

## References on slides for Webinar by Molly Carnes October 6, 2020

- Alvarez, S. N. E., Jagsi, R., Abbuhl, S. B., Lee, C. J., & Myers, E. R. (2019). Promoting gender equity in grant making: what can a funder do? *Lancet*, 393(10171), e9-e11. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30211-9
- Atir, S., & Ferguson, M. J. (2018). How gender determines the way we speak about professionals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(28), 7278-7283. doi:10.1073/pnas.1805284115
- Banchefsky, S., Westfall, J., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2016). But you don't look like a scientist!: Women scientists with feminine appearance are deemed less likely to be scientists. *Sex Roles*, 75(3-4), 95-109. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0586-1
- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgeny. *J Consult Clin Psychol*, 42, 155-162.
- Biernat, M., Carnes, M., Filut, A., & Kaatz, A. (2020). Gender, race, and grant reviews: Translating and responding to research feedback. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 46(1), 140-154. doi:10.1177/0146167219845921
- Bol, T., de Vaan, M., & van de Rijt, A. (2018). The Matthew effect in science funding. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(19), 4887. doi:10.1073/pnas.1719557115
- Boudreau, K. J., Guinan, E. C., Lakhani, K. R., & Riedl, C. (2016). Looking across and looking beyond the knowledge frontier: Intellectual distance, novelty, and resource allocation in science. *Manage Sci*, 62(10), 2765-2783. doi:10.1287/mnsc.2015.2285
- Carli, L. L., Alawa, L., Lee, Y., Zhao, B., & Kim, E. (2016). Stereotypes about gender and science: Women ≠ scientists. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(2), 244-260. doi:10.1177/0361684315622645
- Carr, P. B., Dweck, C. S., & Pauker, K. (2012). "Prejudiced" behavior without prejudice? Beliefs about the malleability of prejudice affect interracial interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(3), 452-471. doi:10.1037/a0028849
- Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: how stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(6), 1045-1060. doi:10.1037/a0016239
- Danthi, N., Wu, C. O., Shi, P., & Lauer, M. (2014). Percentile ranking and citation impact of a large cohort of National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute-funded cardiovascular R01 grants. *Circ Res*, 114(4), 600-606. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.114.302656
- 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, 642-658.
- Demicheli, V., & Di Pietrantonj, C. (2007). Peer review for improving the quality of grant applications. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*(2). doi:10.1002/14651858.MR000003.pub2
- Dikmenli, M. (2010). Undergraduate biology students' representations of science and the scientist. *College Student Journal*, 44, 579+.
- Doyle, J. M., Quinn, K., Bodenstein, Y. A., Wu, C. O., Danthi, N., & Lauer, M. S. (2015). Association of percentile ranking with citation impact and productivity in a large cohort of de novo NIMH-funded R01 grants. *Mol Psychiatry*, 20(9), 1030-1036. doi:10.1038/mp.2015.71
- Eagly, A. H., & Szcesny, S. (2009). Stereotypes about women, men, and leaders: Have times changed? *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality*. (pp. 21-47). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Eaton, A. A., Saunders, J. F., Jacobson, R. K., & West, K. (2020). How gender and races stereotypes impact the advancement of scholars in STEM: Professors' biased evaluations of physics and biology post-doctoral candidates. *Sex Roles*, 82(3), 127-141. doi:10.1007/s11199-019-01052-w

- Elmore, K. C., & Luna-Lucero, M. (2017). Light bulbs or seeds? How metaphors for ideas influence judgments about genius. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(2), 200-208. doi:10.1177/1948550616667611
- Er-rafiy, A., & Brauer, M. (2013). Modifying perceived variability: Four laboratory and field experiments show the effectiveness of a ready-to-be-used prejudice intervention. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(4), 840-853. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12010
- Erosheva, E. A., Grant, S., Chen, M. C., Lindner, M. D., Nakamura, R. K., & Lee, C. J. (2020). NIH peer review: Criterion scores completely account for racial disparities in overall impact scores. *Sci Adv*, 6(23), eaaz4868. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaz4868
- Fang, F. C., Bowen, A., & Casadevall, A. (2016). NIH peer review percentile scores are poorly predictive of grant productivity. *Elife*, 5. doi:10.7554/eLife.13323
- Gallo, S. A., & Glisson, S. R. (2018). External Tests of Peer Review Validity Via Impact Measures. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*, 3(22). doi:10.3389/frma.2018.00022
- Gaucher, D., Friesen, J., & Kay, A. C. (2011). Evidence that gendered wording in job advertisements exists and sustains gender inequality. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 101(1), 109-128. doi:10.1037/a0022530
- Ginther, D. K., Kahn, S., & Schaffer, W. T. (2016). Gender, race/ethnicity, and National Institutes of Health R01 research awards: Is there evidence of a double bind for women of color? *Acad Med*, 91(8), 1098-1107. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000001278
- Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science*, 333(6045), 1015-1019. doi:10.1126/science.1196783
- Goldin, C., Rouse C. (2000). Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of "blind" auditions on female musicians. *The American Economic Review*, 90, 715-741.
- Guthrie, C., Rachlinski, J.J., Wistrich, A.J. (2009). The "hidden judiciary": An empirical examination of executive branch justice. *Duke Law Journal*, 58(7), 1477-1530.
- Guthrie, S., Ghiga, I., & Wooding, S. (2017). What do we know about grant peer review in the health sciences? *F1000Res*, 6, 1335. doi:10.12688/f1000research.11917.2
- Haines, E. L., Deaux, K., & Lofaro, N. (2016). The times they are a-changing ... or are they not? A comparison of gender stereotypes, 1983–2014. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(3), 353-363. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684316634081
- Helzer, E. G., Myers, C. G., Fahim, C., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Abernathy, J. H. (2020). Gender bias in collaborative medical decision making: Emergent evidence. *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*. doi:10.1097/acm.0000000000003590
- Hofstra, B., Kulkarni, V. V., Munoz-Najar Galvez, S., He, B., Jurafsky, D., & McFarland, D. A. (2020). The diversity-innovation paradox in science. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 117(17), 9284-9291. doi:10.1073/pnas.1915378117
- Hudson, P. T. W., van der Graff, G.C., Bryden, R. *The rule of three: Situation awareness in hazardous situations*. Paper presented at the Shell International Exploration and Production B.V. [https://heartsandminds.energyinst.org/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0014/3380/ASA-PDF-rule-of-three-paper,-P-Hudson,-C-vdGraaf.pdf](https://heartsandminds.energyinst.org/__data/assets/pdf_file/0014/3380/ASA-PDF-rule-of-three-paper,-P-Hudson,-C-vdGraaf.pdf)
- Isaac, C., Lee, B., & Carnes, M. (2009). Interventions that affect gender bias in hiring: A systematic review. *Acad Med*, 84(10), 1440-1446.
- Jayasinghe, U. W., Marsh, H. W., & Bond, N. (2001). Peer review in the funding of research in higher education: The Australian experience. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(4), 343-364.
- Jayasinghe, U. W., Marsh, H. W., & Bond, N. (2003). A multilevel cross-classified modelling approach to peer review of grant proposals: The effects of assessor and researcher attributes on assessor ratings. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 166(3), 279-300.

- Jerrim, J. (2019). Peer-review of grant proposals. An analysis of Economic and Social Research Council grant applications. *DoQSS Working Papers 19-05, Department of Quantitative Social Science - UCL Institute of Education, University College London.*
- Kaatz, A., Dattalo, M., Regner, C., Filut, A., & Carnes, M. (2016). Patterns of feedback on the bridge to independence: A qualitative thematic analysis of NIH mentored career development award application critiques. *Journal of Women's Health, 25*(1), 78-90. doi:10.1089/jwh.2015.5254
- Kaatz, A., Gutierrez, B., & Carnes, M. (2014). Threats to objectivity in peer review: the case of gender. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences, 35*(8), 371-373. doi:10.1016/j.tips.2014.06.005
- Kaatz, A., Lee, Y. G., Potvien, A., Magua, W., Filut, A., Bhattacharya, A., . . . Carnes, M. (2016). Analysis of National Institutes of Health R01 application critiques, impact, and criteria scores: Does the sex of the principal investigator make a difference? *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges, 91*(8), 1080-1088. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000001272
- Kaltman, J. R., Evans, F. J., Danthi, N. S., Wu, C. O., DiMichele, D. M., & Lauer, M. S. (2014). Prior publication productivity, grant percentile ranking, and topic-normalized citation impact of NHLBI cardiovascular R01 grants. *Circ Res, 115*(7), 617-624. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.115.304766
- Klaus, B., & del Álamo, D. (2018). Talent Identification at the limits of peer review: an analysis of the EMBO Postdoctoral Fellowships selection process. *bioRxiv, 481655*. doi:10.1101/481655
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychol Bull, 137*(4), 616-642. doi:10.1037/a0023557
- Kolev, J., Fuentes-Medel, Y., Murray, F. (2019). *Is blinded review enough? How gendered outcomes arise even under anonymous evaluation.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management, the American Economic Association, and the REER conferences. <http://bit.ly/2Y1m1DF>
- Leslie, S. J., Cimpian, A., Meyer, M., & Freeland, E. (2015). Expectations of brilliance underlie gender distributions across academic disciplines. *Science, 347*(6219), 262-265. doi:10.1126/science.1261375
- Lord, C. G., Lepper, M. R., & Preston, E. (1984). Considering the opposite: a corrective strategy for social judgment. *J Pers Soc Psychol, 47*(6), 1231-1243. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.47.6.1231
- Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight: Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(5), 808-817. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.5.808
- Marchant, A., Bhattacharya, A., & Carnes, M. (2007). Can the language of tenure criteria influence women's academic advancement? *J Womens Health, 16*(7), 998-1003.
- Marsh, H. W., Jayasinghe, U. W., & Bond, N. W. (2008). Improving the peer-review process for grant applications: reliability, validity, bias, and generalizability. *Am Psychol, 63*(3), 160-168. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.160
- Mendelberg, T., Karpowitz, C. F. (2016). Women's authority in political decision-making groups. *Leadership Quarterly, 27*(3), 487-503. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.11.005
- Mendelberg, T., Karpowitz, C. F., Oliphant, J. B. (2014). Gender inequality in deliberation: Unpacking the black box of interaction. *Perspectives on Politics, 12*(1), 18-44. doi:10.1017/S1537592713003691
- Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew Effect in science. *Science, 159*(3810), 56. doi:10.1126/science.159.3810.56
- Monin, B., & Miller, D. T. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(1), 33-43.
- Monteith, M. J., Parker, L. R., & Burns, M. D. (2016). The self-regulation of prejudice *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination, 2nd ed.* (pp. 409-432). New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.

- Mynatt, C. R., Doherty, M. E., & Tweney, R. D. (1977). Confirmation bias in a simulated research environment: An experimental study of scientific inference. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 29(1), 85-95. doi:10.1080/00335557743000053
- Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 175 - 220.
- Pier E L, R., Nathan MJ, Kaatz A, Carnes M, Ford CE (2015). Studying the study section: How group decision making in person and via videoconferencing affects the grant peer review process. Retrieved from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/publications/workingPapers/papers.php>
- Pier, E. L., Brauer, M., Filut, A., Kaatz, A., Raclaw, J., Nathan, M. J., . . . Carnes, M. (2018). Low agreement among reviewers evaluating the same NIH grant applications. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 115(12), 2952-2957. doi:10.1073/pnas.1714379115
- Pier, E. L., Raclaw, J., Carnes, M., Ford, C. E., & Kaatz, A. (2019). Laughter and the chair: Social pressures influencing scoring during grant peer review meetings. *J Gen Intern Med*, 34(4), 513-514. doi:10.1007/s11606-018-4751-9
- Pier, E. L., Raclaw, J., Kaatz, A., Brauer, M., Carnes, M., Nathan, M. J., & Ford, C. E. (2017). 'Your comments are meaner than your score': score calibration talk influences intra- and inter-panel variability during scientific grant peer review. *Res Eval*, 26(1), 1-14. doi:10.1093/reseval/rvw025
- Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2009). Overlooked but not untouched: How rudeness reduces onlookers' performance on routine and creative tasks. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109(1), 29-44. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.01.003
- Porath, C. L., Foulk, T., & Erez, A. (2015). How incivility hijacks performance: It robs cognitive resources, increases dysfunctional behavior, and infects team dynamics and functioning. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(4), 258-265. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.09.002
- Proudfoot, D., Kay, A. C., & Koval, C. Z. (2015). A gender bias in the attribution of creativity: Archival and experimental evidence for the perceived association between masculinity and creative thinking. *Psychol Sci*, 26(11), 1751-1761. doi:10.1177/0956797615598739
- Reeves, A. N. (2014). *Written in Black & White: Exploring confirmation bias in racialized perceptions of writing skills*. Retrieved from <https://nextions.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/written-in-black-and-white-yellow-paper-series.pdf>
- Riskin, A., Erez, A., Foulk, T. A., Kugelman, A., Gover, A., Shoris, I., . . . Bamberger, P. A. (2015). The impact of rudeness on medical team performance: A randomized trial. *Pediatrics*, 136(3), 487-495. doi:10.1542/peds.2015-1385
- Rivera, L., Tilckik, A. (2019). Scaling down inequality: Rating scales, gender bias, and the architecture of evaluation. *American Sociological Review*, 84(2), 248-274.
- Rubin, D. L. (1992). Nonlanguage factors affecting undergraduates' judgments of nonnative English-speaking teaching assistants. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4), 511-531.
- Sandstrom, U., Hallen, M. (2008). Persistent nepotism in peer-review. *Scientometrics*, 74(2), 175-189.
- Severin, A., Martins, J., Heyard, R., Delavy, F., Jorstad, A., & Egger, M. (2020). Gender and other potential biases in peer review: cross-sectional analysis of 38 250 external peer review reports. *BMJ Open*, 10(8), e035058. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035058
- Silbiger, N. J., & Stubler, A. D. (2019). Unprofessional peer reviews disproportionately harm underrepresented groups in STEM. *PeerJ*, 7, e8247-e8247. doi:10.7717/peerj.8247
- Stout, J. G., Grunberg, V. A., & Ito, T. A. (2016). Gender roles and stereotypes about science careers help explain women and men's science pursuits. *Sex Roles*, 75(9), 490-499. doi:10.1007/s11199-016-0647-5
- Tamblyn, R., McMahon, M., Girard, N., Drake, E., Nadigel, J., & Gaudreau, K. (2016). Health services and policy research in the first decade at the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. *CMAJ Open*, 4(2), E213-221. doi:10.9778/cmajo.20150045

- Thomas-Hunt, M. C., & Phillips, K. W. (2004). When what you know is not enough: expertise and gender dynamics in task groups. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, *30*(12), 1585-1598.
- Valantine, H. (2017). The science of diversity and the impact of implicit bias, [https://diversity.nih.gov/sites/coswd/files/images/2017-12/implicit\\_bias\\_talk\\_for\\_toolkit\\_pdf\\_508c\\_0.pdf](https://diversity.nih.gov/sites/coswd/files/images/2017-12/implicit_bias_talk_for_toolkit_pdf_508c_0.pdf): National Institutes of Health Office of the Director, Scientific Workforce Diversity.
- van der Lee, R., & Ellemers, N. (2015). Gender contributes to personal research funding success in The Netherlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *112*(40), 12349. doi:10.1073/pnas.1510159112
- Wenneras, C., & Wold, A. (1997). Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. *Nature* (Vol. 387, pp. 341): Nature Publishing Group.
- Wigboldus, D. H., Semin, G. R., & Spears, R. (2000). How do we communicate stereotypes? Linguistic bases and inferential consequences. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, *78*(1), 5-18.
- Williams, M. J., George-Jones, J., & Hebl, M. (2019). The face of STEM: Racial phenotypic stereotypicality predicts STEM persistence by—and ability attributions about—students of color. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *116*(3), 416-443. doi:10.1037/pspi0000153
- Witteman, H. O., Hendricks, M., Straus, S., & Tannenbaum, C. (2019). Are gender gaps due to evaluations of the applicant or the science? A natural experiment at a national funding agency. *Lancet*, *393*(10171), 531-540. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32611-4