6

Mothers get caught between the prescriptive image of the ideal worker and the prescriptive image of the ideal mother.

The Glass Ceiling and the Maternal Wall in Academia

Joan C. Williams

The glass ceiling in academia is well documented. Women are more likely than men to end up in non-tenure-track positions. Women on tenure track are less likely than men to be at four-year institutions. And highly ranked four-year institutions tend to employ low percentages of women (Mason and Goulden, 2002). Why?

Part of the problem is gender bias, of two types. The more familiar is the glass ceiling that prevents successful women from reaching the summit of their professions. But what exactly is the glass ceiling? Typically, it is defined demographically, by documenting the dearth of women at the top. But *why* the dearth of women, when most academics (men as well as women) see themselves as committed to gender equality? Little information surfaces to help academic administrators who are determined to give women a fair shake.

Many women never get near the glass ceiling because of a type of gender bias that has only recently been documented. In a 2003 law review article, a coauthor and I documented the "maternal wall" that inhibits women's progress once they become mothers (Williams and Segal, 2003). Mason and her team also have documented the sharp impact of having children on academic women's careers. Women who have children soon after receiving their Ph.D. are much less likely to achieve tenure than men who have children at the same point in their career. Prestigious research universities tend to grant tenure to men at a much higher rate, relegating women to second-tier teaching and adjunct positions (Mason and Goulden, 2002). The result is that most women who earn Ph.D.s never get near tenure, much less tenure at a leading institution.

Like the glass ceiling, the maternal wall is documented demographically by documenting the dearth of mothers in tenure-track positions or in tenure-track positions at elite universities. What triggers the maternal wall? How does it affect mothers? Again, depressing demography does not give us guidance on how to avoid more depressing demography in the future.

This chapter does. It describes the patterns of stereotyping and gender bias that create the glass ceiling and the maternal wall. After a review of over a hundred studies, I present the latest findings of empirical social psychology in a readily usable form.

Preliminaries

Most people know what stereotyping is—or think they do. The "commonsense" view represents the latest in academic psychology, circa 1950. Take the example of an employer who assumes that because, demographically, mothers as a group cut back their hours after they have children, a particular woman will do so. Sometimes called statistical discrimination, this is one type of stereotyping.

But it is only one. *Prescriptive stereotyping* is different: it does not just assume stereotypical behavior; it tries to require it (Burgess and Borgida, 1999). Sometimes prescriptive stereotyping is hostile, as when an employer tells a mother that she should not return to work because children need their mothers at home. Sometimes it is benevolent, as when an employer sends a new mother home promptly at 5:00 P.M. because "she has a baby to take care of" but keeps a new father working late because "he has a family to support" (Williams and Segal, 2003, p. 95). Good intentions do not excuse this type of gender bias, which polices men as well as women into traditional gender roles.

What economists call "statistical discrimination," social psychologists call "descriptive stereotyping." When an employer disadvantages women because of the assumption that they will conform to stereotype (as opposed to the assumption that they should), what is often involved is *cognitive bias,* the term associated with the insight that much gender bias (and race and other types of bias) stems from the ways in which stereotypes shape perception, memory, and inferences:

- *Perception.* Cognitive bias shapes the way people are perceived, as when a lawyer who returned from maternity leave was given paralegal work and responded, "I want to say, 'Look, I had a baby, not a lobotomy'" (Williams, 2000, p. 69). Once stereotypes are triggered, people's perceptions are shaped by them, and inconsistent information tends to be ignored (Heilman, 1995).
- *Memory:* People are more likely to remember stereotype-consistent behavior and to forget stereotype-inconsistent behavior (Krieger, 1995). This recall bias causes them to selectively remember events that confirm

stereotypes and forget events that disconfirm them (Banaji, Hardin, and Rothman, 1993).

• *Inferences:* Stereotypes also influence inferences. Said one mother, "Before I went part-time, when people called and found I was not at my desk, they assumed that I was elsewhere at a business meeting. But after I went part-time, the tendency was to assume that I was not there because of my part-time schedule even if I was out at a meeting" (Williams and Segal, 2003, p. 97). When this mother worked full time, coworkers attributed her absences to business reasons. After she went part time, coworkers attributed her absences to family reasons.

In ambiguous situations, stereotypes often drive inferences (Krieger, 1995). Attribution, the process by which people arrive at causal explanations for social events (Travis, 1976), feeds into evaluations, which may also be influenced by inferences ("attribution bias") (Hunt, Borgida, Kelly, and Burgess, 2002). In a circular process, stereotypes drive attribution, which reinforces the stereotypes (Hamilton and Rose, 1980). This circularity accounts for the resiliency of stereotypes and the need for academic institutions to intervene.

Stereotypes often produce relatively small differences, but these add up over time. According to social psychologist Virginia Valian (1999, p. 142), "Success is largely the accumulation of advantage, exploiting small gains to get bigger ones." One experiment set up a model that built in a tiny bias in favor of promoting men; after a while, 65 percent of top-level employees were male. This accumulation of disadvantage plays an important role in creating the glass ceiling and the maternal wall—and especially the interaction of the two.

The Glass Ceiling

One-half of the glass ceiling involves scenarios that cause women to feel they have to try twice as hard to achieve half as much. One such scenario is when a woman says something clever at a meeting, only to hear it recalled later and attributed to a male colleague who had repeated it. The other half of the glass ceiling involves scenarios in which high-powered women are penalized for doing their jobs too well. An example of this is when a leading journal agrees to publish a woman's article, and some of her colleagues begin talking about her arrogance rather than her accomplishment.

Why Women Have a Harder Time Establishing Competence. Social status predicts perceived competence. Typically, men, as measured by body language and patterns of deference in controlled laboratory settings, are accorded more status than women (Foschi, 2000). Women's successful performances tend to be more closely scrutinized and then assessed by stricter standards than men's. Men also have to give more convincing demonstrations of incompetence in order to be judged incompetent overall. Thus,

women have to "jump through more hoops" to establish themselves (Biernat and Kobrynowicz, 1997, p. 544).

One study of academia shows that after controlling for scholarly productivity, women attain tenure more slowly than men do. This slower development cannot be accounted for by a lower standard of performance. Women actually publish higher-quality work than men do, as measured by the number of times their work is cited by other scholars (Hewlett, 2002).

Another question is why women end up doing tasks that subtract from their time for research, such as more student counseling, local arrangements for conferences, and arranging faculty teas or holiday parties. One study found that men who believed that they were interacting with a woman were more likely to assign their partner feminine tasks (Eagly, Wood, and Diekman, 2000). Although taking on such tasks is not the fast track to power and authority, refusing them may lead to charges that a woman is "uncollegial."

There are a number of ways in which subtle gender stereotyping makes it more difficult for women to demonstrate their competence:

- *Competency stereotypes affect objective rule application.* The struggle to establish competence is inhibited by both the application and the structure of objective rules. Studies have shown that when applying objective rules, colleagues tend to create exceptions for men or give them the benefit of the doubt, whereas women are held to the universalistic standards. Social psychologists call this "in-group favoritism" or "leniency bias" (Brewer, 1996, p. 65). Leniency bias is important because it focuses attention not only on the deferential treatment of women but also on the preferential treatment of men (Taylor, 1981). To quote Brewer (1996, p. 65), "Coldly objective judgment seems to be reserved for members of out-groups." Highlighting women's failures while glossing over those of men makes it harder for women to establish their competence. "Selection and merit reviews are particularly vulnerable" to leniency bias.
- *Women are judged on their accomplishments, men on their potential.* Actors tend to attribute their own behavior, or that of their in-group, to stable causes and attribute the behavior of out-groups to situational causes: he is brilliant, but she just got lucky (Deaux and Emswiller, 1974). In academia, men tend to be judged on their potential: he does not have enough publications, but he shows such promise we should at least invite him to give a job talk. Women tend to be judged strictly on their accomplishments: "We can't interview her; she's unqualified" (Krieger, 1995).
- *Women's mistakes are remembered long after men's are forgotten.* Facts that fit a given stereotype are more accurately recalled than facts that do not (Heilman, 1995). Members of the in-group are more likely to recall undesirable behavior committed by out-group members than by in-group members (Krieger, 1995). As a result, women may have a harder time than men being perceived as competent because their mistakes are remembered after men's are forgotten.

• *Results of the competency struggle.* The struggle to be perceived as competent affects women in multiple ways. First, as members of the out-group, they tend to receive fewer rewards than men (Brewer, 1996). In one study, when an in-group member outperformed an out-group member, the in-group wanted to divvy awards based on equity (with awards tied to percentage produced); when an out-group member outperformed an in-group member, in-group members wanted to divvy awards based on equality (identical percentages regardless of individual production figures) (Eagly and Karau, 2002).

In addition, in workplaces with few women, studies show that token women tend to experience polarized evaluations—either very good or very bad (Farley, 1996; Krieger, 1995). A few superstars may actually be perceived as more competent than similarly situated men (Heilman, 2001). But most women tend to experience very low evaluations. This pattern is especially relevant to student teaching evaluations. In addition to polarized evaluations, token women often experience what social psychologists call the "solo effect" (Biernat and others, 1998, p. 304), causing them to feel isolated and unhappy (Taylor, 1981). Of course, social isolation can easily give rise to poor evaluations because a worker is out of the loop.

Third, according to Taylor (1981), in environments where women experience bias, particularly those where they are outnumbered, women sometimes can succeed only by stepping into roles reassuring to men. These include the *mother,* a nurturing consoler who handles the emotion work of a group; the *princess,* who pairs with a male protector; the *pet,* "a group mascot who applauds male achievements and gains acceptance by being a cute little person"; or *Ms. Efficiency,* a glorified secretary who organizes the group. Of course, glorified secretaries are not typically considered to be high-powered academics; nor may they have the time to meet the objective requirements for tenure or promotion.

The struggle for competence may be twice as difficult for women of color. The work of Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin (1999) helps explain the "concrete wall" faced by women of color, positing that a person's different statuses are additive. Thus, a woman of color will have to overcome the additive effect of negative assumptions triggered by her race *and* negative assumptions triggered by her gender (Kennelly, 1999).

Catch-22: When Women Are Penalized for Being Too Competent. While women often have more trouble being perceived as competent than men do, they also may be penalized if they are too competent. To quote Heilman (1995, p. 16), "Women in non-traditional fields may be penalized if they do their jobs well—in some cases, because they do their jobs well." Women face a catch-22.

Heilman also found that women judged as "successful" often triggered dislike. A study of women managers found that they were found to be described as "bitter, quarrelsome and selfish . . . [with] an unbridled

ambition for power and achievement" (Heilman, Block, Martell, and Simon, 1989, p. 941). Whereas assertiveness in men will often be seen as evidence of brilliance or originality, similar behavior in women may be seen as distasteful. To Taylor (1981, p. 103), "Cognitively, it may matter little whether a person categorizes a bright, successful female as a 'career woman' or a 'castrating bitch,' but on both the practical and the motivational side, it will matter a great deal."

Negative reactions to assertive women matter because "advancement in organizations depends not only on competence assessments but also on social acceptance and approval, and the negativity that is a likely reaction to women who prove themselves to be competent in areas that traditionally are off limits to them can be lethal when they strive to get ahead" (Heilman, 2001, p. 661). Thus, accomplished women find themselves on the defensive. In at least one case, a woman was denied full professorship in part for lack of collegiality (*Sweeney* v. *Board of Trustees of Keene State College,* 1979).

As noted above, women who are willing to follow feminine stereotypes may thrive in departments where other women do not. However, women who do conform to stereotypes may well become vulnerable for that reason. For example, in *Weinstock* v. *Columbia University* (2000), the plaintiff was faulted for behaving in too feminine a manner. As the dissent explained, "by describing her as 'nice' and referring to her nurturing manner, [colleagues] were not extolling her positive qualities—rather, they were using these qualities to highlight what they perceived to be her intellectual weakness" (p. 53).

Another danger of traditionally feminine behavior is that if a woman plays the warm and nurturing role, she may find herself doing a disproportionate amount of student advising, only to have her colleagues attribute that workload to her "maternal instinct" rather than to public spiritedness; a catch-22 emerges when a department brands as uncollegial any woman who resists such work but does not value any woman who does it. Some high-powered women attempt to thwart glass ceiling catch-22s by leveraging their sexuality. An article in *Fortune* focused on women who receive approval for conforming to prescriptions of warmth and sexuality (Sellers, 1996). The women were successful because they melded masculine, assertive behavior seamlessly with "socio-emotional 'softeners' [that] assuage[d] resistance and increase[d] their influence in the group" (p. 42). In this way, a high-powered woman may "attract attention to her actual competence." However, these women perpetuate the status quo by reaffirming the unspoken requirement that women be feminine and likable.

Stereotypes become self-fulfilling, as Deaux and Major (1987) explained, when people alter their identities in order to increase approval. The warm reception women get for fulfilling others' expectations encourages women to adopt similar behavior in future interactions (Glick and Fiske, 2001). This reaffirms that women often adopt an approved feminine subtype in order to succeed.

In some sexist environments, the women who succeed are the ones who "know their place." Keeping one's place "involves downplaying the competence and behaving in a friendly, deferential manner when interacting with members of the dominant group" (Glick and Fiske, 1999, p. 209). This creates particular problems in academia. With competition intense for academic jobs, women often face a catch-22. If they act brilliant, they may fail to meet the unarticulated expectation that women will be sociable and reassuring. If they highlight their accomplishments, they may be tripped up by gendered norms of self-promotion—what is considered in a man to be "knowing his own worth" may be seen as unseemly self-promotion in a woman (Eagly and Karau, 2002).

A final disturbing pattern in academia in heavily male departments such as the hard sciences is the sexual harassment of women (Schultz, 1990; *Lipsett* v. *University of Puerto Rico,* 1988). Senior women may find themselves subjected to sexual harassment as a way of derailing them as competitors.

The Maternal Wall

Far fewer studies have explored the patterns of bias and stereotyping that affect mothers in particular as opposed to women in general. Maternal wall bias tends to be triggered at any point when maternity becomes salient—when a woman announces her pregnancy, begins to look pregnant, requests parental leave, stops the clock, or seeks a modified schedule (Williams and Segal, 2003).

In the maternal wall context, women may experience benevolent as well as hostile prescriptive stereotyping. Benevolent stereotyping polices women into traditionalist roles in a "kinder and gentler" way. After women have children, some find themselves advised to work shorter hours or to eschew travel so they can spend more time with their families.

It is one thing for an employer to be sensitive to a woman's new responsibilities—and quite another for a woman to feel that she must live up to her colleagues' expectation that she play June Cleaver.

"But I meant well." What is a well-meaning chair or other administrator to do? Ask. Some mothers have husbands at home full time and want to work long hours. Others are primary caregivers with husbands who travel and want more restricted schedules. Ask a new mother what she wants rather than making assumptions (Williams and Segal, 2003). By policing couples into stereotypical gender roles, colleagues not only rely on traditional stereotypes; they help create them. That is not a proper role for an employer, and it does not take much imagination to envision situations where legal liability might result.

In addition to negative stereotyping, mothers encounter negative competence assumptions. Work by Fiske and Glick documents that subjects rate "businesswomen" as high in competence, close to "businessmen" and "millionaires." "Housewives," in sharp contrast, are rated as very low in

competence, alongside the elderly, blind, "retarded," and "disabled" (to quote the stigmatized words used by the researchers; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, and Xu, 2002, p. 878). A more recent study found that "working mothers" are rated as more similar in competence to "housewives" than to "businesswomen" (Cuddy, Fiske, and Glisk, forthcoming). Thus, when women return from maternity leave, they may fall from "businesswoman" to "housewife" in the eyes of supervisors and colleagues.

One study found that performance reviews of female managers plummeted after pregnancy, in part because pregnancy triggers the stereotype of women as irrational and overly emotional (Halpert, Wilson, and Hickman, 1993). A 1990 study by Corse found that some people like "pregnant women better when they behave passively than when they behave assertively and evaluate them more favorably when they occupy a stereotypically feminine rather than masculine work role" (p. 40). Some coworkers also expect pregnant women to conform rigorously to the mandates of traditional femininity: to be "nonauthoritarian, easy to negotiate with, gentle, and neither intimidating nor aggressive, and nice" (p. 49). In addition to triggering negative competence assumptions, colleagues may sanction mothers who behave in traditionally masculine ways due to an unspoken expectation that mothers will be nonthreatening and "nice."

Another major issue is attribution bias. Among the most common effects of maternal wall attribution bias is the perception that when a mother is absent or late for work, she is caring for her children, while a similarly situated father is thought to be researching (Kennelly, 1999). Employers concerned about women's advancement have recognized the challenges of this type of attribution bias. For example, one hypothetical used by Deloitte and Touche for discussion purposes involved a man and a woman who were late for an early morning meeting. While the team joked about, and then forgot, the man's late arrival, they assumed the woman's late arrival reflected child care difficulties; after the meeting, the team leader warned her of the need to rethink her priorities (McCracken, 2000).

Deloitte's example dramatizes the potentially corrosive impact of maternal wall attribution bias. Another example of attribution bias was the mother, quoted above, who switched from full time to part time and reported that when she was working full time and her colleagues found her not at her desk, they did not hold it against her because they attributed her absence to business reasons. After she went part time, they did tend to hold it against her when they found she was not at her desk, because they attributed her absence to her part-time schedule (even if she was at a business function):

> Before I went part-time, people sort of gave me the benefit of the doubt. They assumed that I was giving them as fast a turnaround as was humanly possible. After I went part-time, this stopped, and they assumed that I wasn't doing things fast enough because of my part-time schedule. As a result, before I went part-time, I was getting top-of-the-scale performance reviews. Now I'm

not, though as far as I can tell, the quality of my work has not changed [Williams and Segal, 2003, p. 97].

Note that this lawyer enjoyed the benefit of the doubt as long as she worked full time. Once she went part time, the "leniency bias" no longer worked in her favor.

The 1993 Family and Medical Leave Act requires that academic institutions offer unpaid parental leaves to primary caregivers. Many universities also offer stop-the-clock policies, and some are beginning to offer reduced-hours tenure tracks. However, studies by Hochschild (1997) report that women who use family-friendly policies often suffer career detriments because of negative competence assumptions associated with motherhood. For example, a study by Eagly and Steffen (1986) found that women who work part time are viewed as less warm and nurturing than homemakers but as having the same lack of go-getter qualities.

A related phenomenon is the widespread sense that certain (typically dead-end) jobs are suitable for mothers, whereas certain (typically high-powered) jobs are not (Heilman, 1983). The perceived lack of fit between good jobs and mothers is another facet of the maternal wall.

Mothers also can experience the catch-22 between being an ideal worker and an ideal mother. Employed mothers are perceived as less family oriented, more selfish, and less sensitive to the needs of others than unemployed mothers (Etaugh and Gilomen, 1989). A mother's decision to remain employed, unlike a father's, is perceived as uncorrelated with her desire to "provide," according to studies by Biernat and Kobrynowicz (1997). In the same series of studies, the "very good mother" was more likely than the "very good father" to be described as "willing to always be there and to do anything for the children" (p. 592).

Mothers get caught between the prescriptive image of the 24/7 ideal worker and the prescriptive image of the 24/7 ideal mother (Ridgeway and Correll, 2004). Because no one can serve two masters 24/7, the result is a clash between the ideal-worker norm and the norm of parental care, which gives rise to the "hard truth" that a woman cannot be a good worker and a good mother (Williams, 2000).

Sociological evidence reveals that mothers sometimes experience informal social sanctions for violating the prescriptive norm of the ever-available mother. "It takes more than paying a mortgage to make a home," said one woman's colleague disapprovingly when she returned from maternity leave (Hochschild, 1997, pp. 106–107). Also, in one tenure denial lawsuit involving a reported tentative settlement of $495,000, the provost who denied tenure allegedly told another professor that the mother's decision to "stop the clock" was a "red flag"; the department chair also wrote in a memo that she "knew as a mother of two infants, she had responsibilities that were incompatible with those of a full-time academician." (Schneider, 2000).

The incidence of childlessness among women academics is high. Over 50 percent of tenured women have no children (Mason and Goulden, 2002). The result is that women academics are more likely than women in many other fields to find themselves isolated. This gives rise to a version of the solo effect, discussed earlier, where the few-and-far-between mothers feel isolated and out of the loop. Mothers may be so few that any mistake a mother makes is heightened in salience.

Unfortunately, very few studies have examined stereotypes related to women of color and motherhood. Yet evidence is emerging of distinctive stereotypes of professional African American mothers. An important dissertation by Clarke (2002) documents that the maternal wall for black women professionals deprives many not only of children but also of partners. African American women in positions of power are much less likely to find partners: in effect, many black women professionals hit a "family wall" rather than a maternal wall. More research is needed.

The Interaction Between the Glass Ceiling and the Maternal Wall

Because the ideal worker in academia continues to be defined as someone who needs no time off for family care, most parents find themselves in the position of "asking for accommodations" (Williams and Segal, 2003). To "gain accommodations," mothers need to be in a position where they can "cash in their chips" in order to garner political support for the accommodation proposed. If a woman has encountered glass ceiling problems, she may well have few chips to cash in: in fact, she may well find that she lacks the political support necessary to persuade people to "do her a favor." This is the most obvious way the glass ceiling exacerbates the maternal wall.

A more subtle interaction between the glass ceiling and the maternal wall occurs in careers, particularly in academia, where, it is said, "if you want to move up, you have to move." In that context, nonmothers (including men) will tend to move up if they reach a certain level of accomplishment, whereas mothers are more likely than others to be unable to relocate, according to a long line of studies (Bielby and Bielby, 1992; Deitch and Sanderson, 1987; Shauman and Xie, 1996).

Gender Wars

The maternal wall not only affects mothers; it also affects nonmothers to the extent that employers presume that all women eventually will become mothers (Heilman, 1995). For example, in *Barbano* v. *Madison County* (1990), an employer asked women applicants questions about their family lives that he did not ask men. The questions were relevant, he said, "because he did not want to hire a woman who would get pregnant and quit" (p. 141).

Another way the maternal wall disserves all women is by pitting non-mothers against mothers in a workplace (Williams, 2000). This, of course, decreases women's ability to work together to counter glass ceiling bias. Extensive anecdotal reports suggest that this division often makes women their own worst enemies, as women without children lead the charge against mothers (Burkett, 2000). These gender wars are particularly acute in academia because of the high numbers of childless women.

Childless women are understandably pained when they are asked to countenance a shift in workplace norms that would make it easier for women to have children. This wistfulness can easily turn to anger if they are asked, for example, to take over for a colleague out on parental leave, if they felt that they sacrificed having a baby themselves through what Hewlett (2002) called a "creeping nonchoice."

Childless women are often joined by child-free women. The motivations of child-free women are quite different. They never wanted children; instead, their goal is to imagine a full adult female life without children. They may feel that policies that help mothers serve to reinforce the perception that all women are mothers, which feeds the perception that women without children are unnatural.

It is important to recognize that the maternal wall often manifests as a fight among women. That does not mean that it is not gender discrimination: empirical social psychology has shown clearly that women as well as men hold gender stereotypes (Rudman, 1998). In the recent landmark maternal wall case of *Back* v. *Hastings on Hudson* (2004), the defendants were women who engaged in descriptive stereotyping, refusing to grant tenure to a school psychologist based on the assumption that she would slack off after tenure because she had "little ones at home." Prescriptive stereotyping is also a possibility: imagine a supervisor who stayed home with her children and then fails to promote another mother based on her belief that moms should work at most part time when children are young. The crucial point is that all women, nonmothers as well as mothers, are disadvantaged by a workplace that enshrines the ideal worker who starts to work in early adulthood and works, full time and over time, for forty years straight.

Fathers on the Front Lines of Family Care: The Paternal Wall

The maternal wall applies not only to mothers, but to any adult who engages in the kinds of family caregiving traditionally allocated to mothers. Unfortunately, few studies analyze the employment barriers faced by fathers who seek an active role in family care (Malin, 1998; Cunningham, 2001). More research is urgently needed on this subject.

Fathers may well face a threshold effect. Because men are presumed competent simply because they are men, fathers who take off for the occasional doctor's appointment may actually benefit at work if they are judged

to be warm as well as competent (Fiske, 1999). However, if a man goes beyond the occasional school play and asks to go on a flexible work arrangement or part time, he may find his evaluations plummeting. In fact, fathers who work part time may find themselves worse off than mothers who work part time: male part-timers are perceived as "even lower in agency than the male homemaker," presumably based on the assumption that the male part-timer is an incompetent worker who cannot find a good job (Eagly and Steffen, 1986; Etaugh and Fogler, 1998).

In addition, given the widespread sense that "masculinity [is tied] to the size of a paycheck" (Gould, 1974), a father who takes time off or goes part time may face the sense that he is less of a man or inappropriately feminine. Finally and most painfully, a father whose ideal worker status is threatened may be seen not only as a less manly man but also as a less effective provider—and consequently as a flawed father (Townsend, 2002).

A dramatic example of prescriptive stereotyping of fathers is *Knussman* v. *Maryland* (2001), in which a Maryland state trooper was told that he could not take parental leave after the birth of his child "unless [his] wife [was] in a coma or dead" (p. 630). Of course, when fathers are precluded from taking time off, the result is not only to police fathers into traditional breadwinner roles; women also are policed into caregiver roles.

Conclusion

The glass ceiling and the maternal wall affect women and men in nontraditional roles in all professions. Academia, despite its lofty ivory towers, is not immune from gender stereotyping and cognitive bias. In order to combat the negative effects of stereotyping and create a more equitable workplace, academic administrators must examine each employment practice for the telltale signs of workplace discrimination exposed by the studies discussed in this chapter and many more like them.

References

Back v. *Hastings on Hudson,* 2004 U.S. App. Lexis 6684 (2d Cir. Apr. 7, 2004).

Banaji, M. R., Hardin, C., and Rothman, A. "Implicit Stereotyping in Personal Judgment." *Personality and Social Psychology,* 1993, *65,* 272–281.

Barbano v. *Madison County,* 922 F.2d 139 (2d Cir. 1990).

Bielby, W. T., and Bielby, D. D. "I Will Follow Him: Family Ties, Gender Role Beliefs, and Reluctance to Relocate for a Better Job." *American Journal of Sociology,* 1992, *97,* 1241–1267.

Biernat, M., and Kobrynowicz, D. "Gender- and Race-Based Standards of Competence: Lower Minimum Standards by Higher Ability Standards for Devalued Groups." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1997, *72,* 544–557.

Biernat, M., and others. "All That You Can Be: Stereotyping of Self and Others in a Military Context." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1998, *75,* 301–317.

Brewer, M. B. "In-Group Favoritism: The Subtle Side of Intergroup Discrimination." In D. M. Messick and E. Tenbrunsel (eds.), *Codes of Conduct: Behavioral Research into Business Ethics.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1996.

Burgess, D., and Borgida, E. "Who Women Are, Who Women Should Be: Descriptive and Prescriptive Gender Stereotyping in Sex Discrimination." *Psychology, Public Policy, and the Law,* 1999, *5,* 665–692.

Burkett, E. *The Baby Boon: How Family-Friendly America Cheats the Childless.* New York: Free Press, 2000.

Clarke, A. Y. "I Do If I Could: Marriage, Meaning and the Social Reproduction of Inequality." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2002.

Corse, S. J. "Pregnant Managers and Their Subordinates: The Effects of Gender Expectations on Hierarchical Relationships." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 1990, *26,* 25.

Cuddy, A.J.C., Fiske, S. T., and Glick, P. "Working Moms Can't Win: Mothers Are Incompetent and Career Women Are Unkind." *Journal of Social Issues,* forthcoming.

Cunningham, K. "Father Time: Flexible Work Arrangements and the Law Firm's Failure of the Family." *Stanford Law Review,* 2001, *53,* 967–1008.

Deaux, K., and Emswiller, T. "Explanations for Successful Performance on Sex-Linked Tasks: What Is Skill for the Male Is Luck for the Female." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1974, *29,* 80–85.

Deaux, K., and Major, B. "Putting Gender into Context: An Interactive Model of Gender-Related Behavior." *Psychology Review,* 1987, *94,* 369–389.

Deitch, C. H., and Sanderson, S. W. "Geographic Constraints on Married Women's Careers." *Work and Occupation,* 1987, *14,* 616–634.

Eagly, A. H., and Karau, S. J. "Role Congruity Theory of Prejudice Toward Female Leaders." *Psychological Review,* 2002, *109*(3), 573–598.

Eagly, A. H., and Steffen, V. J. "Gender Stereotypes, Occupational Roles, and Beliefs About Part-Time Employees." *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 1986, *10,* 242–262.

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., and Diekman, A. "Social Role Theory of Sex Differences and Similarities: A Current Appraisal." In T. Eckes and H. M. Trautner (eds.), *The Development of Social Psychology of Gender.* Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 2000.

Etaugh, C., and Fogler, D. "Perceptions of Parents Whose Work and Parenting Behaviors Deviate from Role Expectations." *Sex Roles,* 1998, *39,* 215–223.

Etaugh, C., and Gilomen, G. "Perceptions of Mothers: Effects of Employment Status, Marital Status, and Age of Child." *Sex Roles,* 1989, *20,* 67.

Farley, C. F. "Confronting Expectations: Women in the Legal Academy." *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism,* 1996, *8,* 333–358.

Fiske, S. T. "(Dis)respecting Versus (Dis)liking; Status and Interdependence Predict Ambivalent Stereotypes of Competence and Warmth." *Social Issues,* 1999, *55,* 473–490.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., and Xu, J. "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition." *Personality and Social Psychology,* 2002, *82,* 878–902.

Foschi, M. "Double Standards for Competence: Theory and Research." *Annual Review of Sociology,* 2000, *26,* 21–42.

Glick, P., and Fiske, S. "Sexism and Other 'Isms': Interdependence, Status, and the Ambivalent Context of Stereotypes." In W. B. Swann Jr., J. H. Langlois, and L. A. Gilbert (eds.), *Sexism and Stereotypes in Modern Society: The Gender Science of Janet Taylor Spence.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1999.

Glick, P., and Fiske, S. "Ambivalent Stereotypes as Legitimizing Ideologies: Differentiating Paternalistic and Envious Prejudice." In J. T. Yost and B. Major (eds.), *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Gould, R. "Measuring Masculinity by the Size of a Paycheck." In J. Pleck and J. Sawyer (eds.), *Men and Masculinity.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Halpert, J., Wilson, M., and Hickman, J. "Pregnancy as a Source of Bias in Performance Appraisals." *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 1993, *14,* 649.

Hamilton, D. L., and Rose, T. L. "Illusory Correlation and the Maintenance of Stereotypic Beliefs." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1980, *39,* 832.

Heilman, M. "Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent Up the Organizational Ladder." *Social Issues,* 2001, *57,* 657–674.

Heilman, M., Block, C., Martell, R., and Simon, M. "Has Anything Changed? Current Characterizations of Men, Women and Managers." *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 1989, *74,* 935–942.

Heilman, M. E. "Sex Bias in Work Settings: The Lack of Fit Model." *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 1983, *5,* 269–298.

Heilman, M. E. "Sex Stereotypes and Their Effects in the Workplace: What We Know and What We Don't Know." *Gender in the Workplace: A Special Issue of the Journal of Social Behavior and Personality,* 1995, *10,* 3–26.

Hewlett, S. A. *Creating a Life: Professional Women and the Quest for Children.* New York: Talk Miramax Books, 2002.

Hochschild, A. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Become Work.* New York: Holt, 1997.

Hunt, J. S., Borgida, E., Kelly, K., and Burgess, D. "The Scientific Status of Research on Gender Stereotyping." In D. L. Faigman, D. H. Kaye, M. J. Saks, and J. Sanders (eds.), *Modern Scientific Evidence: The Law and Science of Expert Testimony.* St. Paul, Minn.: West, 2002.

Kennelly, I. "'That Single Mother Element': How White Employers Typify Black Women." *Gender and Society,* 1999, *13,* 168–192.

Knussman v. *Maryland,* 272 F.3d 625 (4th Cir. 2001).

Krieger, L. H. "The Content of Our Categories: A Cognitive Bias Approach to Discrimination and Equal Employment Opportunity." *Stanford Law Review,* 1995, *47,* 1161.

Lipsett v. *University of Puerto Rico,* 864 F.2d 881 (1st Cir. 1988).

Malin, M. H. "Fathers and Parental Leave Revisited." *Northern Illinois University Law Review,* 1998, *19,* 25.

Mason, M. A., and Goulden, M. "Do Babies Matter? The Effect of Family Formation on the Lifelong Careers of Academic Men and Women." *Academe,* 2002, *88*(6), 21–27.

McCracken, D. M. "Winning the Talent War for Women: Sometimes It Takes a Revolution." *Harvard Business Review,* Nov.–Dec. 2000, pp. 159–164.

Ridgeway, C., and Smith-Lovin, L. "The Gender System and Interaction." *Annual Review of Sociology,* 1999, *25,* 191–216.

Ridgeway, C. L., and Correll, S. "Motherhood as a Status Characteristic." *Journal of Social Issues,* 2004, *60,* 683–700.

Rudman, L. A. "Self Promotion as a Risk Factor for Women: The Cost and Benefit of Counterstereotypical Impressions Management." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1998, *74*(3), 629.

Schneider, A. "U. of Oregon Settles Tenure Lawsuit over Maternity Leave." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* July 21, 2000, p. A12.

Schultz, V. "Telling Stories About Women and Work." *Harvard Law Review,* 1990, *103,* 1249.

Sellers, P. "Women, Sex, and Power." *Fortune,* Aug. 5, 1996, p. 42.

Shauman, K. A., and Xie, Y. "Geographic Mobility of Scientists: Sex Differences and Family Constraints." *Demography,* 1996, *33,* 455.

Sweeney v. *Board of Trustees of Keene State College,* 604 F.2d 106 (1st Cir. 1979).

Taylor, S. E. "A Categorization Approach to Stereotyping." In D. L. Hamilton (ed.), *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior.* Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1981.

Townsend, N. W. *The Package Deal: Marriage, Work, and Fatherhood in Men's Lives.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002.

Travis, M. A. "Perceived Disabilities, Social Cognition, and 'Innocent Mistakes.'" In J. S. Carroll and J. W. Paynne (eds.), *Cognition and Social Behavior.* Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1976.

Valian, V. "The Cognitive Bases of Gender Bias." *Brooklyn Law Review,* 1999, *65,* 1049.

Weinstock v. *Columbia University,* 224 F.3d 33 (2d Cir. 2000).

Williams, J. *Unbending Gender: Why Work and Family Conflict and What to Do About It.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Williams, J. C., and Segal, N. "Beyond the Maternal Wall: Relief for Family Caregivers Who Are Discriminated Against on the Job." *Harvard Women's Law Journal,* 2003, *26,* 77.

JOAN C. WILLIAMS is professor of law and director of the Program on WorkLife Law, American University, Washington College of Law.