

A brief social-belonging intervention in the workplace: evidence from a field experiment

Sanaz Mobasseri, Sameer B Srivastava, Laura Kray. "A Brief Social-Belonging Intervention in the Workplace: Evidence from a Field Experiment." *Academy of Management Discoveries*, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2019.0001>
<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/40356>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."



A Brief Social-Belonging Intervention in the Workplace: Evidence from a Field Experiment

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Discoveries</i>
Manuscript ID	AMD-2018-0115.R4
Manuscript Type:	Discoveries in Brief
Keywords:	Newcomer Socialization < Careers & Socialization, Intra-organizational networks < Networks, Inequality/Stratification < Organizational & Management Theory, Diversity < Diversity & Workforce Issues, Gender Roles < Diversity & Workforce Issues
Abstract:	<p>Brief interventions that strengthen an individual's sense of social belonging have been shown to improve outcomes for members of underrepresented, marginalized groups in educational settings. This paper reports insights based on an attempt to apply this type of intervention in the technology sector. Adapting a social-belonging intervention from educational psychology, we implemented a quasi-random field experiment, spanning twelve months, with 506 newly hired engineers (24% female) in the R&D function of a west coast technology firm. We did not find a statistically significant effect of the treatment on a core attainment outcome—bonus relative to base salary—that exhibited a significant gender gap, with women receiving proportionally lower bonuses than men. We did not find anticipated gender gaps in promotion rates or social network centrality, and we also did not find a statistically significant effect of the treatment for women on these outcomes. Drawing on meaningful differences between educational versus workplace settings, we identify four theoretical moderators that might influence the efficacy of social-belonging interventions adapted from educational settings into the workplace. Finally, based on the limitations of our study design, we provide four recommendations that future researchers might adopt.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

A Brief Social-Belonging Intervention in the Workplace: Evidence from a Field Experiment*

Sanaz Mobasseri
Questrom School of Business
Boston University
595 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
312-752-8849
sanazm@bu.edu

Sameer B. Srivastava
Haas School of Business
University of California, Berkeley
2220 Piedmont Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94720
617-895-8707
srivastava@haas.berkeley.edu

Laura J. Kray
Haas School of Business
University of California, Berkeley
2220 Piedmont Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94720
510-642-0829
kray@haas.berkeley.edu

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

December 2019

* Please direct all correspondence to Sanaz Mobasseri (sanazm@bu.edu; 595 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA, 02215). We thank the representatives from TechCo, who facilitated research access and helped in the design and implementation of the intervention. We also thank Don Moore, Leif Nelson, Nicole Stephens, András Tilcsik, and participants of the INSEAD Women at Work Conference and the Academy of Management's 2019 Session on Understanding Biases and Overcoming Barriers for Promoting Gender Inclusive Organizations for valuable feedback. Research funding was provided by the Greater Good Science Center at the University of California, Berkeley. The usual disclaimer applies.

A Brief Social-Belonging Intervention in the Workplace: Evidence from a Field Experiment

ABSTRACT

Brief interventions that strengthen an individual's sense of social belonging have been shown to improve outcomes for members of underrepresented, marginalized groups in educational settings. This paper reports insights based on an attempt to apply this type of intervention in the technology sector. Adapting a social-belonging intervention from educational psychology, we implemented a quasi-random field experiment, spanning twelve months, with 506 newly hired engineers (24% female) in the R&D function of a west coast technology firm. We did not find a statistically significant effect of the treatment on a core attainment outcome—bonus relative to base salary—that exhibited a significant gender gap, with women receiving proportionally lower bonuses than men. We did not find anticipated gender gaps in promotion rates or social network centrality, and we also did not find a statistically significant effect of the treatment for women on these outcomes. Drawing on meaningful differences between educational versus workplace settings, we identify four theoretical moderators that might influence the efficacy of social-belonging interventions adapted from educational settings into the workplace. Finally, based on the limitations of our study design, we provide four recommendations that future researchers might adopt.

Keywords: social belonging, STEM, gender, interventions, inequality

INTRODUCTION

Gender inequalities persist in science, technology, engineering, and math (“STEM”) fields, with women being less likely than men to pursue advanced degrees and rise to the senior ranks of leading technology firms (Ceci & Williams, 2007; National Science Foundation, 2018). In response, firms have invested heavily in diversity and inclusion programs (Kalev, Kelly, & Dobbin 2006)—for example, adding more structure to performance evaluations (Correll, 2017), hiring diversity specialists (Williams & Wade-Golden, 2013), and launching formal mentoring and training programs to reduce the social isolation of women (Kalev, 2009; Srivastava, 2015). Yet our understanding of which programs ultimately prove effective and under what conditions remains incomplete (Cheryan et al., 2017; Dobbin, Schrage, & Kalev, 2015).

Separately, research in educational psychology has demonstrated the success of interventions that influence minority students’ sense of social belonging when they enter a new academic setting. Such interventions buffer minorities from social identity threat and equip them to successfully navigate an environment that might otherwise feel unwelcoming (Kizilec et al., 2017; Walton et al., 2015; Walton & Cohen, 2007, 2011). For example, a one-hour social-belonging intervention consisting of three parts—participants (a) learning about older students’ experiences in overcoming doubts about their belongingness; (b) writing a self-reflection to facilitate internalization of the message; and (c) filming a video message directed at hypothetical others to help them internalize the message that doubts about belongingness are common but can be overcome (Cooper & Fazio, 1984)—eliminated gender differences in grade point average (GPA) at a selective university engineering program (Walton et al., 2015). A similar social-belonging intervention targeting freshmen’s sense of social belonging at a university raised black students’ GPAs and halved the minority achievement gap (Walton & Cohen, 2011).

1
2
3 Building on these insights, we conducted a twelve-month field experiment at a large west
4 coast technology firm to assess whether a brief social-belonging intervention—analogueous to the
5 one used in educational settings but adapted to a corporate context—can positively shape a
6 newly hired female engineer’s subjective experience and thereby enable her to achieve higher
7 levels of attainment and occupy more central positions in the workplace social network. We did
8 not find that a comparable intervention in a workplace setting had an effect on women’s bonus as
9 a percentage of base, where women’s bonuses as a percentage of their base salaries were, on
10 average, 1.3 and 1.2 percentage points lower than men’s bonuses as a percentage of men’s base
11 salaries in Years 1 and 2. Surprisingly, we did not find predicted gender gaps in promotion rates,
12 and we also did not find a statistically significant effect of the treatment for women on this
13 outcome. Also in contrast to prior research leading us to expect *a priori* gender differences in
14 social networks (Ibarra, 1992; 1993; Kleinbaum, Stuart, & Tushman, 2013), we did not find that
15 women and men’s social network centrality differed among our sample of newcomers at the
16 organization, and we again found no significant treatment effect of the intervention. To
17 contextualize these results and inform future research, we identified four potential theoretical
18 moderators that may influence the effectiveness of social-belonging interventions in the
19 workplace relative to educational settings. Finally, recognizing certain limitations in our research
20 design, we conclude by offering four suggestions for how to modify the design to increase the
21 likelihood of more successfully adapting social-belonging interventions to workplace settings.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 THEORY

47
48
49 Although newcomers generally experience uncertainty about the extent to which they
50 belong to a new setting, this uncertainty is heightened for, and threatens the social identities of,
51 members of marginalized groups (Walton & Cohen, 2007). Experiencing a sense of social
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 belonging through positive interactions and supportive relationships improves subjective well-
4 being, health, and cognitive and emotional processes (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In educational
5 environments, a brief social-belonging intervention targeted to first-year college undergraduates
6 can have lasting positive consequences for learning and achievement—as manifested in course
7 grades, overall GPA, and graduation rates (Walton & Cohen, 2011). Such interventions have
8 positive consequences because they buffer students from social identity threat and encourage
9 them to seek support and persist in the face of obstacles.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Three similarities between the experience of an underrepresented minority entering a new
20 school and that of a woman joining a technology firm motivated our study of a social-belonging
21 intervention. First, just as non-white students are numerical minorities in elite educational
22 institutions, women are significantly underrepresented in technology firms—particularly in core
23 research and development functions (National Science Foundation, 2018). Simple differences in
24 numerical proportions can adversely affect how others perceive minorities and how minorities
25 perceive themselves, thereby threatening minorities' social identities and eroding their sense of
26 social belonging (Good, Rattan, & Dweck, 2012). Thus, a priori, this appeared to be a promising
27 context for extending research on social-belonging interventions.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Second, just as non-white or first-generation students at elite educational institutions face
41 a dominant culture that they often experience as unfamiliar or unwelcoming (Fordham & Ogbu,
42 1986; Stephens et al., 2012), women entering technology firms must contend with so-called
43 “bro” cultures that can be chilly and unreceptive. Women in technology, especially as minority
44 group members, are likely to experience a variety of subtle and explicit cues that make their
45 gender salient and highlight ways in which they are not welcome. Such cues range from humor
46 that stigmatizes their gender or feminine characteristics, sexually predatory behavior that
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reinforces hegemonic masculinity, and stereotypically masculine objects in the environment that
4 signal the workplace is better suited to men (Cheryan et al., 2017; Cheryan et al., 2009; Logel et
5 al., 2009). These experiences can reinforce self-perceptions of being an outsider and lead women
6 to feel that they do not belong.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Finally, attainment in both the educational and corporate realms relies, in part, on
13 accessing valuable resources such as task advice, support, and mentorship through social
14 relationships (Burt, 2005; Srivastava, 2015; Stephens, Hamedani, & Destin, 2014). Yet non-
15 white students in educational settings and women in technology may also be more likely to be
16 structurally excluded from networks that could serve as conduits to such resources (Ibarra, 1992;
17 Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 1998). They may also lack access to the cultural knowledge needed to
18 successfully build and activate these relationships (Erickson, 1996; Turco, 2010).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Given the commonalities between the experiences of marginalized newcomers to
30 educational and corporate settings, we explored whether a brief social-belonging intervention—
31 adapted to a corporate context—would improve attainment for women entering a technology
32 firm. Consistent with the pattern in many technology firms, women in our empirical setting
33 earned lower starting salaries and received smaller performance-based bonuses as a proportion of
34 their salary in their first two years after hire. Thus, there was a gender gap in one key indicator
35 (performance-based bonus in years 1 and 2) though, surprisingly, not in another key indicator
36 (promotion rate) that the intervention could potentially have addressed. However, despite not
37 finding a gender difference in untreated newcomers' likelihood of promotion, the low
38 representation of women in senior ranks of the technology company provides evidence of a
39 broader gender gap within the organization. Moreover, educational psychology researchers have
40 conjectured that brief social-belonging interventions might also prove effective in the workplace
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Walton et al., 2015: 481), and other brief interventions—for example, ones that emphasize a
4 newcomer’s authentic individual identity—have been shown to change attitudes toward women
5 in the workplace, boost job performance, and reduce turnover in corporate settings (Cable, Gino,
6 & Staats, 2013; Chang et al., 2019).
7
8
9
10
11

12 We therefore implemented a social-belonging intervention that aimed to make female
13 participants more likely to encode the difficulty of joining a new organization as routine and
14 common to all newcomers rather than as evidence of nonbelonging. We investigated the
15 possibility that women receiving such an intervention would therefore stay more engaged, be
16 more inclined to seek out help and support, and ultimately receive higher performance-based
17 bonuses and get promoted at a higher rate (and thereby receive higher base salaries) than women
18 receiving a neutral intervention. Despite not finding a difference in social network centrality
19 between women relative to men in the control group as well as in the entire sample, we also
20 examined whether women receiving the social-belonging intervention would experience a lift
21 that women and men in the control group did not because the social-belonging intervention
22 strongly emphasized reaching out to colleagues for help and advice. If women’s professional
23 networks were bolstered by the intervention, it would enable them to build more social
24 connections, thereby propelling them to a more central position in the workplace social network.
25
26 We therefore assessed whether the intervention might have especially affected women’s
27 propensity to connect with their colleagues in supplemental analyses.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **METHOD**

48 **Empirical Setting and Sample**

49 Our research site was a large technology company on the west coast (hereafter referred to
50 as TechCo). Our intervention included all 506 full-time engineers (24% female) hired into
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 TechCo's Research and Development (R&D) function between January and December 2014.¹

4
5 The intervention took place during the R&D function's orientation for newly hired full-time
6
7 employees. TechCo held these orientations each month and strongly encouraged new hires to
8
9 attend the first orientation scheduled after their start date (i.e., within their first month of
10
11 employment). Newcomers joining in odd months received a social-belonging intervention, while
12
13 those joining in even months received a control intervention. The result was quasi-random
14
15 assignment to experimental condition, with 271 newly hired engineers assigned to the social
16
17 belonging (treatment) group and 235 assigned to the control group ($n = 506$).²

21 **Research Design**

22
23
24 We began by conducting and filming 24 interviews with seasoned TechCo employees. In
25
26 these interviews, which ranged between 30 and 90 minutes in length, we learned about TechCo's
27
28 working environment, how employees described the environment, the challenges they faced in
29
30 integrating into the organization, and the strategies they used to overcome obstacles. We
31
32 structured our interview protocol in the form of a life story interview to facilitate learning the
33
34 psychosocial constructions that existing employees used to make sense of their integration into
35
36

37
38
39 ¹ We agreed with TechCo to run the study for a year, a timeframe in which they expected to hire about 500 new
40
41 engineers.

42 ² Although we alternated treatment and control groups in successive months, we cannot rule out the
43
44 possibility of cross-contamination between the two groups. For example, if a treatment group employee
45
46 revealed details of what she observed during orientation to a struggling control group colleague, the latter
47
48 would effectively receive a (perhaps diluted) form of the treatment. TechCo staff who helped implement
49
50 the intervention monitored forums on ChatTool for mentions of the orientation program or either
51
52 intervention but did not find any evidence of such discussions taking place among employees. Yet we
53
54 cannot rule out the possibility that these conversations took place in person or in other communication
55
56 modes. Of course, cross-contamination is also a risk faced by social-belonging interventions in
57
58 educational settings, and this risk would be arguably greater if a given cohort of newcomers was
59
60 randomly assigned to treatment and control conditions in the same month.

1
2
3 and subsequent success at TechCo. Appendix A includes our interview protocol.
4

5
6 Closely paralleling past social belonging research, our design included treatment and
7
8 control conditions with three components: (1) watching a video; (2) writing a brief self-reflection
9
10 about the video; and (3) filming a video message directed at receptive hypothetical others. The
11
12 social-belonging (treatment) intervention made salient that internal job challenges facing newly
13
14 hired engineers at TechCo were widespread and could be overcome, while the customer service
15
16 (control) intervention focused on how TechCo managed external customer relationships. Both
17
18 interventions were implemented during the onboarding module on organizational culture by the
19
20 same TechCo employees who facilitated the overall onboarding program to ensure consistency
21
22 across interventions and to avoid potential demand effects from having external researchers
23
24 implement the intervention.
25
26

27
28 ***Intervention Part 1: Watching a Video.*** In Part 1, newly hired employees watched a 10-
29
30 minute video, which we produced based on our interviews of TechCo employees. Individuals
31
32 featured in the video (more than half of whom were women) described the challenges they
33
34 initially faced at their jobs, explained how and when they overcome their concerns and felt that
35
36 they fit into TechCo, and provided their own advice for future organizational entrants.³ For
37
38 example, one woman featured in the video described how she felt after overcoming her initial
39
40 difficulties at TechCo: “I felt like I was part of the team when I could recognize patterns and
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 ³ Although the design of our social-belonging intervention was broadly in line with those used in prior studies, we
48 acknowledge the possibility that its effectiveness was diluted by including a relatively large proportion of senior
49 women in the video (relative to the actual proportion of women to men in senior positions). We conjecture that an
50 intervention featuring fewer tenured women in the social-belonging video might have proven to be more effective.
51 For example, Ely (1994) finds that women who work in firms such as TechCo that have a low proportion of women
52 in the senior ranks may be less likely to experience gender as a positive basis for shared and positive identification.
53 In line with this finding, it is possible that newly hired women in TechCo were less likely to experience positive
54 identification with women featured in the video, and, consequently, less likely to internalize social-belonging
55 content from them. A useful avenue for future research would be to examine how changing the composition of
56 majority versus minority group members in a social-belonging video might influence the intervention’s efficacy.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 problems and I would speak up and I was able to help decide what the right solutions were. I
4 could tell at that point that my team valued my opinion and welcomed having me at the table.”
5
6

7
8 Closely following prior research, the interview clips selected for the social belonging
9 video also contained advice that tenured employees had for newcomers (Walton et al., 2015;
10 Walton, 2014; Walton & Cohen, 2011, 2007). In addition, employees in the social-belonging
11 video emphasized persistence, patience for learning, tolerance for discomfort, navigating
12 awkwardness, and reaching out to unfamiliar others. Appendix B contains illustrative quotes
13 from the interview clips used in the social-belonging intervention video.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 The control intervention began with a 10-minute video of TechCo customers describing
23 their experiences using various TechCo products. The structure of the control condition video
24 was similar to that of the treatment condition in that customers: (1) described their technological
25 problems; (2) detailed implementation and adoption processes for TechCo products; and (3)
26 made recommendations to future TechCo users based on their experience. In sum, whereas the
27 social-belonging intervention focused on intrapsychic factors related to fitting into the
28 organization, the control video focused on customer experiences with TechCo’s products.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 ***Intervention Part 2: Written Reflection.*** After watching the video associated with their
39 experimental condition, newcomers were instructed to complete a 15-minute written individual
40 reflection task. In the social-belonging condition, newcomers were asked to think about what
41 challenges they would personally face in their new jobs, how employees in the video had
42 overcome similar challenges, and how their past experience and skills could serve them in their
43 new roles. The control group instead reflected on how customers gained from using TechCo’s
44 technology and services. Both groups answered the same number of questions for the written
45 reflection and were allocated the same amount of time.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ***Intervention Part 3: Filming a Video Message Intended for Future Newcomers.*** The
4
5 last component of the intervention was a video filming task in semi-private booths (similar to
6
7 voting booths). To encourage newcomers to see themselves as advocates rather than just
8
9 beneficiaries of the intervention content, newcomers in the treatment group were asked to
10
11 provide advice about overcoming challenges at TechCo to future new employees based on their
12
13 written reflections. Newcomers in the control group were asked to describe what they had
14
15 learned about how TechCo best served their customers. Across both groups, filmed video
16
17 messages ranged in length from one to 14 minutes. Both interventions lasted approximately one
18
19 hour and were nearly identical in format, structure, order and length. They differed only in the
20
21 underlying content: social belonging or customer experience.
22
23
24
25

26 While our approach is substantively similar in procedure and content to past research, we
27
28 identified aspects of belonging that were particularly relevant to women engineers at TechCo and
29
30 adapted the intervention accordingly. In addition to a focus on overcoming social adversity in
31
32 new environments, we highlighted specific challenges facing new engineers at TechCo such as
33
34 learning and understanding various acronyms and jargon related to TechCo's products and
35
36 software development process, as well as identifying and knowing how to solicit help from
37
38 technical experts on other TechCo teams. We included this engineering-specific content,
39
40 alongside content related to concerns about social isolation and exclusion, because both sets of
41
42 challenges were consistently emphasized by the TechCo employees we interviewed in the
43
44 study's design phase.
45
46
47
48

49 **Data Collection and Sample**

50
51 After the intervention was completed, we collected data from TechCo's human resources
52
53 department ("HR") and from their online social collaboration tool ("ChatTool"). We had access
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to a variety of HR data from 2014 to 2016, including base salary, bonus, promotion date,
4
5 nomination for an internal recognition award, departure date and reason for exit (voluntary or
6
7 involuntary), and restricted stock units. Although TechCo is similar to other large technology
8
9 firms in that women are underrepresented in its senior ranks and paid comparatively less than
10
11 men, our analyses are limited to cohorts of newcomers to TechCo and their attainment outcomes
12
13 that can be observed during our study period. It is important to note that the attainment outcomes
14
15 that we observe among newcomers may be less pronounced than one would find in the company
16
17 as a whole.
18
19
20

21
22 Unfortunately, due to internal legal policy, the firm determined after data collection had
23
24 already ended that they could not provide us with HR data for the 140 newly hired engineers
25
26 who joined offices outside the U.S. Thus, for analyses related to employee attainment, our
27
28 sample consists of the 366 newly hired engineers (27% women) who worked in U.S. offices. Our
29
30 sample for analyses related to social network position includes all 506 newly hired engineers
31
32 (24% women).
33
34

35 **Key Dependent Variables: Bonus as a Proportion of Base Salary and Promotion Rate**

36
37
38 After consulting with the HR team about how performance is recognized and rewarded in
39
40 the organization, we decided to focus on two indicators of post-hire achievement where gender
41
42 differences were detected: bonus as a proportion of base salary and the likelihood of getting
43
44 promoted during our observation window. Bonus as a proportion of base salary corresponds most
45
46 closely to how performance is evaluated and ultimately rewarded in the organization. Everyone
47
48 in our sample was eligible for a performance-based bonus and in the risk set to get promoted
49
50 during this period. Bonus as a proportion of base salary ranged from 0 to 30% across both years
51
52 and women received lower bonuses relative to their base salaries than their male counterparts.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In contrast, women in our sample were promoted at higher, rather than lower, rates than
4 men. This was likely a reflection of the fact that women entered at lower hierarchical levels and
5 corresponding salary bands. 28% of employees in our sample earned a promotion during this
6 time period. Because promotion rates tend to be higher at lower rungs of an organizational career
7 ladder, it is important to control for rank in models that estimate a person's likelihood of
8 promotion. When we included a proxy for rank (starting base salary) in promotion models, there
9 were no significant differences in the promotion chances of men versus women. Although
10 women entered the organization at lower starting salaries than men, this difference could have
11 existed for a variety of reasons—such as job-relevant skills, past work experiences, negotiation
12 strategy, salary discrimination—that we cannot observe in our data.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Potential Dependent Variables that Proved to be Infeasible: Nomination for Internal** 27 **Recognition Programs and Turnover⁴** 28 29

30 Although nomination for internal recognition programs and both voluntary and
31 involuntary exits are also meaningful indicators of positive and negative attainment, respectively,
32 these were relatively rare events during our observation period. Thus, there was not enough
33 variance in these outcomes to detect a statistically significant gender difference or statistically
34 significant effect of the intervention on these outcomes. Only 14 (6 women) employees were
35 nominated for the internal recognition program and only 16 (4 women) departed involuntarily.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Exploratory Dependent Variables: Social Network Centrality** 46

47 In addition to the career attainment measures of bonus as a proportion of base salary and
48 promotion rate described above, we also analyzed social network data that were sourced from the
49
50
51

52
53 ⁴ Initial restricted stock unit (RSU) grants were driven primarily by pre-hire negotiations. Subsequent RSU grants
54 were based in part on group, rather than individual, success, and were not consistently available to everyone. Thus,
55 we ascertained and TechCo HR strongly advised us that RSUs are not a meaningful outcome variable.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 complete record of public communications among all employees from January 2014 to January
4
5 2016 on TechCo's primary social collaboration tool, ChatTool. We did so under the premise that
6
7 newcomers who experience a greater sense of social belonging would engage more with their
8
9 fellow employees on this public communication platform. Appendix C provides examples of
10
11 other social organizational platforms that are comparable in terms of design, user interface, and
12
13 function to ChatTool.
14
15

16
17 ChatTool, which accounts for the lion's share of internal communications (relative to
18
19 email and text messaging) affords three advantages as a research tool. First, TechCo
20
21 management strongly encourages and normatively reinforces widespread employee use of
22
23 ChatTool because it ensures that knowledge is publicly available beyond local team members
24
25 and stored in a central location, minimizing concerns about the loss of valuable information
26
27 when employees depart. Second, ChatTool encompasses communication for both work-related
28
29 and social reasons. For example, special interest groups, such as recreational sports and hobby
30
31 groups, are frequently formed and managed through ChatTool. Lastly, following broader trends
32
33 in the industry toward transparency and a shift away from formal hierarchy, ChatTool fosters
34
35 collaborative idea generation and problem solving that transcends formal subunit boundaries.
36
37
38
39

40 By design, ChatTool enables seven different types of communication between
41
42 employees: posting information on individual or group pages, commenting on others' posts on
43
44 individual or group pages, liking others' posts or comments, receiving likes, following other
45
46 employees, and acquiring followers of their own. Our main results are based on aggregate
47
48 ChatTool communications to both individuals and groups; however, the results are materially
49
50 unchanged when we consider each of these types of communication tools to different audiences
51
52 separately. Despite TechCo's qualitatively informed belief that gender difference in social
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 networks existed, we were unable to detect a gap between women and men's network centrality
4
5 in our sample of newcomers on ChatTool. Extant research argues that gender differences in
6
7 women and men's social networks stem from organizational constraints that limit women's
8
9 access to valuable network ties and gendered differences in preferences and network
10
11 development patterns (Ibarra 1992, 1993). Thus, it is surprising that we find no evidence of
12
13 gender differences in social network characteristics based on a comprehensive and widely used
14
15 online communication platform such as ChatTool. However, because of the rich and unique
16
17 nature of the ChatTool data, we report the results from these analyses to help guide future
18
19 researchers towards other types of network measures where effects of a social-belonging
20
21 intervention may be more detectable.
22
23
24
25

26 To explore the intervention's potential effects on employees' social belonging, we
27
28 focused on centrality in the ChatTool communication network, reasoning that newcomers who
29
30 feel a sense of belonging at TechCo may alter their network development patterns in ways that
31
32 resulted in more central, and consequently, more valuable, social network positions in TechCo.
33
34 We first constructed a person-week network for all employees in the sample.⁵ We focused our
35
36 analyses on two social network measures of centrality: degree centrality and eigenvector
37
38 centrality. Whereas degree centrality measures the sheer number of people one is in contact with,
39
40 eigenvector centrality accounts for the centrality of each contact that one is communicating with.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 ⁵ We also analyzed employees' social network position in the network defined by interactions between just the 506
54 newly hired engineers (rather than all employees in the organization). Results based on these measures were
55 comparable to what we report below.
56
57
58
59
60

Independent Variables

Our two key independent variables were *Female* and *Treated*.⁶ *Female* was set to 1 for women based on responses to a self-report in a health insurance questionnaire. *Treated* was set to 1 for employees who received the social-belonging intervention and to 0 for those who received the control intervention. The variable of interest is the interaction term: *Female* × *Treated*. Given that one's likelihood of getting promoted is higher at lower rungs of the hierarchy (where there are more open positions for advancement) than in the upper echelons, we included log base starting salary as a proxy for rank in models of an employee's promotion chances.

Estimation

For analyses of bonus as a proportion of base salary, we estimated OLS models with no control variables (given quasi-random assignment and the fact that all employees were hired into the same R&D function). For analyses of promotion rates, we estimated linear probability models, rather than logit models, given that our key variable of interest is an interaction term (Mize, 2019). Importantly, logistic regression analyses of promotion, t-tests for proportions, and analyses of average marginal effects for women produce substantively similar results. Finally, for analyses of network centrality, we estimated OLS models that included week fixed effects to account for vacations and potential seasonality in online activity.

⁶ Despite developing and piloting manipulation checks to examine whether our treatment condition led people to draw different inferences about social belonging relative to our control condition, TechCo decided not to use any manipulation checks. In pilots, TechCo newcomers were alarmed by manipulation check items and concerned about whether and how their responses would be used in an evaluative capacity. After concluding the experiment, we conducted a supplemental study involving 224 Amazon Mechanical Turk participants who recognized that the content provided in our study's treatment condition emphasized more content pertaining to the challenges of fitting in at TechCo, building relationships with coworkers, and tips for success as a new employee than did the content in our study's control condition. Data and results from this supplemental study are available upon request.

RESULTS

Table 1 provides key descriptive statistics for the overall sample of newly hired employees, as well as the subgroups of female and male newcomers in treatment and control. We report descriptive statistics for base salary in years 1 and 2, bonus as a proportion of base salary in years 1 and 2, promotion rates, degree centrality, and eigenvector centrality. Results from OLS regression models reported that, on average, women earned \$15,359 less ($p < 0.001$) in Year 1 and \$14,150 less ($p < 0.001$) in Year 2 than their male counterparts. Women were awarded bonuses as a proportion of their base salary that were 1.3 percentage points ($p < 0.01$) lower in Year 1 and 1.2 percentage points lower ($p < 0.05$) in Year 2 than their male counterparts. In contrast, women were 11.8% ($p < 0.05$) more likely to earn a promotion during our study than their male colleagues.

The gender differences we detected were fewer overall and, at least for promotion rates, in the opposite direction than we would expect based on prior research on gender differences in career attainment (Ceci & Williams, 2007; National Science Foundation, 2018) and in social network centrality (Ibarra 1992, 1993). To summarize, women received statistically significantly lower bonuses relative to their base salaries than their male counterparts and were promoted at statistically significantly higher, rather than lower, rates than men. We did not detect statistically significant gender gaps in the following outcomes: likelihood of receiving nominations for internal recognition programs, turnover, and social network centrality. Despite these unanticipated patterns, we examined whether the social belonging intervention had differential effects on women versus men, reasoning that in an environment such as this in which women are thriving on key metrics, women's career attainment might benefit especially from a message affirming the normalcy of career challenges as one adjusts to working at TechCo.

 Insert Table 1 about here

Table 2 reports results related to the intervention's effects on bonus as a proportion of base salary in the first and second years after hire. Due to turnover, the sample size is 355 after the first year of employment and 310 after the second year of employment. In Models 1 and 4, the main effect of the variable *Female* is negative and statistically significant for years 1 and 2, suggesting that women receive lower performance-related bonuses than their male counterparts. Consistent with past research, the main effect of the variable *Treated* (in Models 2, 3, 5, and 6) is not statistically significant across model specifications (Walton & Cohen, 2007, 2011; Walton et al., 2015). Moreover, the interaction term *Female* × *Treated* (in Models 3 and 6) fails to reach significance (all $ps > 0.27$). Thus, we were unable to detect a statistically significant effect of the intervention on female newcomers' performance-related bonuses.⁷

 Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 reports results of models that estimate how the social-belonging intervention affected an employee's promotion chances. In Model 1, consistent with expectations, we find that an employee's promotion chances are greater at lower levels of the hierarchy: newcomers entering with higher starting salaries are less likely to be promoted than those who join with lower starting salaries ($p < 0.001$). In Models 2 and 4, we do not find evidence of a main effect

⁷ We also used alternative model specifications to test this by regressing Year 2 salaries on Year 1 salaries, treatment, gender, and the interaction term, but did not find statistically significant evidence for the treatment effect or the interaction term ($ps > .20$). We also logged Year 1 and Year 2 salaries and ran the same regression models, but also did not detect a statistically significant effect for the treatment or the interaction term ($ps > .11$).

1
2
3 of *Female* on the probability of promotion (all $ps > .80$); we also did not find evidence of a main
4
5 effect of *Treated* on promotion rates ($p = 0.094$). Finally, *Female* \times *Treated* does not reach
6
7 statistical significance in Model 5 ($p = 0.27$). Thus, using linear probability and logistic
8
9 regression models, we did not find support for the expectation that the social belonging
10
11 intervention would improve female newcomers' likelihood of getting promoted. Despite the
12
13 lack of statistically significant effects in these models, simple means by gender and
14
15 condition reported in Table 1 demonstrate a trend such that women in the treatment
16
17 group experienced a higher promotion rate (42.9%), as compared to all other groups
18
19 (26.5% for women in the control group; 26.3% for men in the treatment group; 24.3% for
20
21 men in the control condition), which we explore further using post-hoc contrast analyses
22
23 reported below.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36
37 -----
38 Insert Table 3 about here
39
40 -----
41

42 To offer insights from online social network behaviors, we report results related to
43
44 network outcomes in Table 4, despite not finding a gender gap in social network centrality as
45
46 measured on ChatTool. Models 2, 3, and 5 report the main effect of the social-belonging
47
48 intervention on employee's social network centrality as measured in two ways (degree centrality
49
50 and directed eigenvector centrality). *Treated* is not statistically significant across all models. In
51
52 Models 3 and 6, the interaction term, *Female* \times *Treated*, fails to reach significance (all $ps >$
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 0.30). Thus, the intervention did not appear to have statistically significant effects on female
4 newcomers' centrality as measured in ChatTool.
5
6

7
8 -----
9 Insert Table 4 about here
10
11 -----
12

13 While our main analyses did not find evidence in support of the social belonging
14 intervention having a beneficial effect on women's attainment measures, we conducted post-hoc
15 exploratory contrast analyses, which enabled us to vary the comparison group, to look for
16 suggestive evidence of where and for what outcomes the intervention might have had some
17 impact. First, based on the logic that women in the treatment group might disproportionately
18 benefit from the intervention relative to all other participants and that low statistical power might
19 prevent an omnibus 2-way interaction to emerge, we compared women in the treatment group to
20 everyone else (that is, including women in the control group and men in both the treatment and
21 control groups). Thus, these contrast analyses conflate any potential effects of gender in TechCo
22 with the effect of the treatment. Women in the treatment group were indeed more likely to
23 receive promotions than all other groups ($\chi^2(1, N = 366) = 7.34, p = 0.006, d = 0.39$).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Turning next to bonus as a proportion of base salary, we find that women in the treatment
40 group received lower bonuses as a proportion of base salary in the first year ($F(1, N = 355) =$
41 $4.15, p = 0.042, d = 0.29$); this difference was mitigated entirely in Year 2. If women enter
42 similar job roles at TechCo with lower salaries than their male counterparts, then one possible
43 interpretation of this pattern of results is that the social-belonging intervention may have had
44 more of a boosting effect on women than an attenuating effect on a baseline deficit.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Alternatively, earning a promotion may be jointly determined by performance evaluations and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 newcomers' expression of interest in receiving a promotion, unlike compensation decisions
4
5 which may not rely on newcomers' individual actions as much.
6

7
8 Second, based on the logic that the intervention might mitigate gender differences in
9
10 social belonging such that only women in the control group would show evidence of a lack of
11
12 belonging in their network (while women in the treatment group appear to experience
13
14 comparable levels of belonging as men in general), we compared women in the control group to
15
16 everyone else (that is, including men in the control group plus women and men in the treatment
17
18 group). There were no statistically significant differences in the likelihood of promotion or bonus
19
20 as a proportion of base salary in Year 1. However, in Year 2, women in the control group
21
22 received lower bonuses as a proportion of base salary ($F(1, N = 310) = 4.98, p = 0.026, d =$
23
24 0.45).
25
26
27

28
29 Lastly, we conducted further post-hoc analyses to assess whether the intervention was
30
31 more effective with certain subgroups or particular outcome measures. Specifically, we
32
33 examined separately the effects of the intervention for the most junior newcomers and the most
34
35 senior newcomers; we also examined one-to-one and one-to-group communication separately.
36
37 On the one hand, a sense of social belonging might be most malleable at junior levels before
38
39 employees' beliefs about the extent to which they belong are fortified. On the other hand, more
40
41 senior employees may experience greater threats to their sense of social belonging, which could
42
43 have led them to benefit most from the intervention. Along the same lines, we explored whether
44
45 particular modes of communication were more likely to be influenced by the intervention: more
46
47 private one-to-one communication or more public, visible messages that were sent to entire
48
49 working groups. Table 5 summarizes our supplemental analyses investigating possible
50
51 heterogeneous treatment effects. Given the data available to us, we could not detect robust
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 statistically significant evidence that the intervention had a positive impact on any identified
4 subgroups or particular types of social network behaviors based on different modes of ChatTool
5 communications.
6
7
8
9

10 -----
11 Insert Table 5 about here
12 -----
13
14

15 **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

16
17
18 The results from this investigation motivate further reflection on how social-belonging
19 interventions, which prior work has linked to positive outcomes in educational contexts (Yeager
20 & Walton, 2011), can be more effectively adapted to organizational settings and on the
21 methodological limitations of this study that future research can aim to overcome. Although
22 there was clear *a priori* reason to expect that significant gender differences would emerge across
23 multiple measures of career attainment, we observed differences between men and women in
24 some but not all attainment indicators. We identified statistically significant gaps between
25 women and men in bonus amounts as a percentage of base salary and likelihood of promotion (in
26 the opposite direction than we expected), but not in social network centrality, nomination for
27 performance awards, or turnover. Given this peculiar pattern of baseline gender differences
28 present in this organization, we acknowledge that care must be taken in drawing inferences from
29 this single study about the likely efficacy of social belonging interventions in organizational
30 contexts more generally. Moreover, it may be useful to target social-belonging interventions to
31 organizations that display more consistent gender gaps than we observed at TechCo and to check
32 for the presence of these gaps, as well as evidence that women newcomers feel they do not
33 belong in the organization, before investing in such an intervention.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 We proceed by identifying four key differences between typical educational settings and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the specific context of TechCo that might have contributed to the results of our study. Given
4
5 potentially significant differences between school and work settings, we anticipate that
6
7 organizations more closely resembling typical educational settings on these four dimensions and
8
9 outcome measures that more closely correspond to those used in educational institutions are
10
11 more likely to be contexts in which researchers can successfully adapt social-belonging
12
13 interventions.
14
15

16 17 **Proposed Moderator #1: Differences in evaluation frequency and number of evaluators** 18

19 The frequency of evaluations and number of evaluators in TechCo differ from those in
20
21 educational settings in potentially critical ways. A student's grade point average, a dependent
22
23 variable used in past research, reflects performance ratings in multiple classes over time. In
24
25 contrast, newcomers receive performance evaluations at one point in time (annually) at TechCo,
26
27 which drive their bonus percentages and promotion chances. It is possible that more frequent
28
29 evaluations reflect a more accurate measure of performance than do annual evaluations, which
30
31 might be biased by recency effects and other forms of measurement error. If so, then a post-
32
33 intervention performance measure based on multiple instances of evaluation might more
34
35 accurately detect increases in social belonging than an annual performance measure. Through an
36
37 iterative process the behaviors driving early successes are positively reinforced, increasing the
38
39 likelihood of future successes. Multiple evaluations might also provide people with more
40
41 opportunities to develop a sense of social belonging and more practice in buffering their social
42
43 identity threats in the environment.
44
45
46
47
48

49 In organizational settings, future research could instead measure more common
50
51 performance metrics, such as employees' time to completion of frequent and routine tasks,
52
53 instead of holistic, annual performance evaluations. Studying more proximal measures of day-to-
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 day performance might shed light on mediating mechanisms of gender differences for more
4 consequential but infrequent outcomes such as salary and promotion. In addition to multiple
5 evaluations of performance, there are also multiple raters in schools as compared to
6 organizations. For example, students' GPA is based on evaluations from numerous instructors,
7 whereas one supervisor primarily shapes employees' performance evaluations at TechCo. Future
8 research may benefit from studying intervention outcomes in evaluations where performance
9 measures are based on multiple evaluators instead of just one supervisor, such as 360-degree,
10 team, or peer review processes.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Proposed Moderator #2: Differences in performance evaluation content**

22
23
24 The content of performance evaluations in organizations may also differ from
25 assessments in classrooms in terms of standardization and objectivity. The links between social
26 belonging and performance may be stronger in educational environments, where expectations
27 about the content of performance evaluations are more standardized than in TechCo. For
28 example, all students in a course complete the same assignments whereas newcomers at TechCo
29 work on different projects where the specific tasks of their job vary. Subjective evaluations of
30 non-standardized tasks, which are often inputs to performance evaluations that determine bonus
31 payouts, may introduce other pernicious forms of bias that may be too difficult for social-
32 belonging interventions to overcome (Castilla & Benard, 2010; Reskin, 2000; Ridgeway &
33 Correll, 2004).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 We speculate that the objectivity of performance metrics may prove to be an important
48 moderator, with the effects of social-belonging interventions being perhaps easier to detect when
49 performance outcomes are more objectively measured. Future research studies can utilize more
50 standardized measures of employee performance that align well with the context. In large
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 technology firms such as TechCo, examples of such measures include the number and
4 importance of bugs an employee fixes, burn rates, and the number and quality of the product
5 features they help to develop. In other organizational settings, examples of such measures may
6 include billable hours, the rate at which investment opportunities are evaluated, and project
7 timeliness.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Proposed Moderator #3: Participants' age and prior work experience in relevant industries**

15
16
17 Newcomers to TechCo are likely older and more experienced than students entering a
18 university setting, raising the possibility that demographic characteristics such as age or years of
19 work experience might influence the extent to which participants benefit from such
20 interventions. For example, the intervention may have been less likely to affect seasoned TechCo
21 newcomers with more extensive work experience, whose beliefs about social belonging in
22 STEM could be more intractable.⁸ Moreover, we note that recent evidence of the effectiveness of
23 brief psychological interventions in closing the gender achievement gap among MBA students
24 suggests that such interventions can also work for participants who are somewhat older than
25 first-year undergraduates (Kinias & Sim, 2016). Even in organizational settings where brief
26 online diversity trainings shaped attitudes towards women in the workplace (which could be
27 regarded as a manipulation check), interventions with similar aims produced mixed effects on
28 more consequential behavioral outcomes (Chang et al., 2019). Future researchers may target
29 newcomers in internship programs, newcomers hired directly after completing undergraduate or
30 masters' degree programs, or newcomers who transition into STEM roles with little prior
31 experience in the industry.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 ⁸ Although we do not have the data to test this proposition directly, our post-hoc analyses revealed no differences in
54 the intervention's effectiveness for more senior (and likely older and more experienced) versus more junior
55 employees.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Proposed Moderator #4: Intervention content alignment with broader organizational**
4 **culture**
5
6

7
8 Just like broader organizational cultures of innovation, collaboration, or psychological
9 safety can shape employee productivity, an organization's broader culture may also shape an
10 individual's sense of social belonging. For example, organizational cultures, which are
11 characterized by norms and rooted in core beliefs, can endorse more fixed or growth mindsets
12 (Schein, 2010; Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016; Canning, Murphy, Emerson, Chatman, Dweck, &
13 Kray, in press). If individuals perceive their organization endorses more of a fixed mindset—the
14 notion that individual talent and ability are fixed and cannot be changed—then such a core belief
15 may conflict with social belonging content, which emphasizes that obstacles facing new
16 members are common, transient, and surmountable. To the extent that participants, during their
17 first two years of employment, experienced broader organizational cultural content that
18 conflicted with our study's social-belonging content, such as a fixed mindset, then this may have
19 reduced the efficacy of the intervention. Unlike STEM fields where the concept of geniuses can
20 be idealized (Leslie, Cimpian, Meyer, & Freeland, 2015), some academic disciplines and settings
21 are fundamentally rooted in the core belief of learning, which may serve to reinforce
22 participant's internalization of social-belonging intervention content. Applying this distinction to
23 organizational settings, future research can gather firm-wide data on organizational culture—for
24 example, by utilizing Organizational Cultural Profiles (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991)—
25 to investigate whether particular dimensions of an organization's culture across teams and
26 departments moderate the effects of a social-belonging intervention. It may be that a learning
27 orientation is needed for the positive effects of social belonging interventions to take hold.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In addition to targeting social-belonging interventions to the types of organizations and
4 organizational outcomes where they are more likely to be effective, we also acknowledge certain
5 limitations in our study design that might have limited our capacity to detect the intervention's
6 effects at TechCo. In particular, we highlight below four key adjustments we would recommend
7 making to our research design.
8
9

14 **Recommendation for future research #1: Ensure adequate statistical power**

15
16
17 It is possible that we lacked sufficient statistical power to detect the effects of the social-
18 belonging intervention. Previously published literature reports standardized effect sizes
19 (Cohen's d) of the treatment effect for minority group members' post-intervention behaviors
20 (e.g., GPA, hours spent studying, achievement behaviors) ranged from 1.07 to 1.47 (Walton &
21 Cohen, 2007: 91-92; Walton & Cohen, 2011; Walton et al., 2015: 476-477). In this study, an
22 effect size of 1.07 represents a shift of approximately 4.35% in bonus as a percentage of salary
23 (an increase from the observed 14.2% in year 1 to 18.6% and an increase from the observed
24 14.8% in year 2 to 19.1%). Assuming a Type I error rate of 5%, and two-tailed tests, our sample
25 had sufficient statistical power to detect effects in line with previously published research (99.9%
26 statistical power) and to detect minimum simple effects of the treatment ranging from 0.38 to
27 0.41 in effect size for bonus as a proportion of base salary in years 1 and 2 in the full sample.⁹ In
28 contrast, we acknowledge that our sample of 355 newcomers may have been underpowered for
29 analyses related to our second binary dependent variable: whether or not an employee was
30 promoted during the observation period. For example, a sample size of 825 would have been
31 needed to have sufficient (80%) statistical power to detect a one standard deviation effect of the
32

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 ⁹ Assuming a reasonable amount of power (80%), a Type I error rate of 5%, and conservative two-tailed tests, our
54 sample had sufficient statistical power to detect a minimum simple effect of the treatment on social network
55 centrality of 0.33 in effect size and a simple effect of the treatment for women on social network centrality of 0.55.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 social belonging-intervention on newcomers' probabilities of promotion.
4

5 Although this study was an extension rather than a direct replication of past social
6 belonging research, we anticipated at the time we designed the study that our sample size for
7 analyses related to bonus as a percentage of base salary would be reasonable given that our
8 sample was 2.5 times larger than the samples reported in foundational papers on the social-
9 belonging intervention (e.g., Walton & Cohen, 2007; 2011; Simonsohn, 2015). Yet
10 contemporary research guidelines suggest that an interaction driven by a significant effect for
11 one group and not another requires a sample size four times as large as the sample needed to
12 detect the simple effect. Thus, based on these modern research recommendations, an ideal study
13 would need 96 participants per cell to detect such an interaction, in contrast to the 34-175
14 participants per cell that we had.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Recommendation for future research #2: Better target the intervention to subgroups that**
29 **are most likely to benefit**
30
31

32 We do not know if certain subgroups might have benefited more than others from our
33 intervention. Given that longitudinal field experiments of the kind we implemented can take a
34 long time to set up and entail significant opportunity costs for researchers and organizational
35 leaders alike, it may be useful to conduct lab experimental or qualitative research in advance to
36 identify particular subgroups (e.g., employees from different race and ethnicity, sexual
37 orientation, parental status, or socioeconomic status groups within the setting). It may also be
38 helpful for researchers to identify particularly problematic teams within the organization or
39 particular moment's in employees' career trajectories (e.g., after they return from parental leave;
40 when they first take on a supervisory role) that may be especially likely to benefit from such
41 interventions.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Recommendation for future research #3: Use more subtle manipulation checks

Manipulation checks are often a critical component of research design. However, in practice, introducing a new assessment into an organizational environment proved to be more precarious than we had anticipated. When we piloted our experimental materials, TechCo employees were anxious about completing survey items related to their feelings and subjective experience, despite TechCo's emphasis about the anonymous and non-evaluative nature of the items in the manipulation check. To address this limitation, we conducted a follow-up study on Amazon Mechanical Turk to confirm that the content of the videos used in the treatment and control conditions were statistically significantly different as intended. Future attempts to implement social-belonging interventions in the field might benefit from the use of brief post-orientation surveys that can gather feedback on the orientation program and check participants' understanding of the content. Future research can also find other more subtle ways to conduct manipulation checks—for example, by collaborating with individual managers who can gather data about orientation content during weekly check-ins with their subordinates or collecting free text responses from participants and coding the responses for clues of social belonging (e.g., the use of “we” rather than “I”) (Doyle et al., 2017).

Recommendation for future research #4: Collect egocentric network data

Finally, our network analyses were limited to data derived from ChatTool, which primarily reflects task-based employee communication. Yet it is possible that social-belonging interventions affect not a participant's position in the task-coordination network but instead her position in the network of advice-seeking, social support, or mentorship communication, which might largely occur outside of the public ChatTool platform. Past research suggests that social network characteristics of women and minorities differ from those of white men, in part, because

1
2
3 of limited access to informal networks in organizations (Ibarra 1992, 1993). Online
4 communication such as ChatTool that are more accessible and visible than email, text
5
6 messaging, or private in-person communications, may serve to ameliorate gender gaps stemming
7
8 from historically limited network access. We anticipate that future research will benefit from
9
10 tapping into multiple forms of network data—including surveys that can distinguish between the
11
12 exchange of instrumental (e.g., task advice) and expressive (e.g., social support) resources (Lin,
13
14 2001)—that are collected through a variety of data collection techniques (e.g., network surveys,
15
16 sociometric badges, archived electronic communications). Future research can more closely
17
18 examine whether targeting women newcomers' sense of social belonging in STEM changes their
19
20 perception of their socially supportive relationships at work instead of their relationships based
21
22 on actual communication patterns.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Conclusion**

29
30
31 Notwithstanding its limitations and potential differences between workplace and
32
33 educational settings, the current study makes several novel contributions to the growing body of
34
35 work that examines the effects of diversity and inclusion programs, which are rapidly
36
37 proliferating across organizations (Barak, 2016; Dobbin, Schrage, & Kalev, 2015; Kalev, Kelly,
38
39 & Dobbin 2006). The effects of this hour-long intervention in one organization's onboarding
40
41 program may be at best small in size (and non-significant overall). Yet small or null effects can
42
43 still be clinically or practically significant (Cohen, 1992), especially in providing guidance for
44
45 future research. The “file drawer problem” can skew effect size estimates based on published
46
47 literature if it is biased in favor of significant effects (Rosenthal, 1979), and it is therefore
48
49 important to publish null results for this reason alone. Lastly, one of our post-hoc contrast
50
51 analyses provides suggestive evidence that women in the treatment group were more likely to
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 receive promotions than men and women in the control group. Unlike compensation decisions or
4
5 performance evaluations that are heavily shaped by managerial evaluations of performance,
6
7 promotion decisions are also likely shaped by whether an employee expresses a desire to ascend
8
9 in the organization and gain more responsibility. Thus, it is possible that our social-belonging
10
11 intervention may have influenced women by encouraging them to express their interest in
12
13 receiving promotions—a possibility worth investigating further in future research.
14
15

16
17 Whereas much of the work to date has focused on cross-organization comparisons of
18
19 various programs, we report results from a unique, longitudinal quasi-experiment implementing
20
21 a social-belonging intervention in one specific firm (Dobbin, Schrage, & Kalev, 2015; Kalev,
22
23 Kelly, & Dobbin, 2006). That we are unable to detect a robust, statistically significant impact on
24
25 women's attainment outcomes from a social-belonging intervention, which was designed to
26
27 mirror one previously reported to have been effective in educational settings, suggests the need
28
29 for a more nuanced understanding of how practices that were successful in one social context can
30
31 be effectively imported to the workplace. Further research, using longitudinal study designs of
32
33 the kind we implemented along with multiple different types of performance metrics are needed
34
35 to compare diversity and inclusion programs and to determine when, where, and how such
36
37 programs are most likely to be effective at ameliorating workplace inequities.
38
39
40

41
42 Understanding when and how diversity practices work across different contexts is a
43
44 critical step in deciding how to allocate scarce resources to policies and programs that seek to
45
46 address workplace inequality. Gleaning theoretical and empirical insights about what types of
47
48 organizations are best suited to conduct social-belonging interventions and which components of
49
50 research design are critical, such as the ones we offer here, can be just as important as positive
51
52 results in building collective knowledge about the efficacy of diversity and inclusion programs.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In sum, this study highlights the value of a cumulative body of research that uses well-designed,
4 longitudinal field experiments to identify “best practices” in the design of such programs (Kalev,
5
6 Kelly, & Dobbin, 2006).
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics (Means and SD) for All Dependent Measures¹

	All Newcomers (<i>n</i> = <i>n</i> in year 1; <i>n</i> in year 2) (<i>n</i> = 355; 310) ²	Female Newcomers in Treatment (<i>n</i> = 61; 56)	Male Newcomers in Treatment (<i>n</i> = 129; 114)	Female Newcomers in Control (<i>n</i> = 34; 27)	Male Newcomers in Control (<i>n</i> = 131; 113)
Year 1 Base Salary (\$, starting salary)	143,055 (32,893)	131,467 (35,772)	149,033 (31,366)	132,413 (25,214)	145,326 (33,051)
Year 2 Base Salary (\$)	151,511 (33,554)	143,028 (38,010)	155,668 (30,287)	137,258 (29,039)	154,927 (34,075)
Year 1 Bonus Relative to Base Salary (%) ³	14.2 (4.1)	13.3 (4.4)	14.7 (4.0)	13.4 (2.9)	14.4 (4.2)
Year 2 Bonus Relative to Base Salary (%) ³	14.8 (4.0)	14.3 (4.6)	15.1 (3.7)	13.1 (3.7)	15.1 (4.0)
Promoted Newcomers (%) ^{4,5}	28.4 (45.2)	42.9 (49.9)	26.3 (44.2)	26.5 (44.8)	24.3 (43.0)
	All Employees (<i>n</i> = number of people) (<i>n</i> = 10,489)	Female Newcomers in Treatment (<i>n</i> = 73)	Male Newcomers in Treatment (<i>n</i> = 175)	Female Newcomers in Control (<i>n</i> = 42)	Male Newcomers in Control (<i>n</i> = 176)
Degree Centrality	89.2 (183.8)	160.4 (217.8)	153.6 (219.7)	157.3 (193.7)	178.6 (270.9)
Eigenvector Centrality	.008 (.039)	.004 (.025)	.006 (.044)	.004 (.024)	.006 (.040)

Notes: 1. Standard deviations reported in parentheses below means.

2. Due to turnover, the sample size is 355 and 310 at the end of years 1 and 2, respectively.

3. Results from OLS regression show that women received 1.3% lower bonus as a percentage of base in Year 1 (*p* = 0.009) and 1.2% lower bonus as a percentage of base in Year 2 (*p* = 0.021) than their male counterparts.

4. Sample sizes for promotions are 366, 63, 133, 34, and 136 (from left to right in Table 1).

5. Results from logistic regression and linear probability models show that women are 11.8% (*p* = 0.027) more likely to be promoted than their male counterparts.

TABLE 2
OLS Models Estimating Intervention Effects on Year 1 and 2 Bonus as Proportion of Base Salary

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Year 1 Bonus as Prop of Base	Year 1 Bonus as Prop of Base	Year 1 Bonus as Prop of Base	Year 2 Bonus as Prop of Base	Year 2 Bonus as Prop of Base	Year 2 Bonus as Prop of Base
Female	-0.0126** (0.00483)		-0.0105 (0.00778)	-0.0119* (0.00513)		-0.0198* (0.00857)
Treated		0.000510 (0.00433)	0.00301 (0.00501)		0.000735 (0.00460)	-0.000450 (0.00531)
Female × Treated			-0.00405 (0.00999)			0.0118 (0.0108)
Constant	0.146** (0.00250)	0.142** (0.00317)	0.144** (0.00353)	0.151** (0.00265)	0.148** (0.00341)	0.151** (0.00376)
Observations	355	355	355	310	310	310
Adjusted R^2	0.016	-0.003	0.012	0.014	-0.003	0.012

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Note: Sample size varies across models due to employee attrition during the study.

TABLE 3
Linear Probability Models Predicting Promotion

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Promotion	Promotion	Promotion	Promotion	Promotion
Year 1 Base Salary (logged)	-0.894** (0.0962)	-0.888** (0.0990)	-0.894** (0.0960)	-0.894** (0.0988)	-0.888** (0.0989)
Female		0.0130 (0.0505)		0.00174 (0.0508)	-0.0657 (0.0791)
Treated			0.0729 (0.0434)	0.0727 (0.0439)	0.0443 (0.0507)
Female × Treated					0.113 (0.101)
Constant	10.88** (1.140)	10.81** (1.176)	10.85** (1.137)	10.84** (1.173)	10.79** (1.174)
Observations	355	355	355	355	355
Adjusted R ²	0.194	0.192	0.198	0.196	0.197

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

TABLE 4
Models Estimating Effects of Treatment on Social Network Centrality with Week Fixed Effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Degree Centrality	Degree Centrality	Degree Centrality	Eigenvector Centrality (directed)	Eigenvector Centrality (directed)	Eigenvector Centrality (directed)
Female	-6.776 (13.40)		-21.44 (21.04)	-0.00144 (0.00115)		-0.00209 (0.00157)
Treated		-13.47 (12.97)	-24.46 (16.20)		-0.000683 (0.00133)	-0.00100 (0.00183)
Female × Treated			28.46 (27.28)			0.00119 (0.00234)
Week Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	121.7** (32.31)	156.5** (36.17)	170.2** (39.59)	0.148** (0.0214)	0.155** (0.0231)	0.171** (0.0240)
Observations	31,024	32,054	30,458	31,024	32,054	30,458
Adjusted R^2	0.013	0.015	0.016	0.201	0.202	0.208

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

TABLE 5
Exploring Heterogeneous Treatment Effects by Subgroups and Outcome Measures

Subgroup / Specific Outcome Measure and Method	Rationale	Result
Subgroup: Junior employees (those with bottom quartile, third, and half of Year 1 earnings), using OLS and logistic regression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Junior newly hired employees with the lowest starting salaries (and presumably the least prior experience) are closest in age to university freshmen, which was the sample group used in prior work (Walton & Cohen 2007, 2011; Walton et al., 2015). 	Null
Subgroup: Senior employees (those with top quartile, third, and half of Year 1 earnings), using OLS and logistic regression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gender wage gap is often more pronounced at senior levels, reflecting the cumulative disadvantage women often face, than at the entry levels. 	Null
Specific Outcome Measure: One-to-one communication on ChatTool, using OLS with week fixed effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One-to-one communication may be more reflective of help-seeking behavior and thus more susceptible to influence from a social-belonging intervention. 	Null
Specific Outcome Measure: One-to-group communication on ChatTool, using OLS with week fixed effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One-to-group communication is more public and potentially higher stakes than one-to-one communication. The intervention might have emboldened participants to engage in this riskier but potentially more valuable form of communication. 	Null

APPENDIX A

Life Story Interview Protocol

We'd like to ask you a few questions about your experiences at TechCo. We want to learn more about your personal experiences and attitudes to provide future employees with more accurate expectations about working here. If it is helpful, you can think about this interview as an opportunity to share the story of your time at TechCo. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. We are interested in hearing your story as you remember it.

Career History and New Hire Experiences at TechCo

1. Let's start by talking about your career history prior to joining TechCo. What did you study / what was your major? Can you tell us a bit about your career trajectory leading up to your employment here? How long have you been working at TechCo and what brought you here?
2. Thinking back to when you first started your job here, what were your expectations about working at TechCo? ... About your job or colleagues at TechCo? What, if anything, did you find surprising about working at TechCo? What types of uncertainties did you face / [doubts did you have]? Can you think of any examples?
3. Are there times when you felt as though you didn't fit in? Can you please provide examples of what this felt like?
4. Please identify what you now consider to be the greatest challenge you faced at TechCo.

The Turning Point at TechCo

5. In looking back over your time at TechCo, it may be possible to identify certain key moments that stand out as turning points – episodes that marked an important change in your career. Please identify a particular episode in your time at TechCo that you now see as a turning point. Can you tell us about the point at which you really knew that you belong at TechCo? Where were you, what did you feel, what did you experience?
6. Please describe how you established relationships at work to help you succeed.
7. Can you describe how you worked to achieve your social position in the organization?

Current Experiences at TechCo

8. How would you describe the culture at TechCo? What are the core values of TechCo as you see it? How have you personally adapted to the culture at TechCo?
9. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about your experiences at TechCo?

APPENDIX B
Illustrative Quotes from Pilot Interviews
(Featured in Part 1 of Social-Belonging Intervention - Video)

Describing their experience as a newly hired employee

“I was scared shitless, uhm (chuckle)... College was .. you go into a computer cluster, you sit down there, you’re there for twelve hours, when you leave its four in the morning and you’re this haggard, zombie person who can barely walk and is kind of drooling out of the side of their mouth, and, uhm, I REALLY hated doing THAT, and so I was really afraid when I got here that it would be more of THAT.”

“I really didn’t know what TechCo did, uhm, even when I started working.”

“I was worried that I would have to know all the answers... I had a lot of trouble speaking up in our bug triage meetings... There were a lot of very complicated problems. There was a lot of working with people to figure out what the problems ARE.”

“I think the hardest transition points were (A) not knowing people ... suddenly, I was completely back to square one and I didn’t know who to go to. And not only that, I didn’t know the lingo. I mean, I remember going with my notepad to product reviews and just writing down all these questions – what is [acronym], what is this, what is that? And just kind of wanting to push the fast forward button so that I’d be in a position to like know everything and be what I was at the earlier company, but I guess, you know, that just wasn’t practical. SO, you know, it was overwhelming and there was that feeling of, you know, am I ever going to be able to be successful here because it has taken me SO long to come up to speed with things.”

Describing their turning points at TechCo

“I felt ... I have a way to get people to hear what I’m saying instead of just being the noise in the background.”

“I think the epiphany for me was learning that my contributions are just as valuable even if I’m not the most technical in the room.”

“At other companies they expect you to ramp up in one month or three months, but at TechCo ... it can take six months. And at that point, I think I was four months in, and so I thought I was already behind but it turned out I was pretty far ahead.”

“I felt like I was part of the team when I could recognize patterns and problems and I would speak up and I was able to, you know, help decide what the right solutions were. I could tell at that point that my team valued my opinion and welcomed having me at the table.”

“Kinda the key tipping point for me ... was ... making the choice to get more involved in different groups and go to different meetings.”

Reflecting on their new hire experience

“New hire mentality... is like, yeah I know what I’m doing, alright we are gonna go make things happen, which is just a bunch of garbage.”



“Don’t worry that you are not going to be able to pick up things straightaway ... so give yourself that time.”

“Meet ... the people around you, in the next aisle, on that other floor, in the kitchen, wherever it might be because those are the people that you are gonna need help from.”

“As new hires, we often feel sceptical about reaching out, so that would be one very crucial piece of advice, like, I could give, is to just reach out and make an effort and you’ll be very surprised at the number of responses you’ll get and the amazing feedback and insights you’ll have.”

APPENDIX C

Examples of Social Collaboration Tools



REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. 1995. The Need to Belong: Desire for Interpersonal
7 Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3):
8 497–529.
9
- 10 Barak, M. E. M. 2016. *Managing Diversity: Toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace*. (4th ed.).
11 Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications.
12
- 13 Burt, R. S. 2005. *Brokerage and Closure: An Introduction to Social Capital*. Oxford; Oxford
14 University Press.
15
- 16 Cable, D. M., Gino F., & Staats B. R. 2013. Breaking Them in or Eliciting Their Best?
17 Reframing Socialization around Newcomers' Authentic Self-expression. *Administrative*
18 *Science Quarterly*, 58(1): 1–36.
19
- 20 Canning, E. A., Murphy, M., Emerson, K. T. U., Chatman, J. A., Dweck, C. S., & Kray, L. J. (In
21 press). Cultures of genius at work: Organizational mindsets predict cultural norms, trust, and
22 commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.
23
24
- 25 Castilla, E. J., & Benard, S. 2010. The Paradox of Meritocracy in Organizations. *Administrative*
26 *Science Quarterly*, 55: 543–576.
27
- 28 Ceci, S. K., & Williams, W. M. 2007. *Why Aren't More Women in Science? Top Researchers*
29 *Debate the Evidence*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
30
- 31 Chang, E. H., Milkman K. L., Gromet D. M., Rebele R. W., Massey C., Duckworth A. L., &
32 Grant A. M. 2019. The Mixed Effects of Online Diversity Training. *Proceedings of the*
33 *National Academy of Sciences*, 116(16): 7778–a7783.
34
- 35 Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C. A. 2016. Paradigm Lost: Reinvigorating the Study of
36 Organizational Culture. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36:199–224.
37
38
- 39 Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. 2009. Ambient Belonging: How
40 Stereotypical Cues Impact Gender Participation in Computer Science. *Journal of*
41 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(6): 1045–1060.
42
- 43 Cheryan, S., Ziegler, S. A., Montoya, A. K., & Jiang, K. 2017. Why are Some STEM Fields
44 More Gender Balanced Than Others? *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(1): 1–35.
45
- 46 Cohen, J. 1992. A Power Primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1): 155-159.
47
- 48 Cooper, J., & Fazio, R. 1984. A New Look at Dissonance Theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.),
49 *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
50
- 51 Correll, S. J. 2017. Reducing Gender Biases in Modern Workplaces: A Small Wins Approach to
52 Organizational Change. *Gender and Society*, 31(6): 725–750.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Dobbin, F., Schrage, D., & Kalev, A. 2015. Rage against the Iron Cage: The Varied Effects of
4 Bureaucratic Personnel Reforms on Diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 80(5):
5 1014–1044.
6
7
8 Doyle, G., Goldberg A., Srivastava, S. B., & Frank M. C. 2017. “Alignment at Work: Using
9 Language to Distinguish the Internalization and Self-Regulation Components of Cultural
10 Fit in Organizations.” In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for
11 Computational Linguistics*.
12
13 Ely, R. K. 1994. The Effects of Organizational Demographics and Social Identity on
14 Relationships among Professional Women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 203–238.
15
16 Erickson, B. H. 1996. Culture, Class, and Connections. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(1):
17 217–251.
18
19 Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. 1986. Black Students’ School Success: Coping with the ‘Burden of
20 ‘Acting White.’’ *The Urban Review* 18(3): 176–206.
21
22
23 Good, C., Rattan, A., & Dweck, C. S. 2012. Why Do Women Opt Out? Sense of Belonging and
24 Women’s Representation in Mathematics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
25 102(4): 700–717.
26
27 Ibarra, H. 1992. Homophily and Differential Returns: Sex Differences in Network Structure and
28 Access in an Advertising Firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(3): 422–447.
29
30 Ibarra, H. 1993. Personal Networks of Women and Minorities in Management: A Conceptual
31 Framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1): 56–87.
32
33 Kalev, A. 2009. Cracking the Glass Cages? Restructuring and Ascriptive Inequality at Work.
34 *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(6): 1591–1643.
35
36 Kalev, A., Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. 2006. Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy
37 of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71:
38 589–617.
39
40
41 Kinias, Z., & Sim, J. 2016. Facilitating Women’s Success in Business: Interrupting the Process
42 of Stereotype Threat Through Affirmation of Personal Values. *Journal of Applied
43 Psychology*, 101(11): 1585–1597.
44
45 Kizilec, R. F., Saltarelli, A. J., Reich, J., & Cohen, G. L. 2017. Closing Global Achievement
46 Gaps in MOOCS. *Science*, 355(6322): 251–252.
47
48 Kleinbaum, A. M., Stuart T. E., & Tushman, M. L. 2013. Discretion Within Constraint:
49 Homophily and Structure in a Formal Organization. *Organization Science*, 24(5):
50 1316–1336.
51
52
53 Leslie, S. J., Cimpian, A., Meyer, M., & Freeland, E. 2015. Expectations of Brilliance Underlie
54 Gender Distributions Across Academic Disciplines. *Science*, 347: 262–265.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lin, N. 2001. The Position Generator: Measurement Techniques for Investigations of Social
4 Capital. *Social Capital: Theory and Research*.
- 5
6 Logel, C., Walton, G. M., Spencer, S. J., Iserman, E. C., von Hippel, W., & Bell, A. E. 2009.
7 Interacting with Sexist Men Triggers Social Identity Threat Among Female Engineers.
8 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(6): 1089–1103.
- 9
10 Mehra, A., Kilduff, M., & Brass, D. J. 1998. At the Margins: A Distinctiveness Approach to the
11 Social Identity and Social Networks of Underrepresented Groups. *Academy of Management*
12 *Journal*, 41(4): 441–452.
- 13
14
15 Mize, T. D. 2019. Best Practices for Estimating, Interpreting, and Presenting Nonlinear
16 Interaction Effects. *Sociological Science*, 6: 81-117.
- 17
18 National Science Foundation. 2018. *Science and Engineering Indicators 2018*. Alexandria, VA:
19 National Science Foundation. (Retrieved February 26, 2018, from
20 <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsb20181/>).
- 21
22
23 O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. 1991. People and Organizational Culture: A
24 Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit. *Academy of*
25 *Management Journal*, 34(3): 487–516.
- 26
27 Reskin, B. F. 2000. The Proximate Causes of Employment Discrimination. *Contemporary*
28 *Sociology*, 29: 319–328.
- 29
30 Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. 2004. Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical
31 Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations. *Gender & Society*, 18(4): 510–531.
- 32
33 Rosenthal, R. 1979. The “File Drawer Problem” and Tolerance for Null Results. *Psychological*
34 *Bulletin*, 86(3): 638-641.
- 35
36 Schein, E. H. 2010. *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-
37 Bass.
- 38
39 Simonsohn, U. 2015. Small Telescopes: Detectability and the Evaluation of Replication Results.
40 *Psychological Science*, 26(5): 559–569.
- 41
42
43 Srivastava, S. B. 2015. Network Intervention: A Field Experiment to Assess the Effects of
44 Formal Mentoring on Workplace Networks. *Social Forces*, 94: 427–452.
- 45
46 Stephens, N. M., Fryberg, S. A., Markus, H. R., Johnson, C. S., & Covarrubias R. 2012. Unseen
47 Disadvantage: How American Universities’ Focus on Independence Undermines the
48 Academic Performance of First-Generation College Students. *Journal of Personality and*
49 *Social Psychology*, 102(6): 1178–1197.
- 50
51
52 Stephens, N. M., Hamedani, M. G., & Destin, M. 2014. Closing the social-class achievement
53 gap: A difference-education intervention improves first-generation students' academic
54 performance and all students' college transition. *Psychological Science*, 25(4): 943–953.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Turco, C. J. 2010. Cultural Foundations of Tokenism: Evidence from the Leveraged Buyout
4 Industry. *American Sociological Review*, 75(6): 894–913.
5
6 Walton, G. M. 2014. The New Science of Wise Psychological Interventions. *Current Direction*
7 *in Psychological Science*, 23: 73–82.
8
9 Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. 2007. A Question of Belonging: Race, Social Fit, and
10 Achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1): 82–96.
11
12 Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. 2011. A Brief Social-Belonging Intervention Improves
13 Academic and Health Outcomes of Minority Students. *Science*, 331: 1447–1451.
14
15 Walton, G. M., Logel, C., Peach, J. M., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. 2015. Two Brief
16 Interventions to Mitigate a ‘Chilly Climate’ Transform Women’s Experience, Relationships,
17 and Achievement in Engineering. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(2): 468–485.
18
19 Williams, D. A., & Wade-Golden, K. C. 2013. *The Chief Diversity Officer: Strategy, Structure,*
20 *and Change Management*. Sterling, VA; Stylus Publishing.
21
22 Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G. M. 2011. Social-Psychological Interventions in Education: They’re
23 Not Magic. *Review of Educational Research*. 81(2): 267–301.
24
25

26 ***
27

28 Sanaz Mobasseri (sanazm@bu.edu) is an Assistant Professor of Management & Organizations
29 and Sociology (by courtesy) at Boston University. Her research investigates race and gender
30 inequalities in organizations using field experimental and computational methods. She earned her
31 PhD at the University of California, Berkeley’s Haas School of Business.
32
33

34 Sameer B. Srivastava (srivastava@haas.berkeley.edu) is Associate Professor and Harold Furst
35 Chair in Management Philosophy and Values at UC Berkeley’s Haas School of Business. His
36 research unpacks the interrelationships between the culture of social groups, the cognition of
37 individuals in these groups, and the network ties they form. He co-directs the Berkeley-Stanford
38 Computational Culture Lab and the Berkeley Haas Culture Initiative.
39
40

41 Laura J. Kray (ljkray@berkeley.edu) is Professor and the Ned and Carol Spieker Chair in
42 Leadership at UC Berkeley’s Haas School of Business. Kray studies the effects of gender
43 stereotypes and mindsets on workplace behavior, including negotiations, leadership, and ethical
44 decision-making. Her work has been supported by the National Science Foundation and has been
45 recognized with multiple best research awards from the Academy of Management and the
46 International Association of Conflict Management.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60