WorkLifeLaw

Hastings' Center for WorkLife Law is an advocacy and research organization that seeks to advance racial, gender, and class equity.

About the Authors

Joan C. Williams, J.D. is a scholar of social inequality who focuses on the impact of race, gender, and social class in the workplace and in politics. The Founding Director at the Center for WorkLife Law, she is also Sullivan Professor at the University of California, Hastings.

Janine Yancey, J.D. is an entrepreneur, lawyer and workplace visionary, improving organizational ethics, respect and inclusion. As the founder and CEO of Emtrain, Janine has created an innovative CultureTech platform that provides online education, advice and analytics. EmtrainAI was recognized as a World Changing Idea in AI and Data by Fast Company in 2020. Janine earned her JD at University of California Hastings School of Law and a BA in English and Political Science at the University of California Berkeley.

Leann Pereira, Ed.D. is a learning and development professional who has conducted workplace research and designed programs across talent management functions. Leann is the Senior Director of Organizational Psychology at Emtrain and is responsible for psychometrics and skills-based content. She holds a doctorate in educational psychology and leadership studies, and an MS in Organization Development from the University of San Francisco, as well as a BA in women's studies from Rutgers University.

Rachel Korn, Ph.D Rachel is a social psychologist with a focus on gender and racial equity in the workplace. Rachel currently serves as Research Director at the Center for WorkLife Law. She holds a doctorate in social psychology from the University of Rochester and a BS in psychology from Virginia Tech.

Elvir Causevic, J.D., D.Sc. is a serial entrepreneur and social change activist. Starting as applied math faculty at Yale University, he founded and built four companies, two of which were acquired by Fortune 500 medical device firms, and one by a leading Wall Street investment bank, where he was in executive leadership. He now serves as board member, investment banker, lawyer and technology advisor across a number startup, large corporate and non-profit organizations. He holds a doctorate in electrical engineering from Washington University in St. Louis and a JD from UC California Hastings.

Robert Todd is a digital learning pioneer who has led innovative learning technology for McKinsey, LinkedIn, DigitalThink, and ?What If! (@Accenture). He designed the award-winning Emtrain AI platform and now leads its learning and culture analytics evolution as Emtrain's Chief Research, Development, and Innovation Officer.

Laraine McKinnon is a talent & culture strategist tackling hard-to-solve problems using behavioral science, big data, and practical implementation. Laraine helps Emtrain design learning architecture and data analytics and enable clients to apply innovations to their strategic goals. She holds a B.A. in Women's Studies and Political Science from Wellesley College.

APPENDIX

Scale Development

The Emtrain dataset contained four questions that addressed aspects of prove-it-again bias. These four questions asked about speaking time at meetings, how ideas are valued, whether some people's ideas seem to count more, and the way contributions are acknowledged. These four questions were turned into a scale with an alpha of $\alpha = .63$.

The WorkLife Law data contains a prove-it-again scale that asks about having to prove oneself repeatedly, having ones ideas stolen, getting less respect and recognition for the same work, and having accomplishments met with surprise or dismissed as luck. The questions differ slightly in each industry dataset because of the need to fit the survey to time constraints. The scale alphas range from $\alpha = .86$ to $\alpha = .92$.

The Emtrain dataset contained four questions that addressed aspects of tightrope bias. These four questions asked about the ability to be authentic to oneself, having to minimize one's identity to fit in, manager appreciation for people of different backgrounds, and distribution of support tasks. These four questions were turned into a scale with an alpha of $\alpha = .57$.[44]

The WLL data contains a tightrope scale that asks about pushback for assertive behavior, self-promotion, leadership expectations, interruptions, fitting in to a narrow range of behaviors at work, and access to desirable assignments. . The questions differ slightly in each industry dataset due to space constraints. The scale alphas range from $\alpha = .83$ to $\alpha = .87$.

[44] Note: the alphas for our two bias scales using the Emtrain data were somewhat lower than we typically see in WorkLife Law data. Conceptually, the questions did not match up perfectly to the WorkLife Law bias constructs. This issue was particularly prominent with the tightrope scale, which focused on having to behave in a certain way to be accepted at work and on the office housework, while the WorkLife Law scale includes a wider range of questions and a focus on the likeability-competence tradeoff. This research brief shares exploratory analyses, and is a first step towards understanding how respect and bias are linked in the workplace. Thus, we chose to share the results despite the scales not being as tight as we would want in an experimental setting.

The Emtrain dataset contained four questions that asked about the sense of belonging at one's organization, including feeling a sense of belonging, leaders cultivating a sense of belonging, being the real you at work, and being valued for the ways you are different. These four questions were turned into a scale with an alpha of $\alpha = .75$.

The WorkLife Law data includes three questions asking about belonging, customized from Greg Walton's work on belonging for a workplace environment. The scale alphas range from $\alpha = .66$ to $\alpha = .73$.

The Emtrain dataset additionally contained one question used as a measure of respect in one's organization, and one question that asked about feeling confident that you can advance your career at your organization.

The WorkLife Law data contained one question that asked about feeling that you have a path for advancing your career at your organization.