00-CV-00301-DECL

A

Exhibit A

Expert Report – Eugene Borgida

Beck, et al. v. The Boeing Company, et al.

November 10, 2003

Background and Credentials

1. I was formally retained as a consultant and expert witness in *Beck et al. v. The Boeing Company., et al.* by the law firm McNaul, Ebel, Nawrot, Helgren & Vance on September 2, 2003. In this case, the plaintiffs claim to have been denied, based on their gender, competitive promotions (for non-management female employees), annual compensation adjustments for salaried women, and overtime opportunities. Plaintiffs are women who worked at Boeing's Puget Sound facilities at any time from February 25, 1997 to the present. Plaintiffs' counsel asked me to review case materials (see *Appendix A*) and to address the extent to which gender stereotyping may or may not play a role in understanding these claims. I was also asked to address whether women would likely be disadvantaged by various Boeing employment practices. My review of these materials in this report is only based on Boeing practices through 2000. I am being paid an hourly rate of $400 (applied to preparation, travel time, and court time) plus expenses for my professional services on this case. A list of other cases in which I have served as a litigation consultant or expert witness is attached to this report as *Appendix B*.

2. My fields of expertise within the social sciences include social psychology, psychology and law, and political psychology. I have a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in psychology with specialization in social psychology and psychology and law. I have been on the faculty of the University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) since 1976 where I am a Professor of Psychology and Law, and Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor of Psychology. I was appointed to the endowed Fesler-Lampert Chair in Urban and Regional Affairs for 2002-2003. I served as Chair of the Department of Psychology

from 1996 until July 1, 1999. I am also an Adjunct Professor of Political Science. Prior to serving as Department Chair, I served a three-year term as Associate Dean for Research and Planning in the University's College of Liberal Arts (1992-95). I currently serve as Co-Director of the University's Center for the Study of Political Psychology.

3. I have served as an editorial consultant in my fields of expertise for a number of peer-reviewed journals. From 1990-93, I served as Associate Editor of social psychology's premier research journal (section on Attitudes and Social Cognition) -- the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. I currently serve as Co-Editor of the journal Political Psychology. I have also served as a member of the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Science Advisory Panel for Social Psychology (serving from 1997-2000). During my service in these various editorial roles over the years I have routinely reviewed theoretical and empirical manuscripts and grant proposals involving gender stereotyping and prejudice.

4. With regard to other significant professional associations, I am an elected member of the Society for Experimental Social Psychology, an elected Fellow of the American Psychological Association (since 1990), and a Charter Member of the American Psychological Society (APS) since 1989. I have served as a nationally elected member-at-large of APS's Board of Directors (1999-2002), and on the Executive Committee of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (1998-2000). Finally, since 2000 (and through 2003), I serve on the Board of Directors of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), representing the American Psychological Association (APA).

5. I have conducted research on the nature and consequences of gender stereotyping and gender prejudice, as well as on other gender-related research questions (e.g., social perception of rape, legal reform of rape shield laws, rape trauma syndrome evidence, and sexual harassment) since the late 1970's. This research, which includes both survey and experimental investigations, has been published exclusively in peer-reviewed journals over the years.

6. In addition, I have published review articles and invited book chapters on gender stereotyping and other research questions related to gender. For example, I published one of the first quantitative meta-analyses of gender bias in the psychological literature (see Swim, Borgida, Maruyama, & Myers, 1989). In 1995, I co-edited a special (peer-reviewed) issue of the Journal of Social Issues with Dr. Susan Fiske (Princeton University), entitled: "Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment, and the law." Fiske and I also co-authored a chapter in 1999 entitled "Social framework analysis as expert testimony in sexual harassment suits" for S. Estreicher's edited volume, Sexual harassment in the workplace. In addition, I published in 2000 in Psychology, Public Policy, and Law a review and analysis of the research literature on descriptive and prescriptive stereotyping in sex discrimination (with Burgess). And, in 2002, along with Hunt, Kelly, and Burgess, I published a chapter on the scientific status of gender stereotyping in the West Publishing Co. case book, Modern scientific evidence: The law and science of expert testimony (edited by Faigman, Kaye, Saks, and Sanders).

A recent (October 2003) copy of my curriculum vita has been provided as *Appendix C*, attached to this report. The vita should be consulted for additional information on my educational background and credentials to proffer an expert opinion in this case. The vita lists all of my publications, including those over the past ten years, up to October 2003.

Summary of Expert Opinion

7. In general, my expert opinion in *Beck et al. v. The Boeing Company, et al.* is that the social scientific research literature on gender stereotyping and prejudice plays an important explanatory role in understanding how gender stereotypes affect pay and promotion and overtime practices at The Boeing Company, et al. More specifically, in this report, my opinion is reflected in the following ways:

a. that most people, consciously or unconsciously, harbor gender stereotypes.

b. that under various circumstances people make decisions based on gender stereotypes, whether or not they are aware that such generalizations about women can result in faulty judgments about specific individuals.

c. that men who work in male-dominated industries such as the aerospace and aircraft industry are likely to hold preconceived, stereotypic beliefs about the ability of women to perform tasks that are typically associated with males, such as performing jobs requiring mechanical or technical skills, and that these beliefs in turn would likely influence how they rate women for compensation and whether they would select them for overtime assignments.

d. in the absence of specific, accurate, and job relevant information about a female employee, a male manager at Boeing (like male managers more generally) would likely rate a *male higher than a female for compensation and promotion purposes*, even though both may be comparably performing employees.

e. relatedly, in Boeing's Salary Review Groups, when there is an absence of specific, accurate, and evidence of competent performance, there is an increased likelihood that gender stereotypes will bias managers' compensation decisions, as managers in this circumstance are more inclined to rely primarily on the opinions of fellow managers who are usually male.

f. that the gender stereotypic belief that women may not desire to work as much as men increases the likelihood that a male would not believe a woman would seek or want overtime work.

g. that males at Boeing, based on beliefs that women are poor negotiators or will not negotiate, that men need to support families or that women are reluctant and less willing than men to be confrontational about decisions affecting them, would be more likely (all other things being equal) to establish a lower salary for a woman than a man, and to provide her with fewer employment opportunities than those extended to the man.

Overview of Scientific Approach

8. This opinion reflects the application of a *social framework analysis*. This approach to expert scientific testimony represents a scientifically known and established approach to using social science evidence in litigation (see Fiske & Borgida, 1999; Hunt et al., 2002). It is an approach that has increasingly been accepted in the courts over the past decade or more in cases involving, for example, employment discrimination, eyewitness identification, and sexual victimization. A social framework analysis uses general conclusions from tested, reliable, and peer-reviewed social science research and applies them to the case at hand. It provides an assessment of general causation in a research area in order to inform fact finders about more specific causation issues associated with a particular case. This approach has been written about most extensively by legal scholars Monahan and Walker who have discussed the social framework approach in their law review writings (e.g., Monahan & Walker, 1986; Monahan & Walker, 1991; Walker & Monahan, 1987; Walker & Monahan, 1988), in their legal casebook, now in its fourth edition (Monahan & Walker, 1998), and in relation to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 113 S.Ct. 2786 (1993) (see Monahan & Walker, 1994; Walker & Monahan, 1996). Monahan and Walker are not the only legal or social science scholars who have written on the use of social framework testimony (see Fiske & Borgida, 1999; Goodman, 1993; Goodman & Croyle, 1989; Mosteller, 1989; Tomkins & Pfeifer, 1992; Tomkins & Cecil, 1994; Vidmar & Schuller, 1989; Wiener, 1995). Moreover, some of the scholarship on social framework testimony has been published in peer-reviewed social and behavioral science journals, as well as in law reviews and legal journals.

9. In the previous cases in which I have been deposed and in which I testified as an expert witness, the court has admitted and I have provided such social framework testimony. In each instance, I drew on my knowledge of social psychology and the established, peer-reviewed scientific research literature on gender stereotyping and gender prejudice,

including my own contributions to this body of social scientific knowledge, to review the set of case documents provided to me for review by plaintiffs' or defense counsel. And in each instance I used specific examples drawn from the case materials to illustrate and highlight the pertinent scientific conclusions drawn from social scientific research literature. This is de facto the approach taken in the American Psychological Association's *amicus curiae* brief submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court in *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins* (1989). I was a member of the *amicus* team assembled by the American Psychological Association to draft that brief (see Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, & Heilman, 1991). This social framework use of social science evidence has generally served to educate fact finders about the conditions under which gender stereotypes and gender prejudice are likely to influence impressions, evaluations, and behavior in social and organizational settings. A considerable body of theory and research in psychology and other social sciences on the nature and consequences of gender stereotyping has accumulated over the past several decades (for general reviews of the scientific literature in psychology, see Ashmore & Del Boca, 1981; Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Deaux, 1995; Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; Deaux & Major, 1987; Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Fiske, et al., 1991; Heilman, 2001; Swann, Langlois, & Gilbert, 1999). In *Robinson v. Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc.* [760 F. Supp. 1486 (M.D. Fla 1991)] and in *Jenson et al. v. Eveleth Taconite Co,* [824 F. Supp. 847 (D. Minn. 1993)], moreover, the judicial opinions concluded that the social framework testimony on gender stereotyping based on this voluminous research literature provided a "sound, credible theoretical framework" for thinking about gender stereotyping and the ways in which stereotyping *consciously and nonconsciously* played a role in these cases (see Fiske & Stevens, 1993, for a discussion of social framework testimony in *Robinson v. Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc.*).

Research on Gender Stereotypes and Gender Prejudice

10. Experimental and non-experimental research, conducted by different investigators from different areas in psychology and in the social sciences, using a variety of scientific methodologies and involving diverse participant or subject populations studied in naturalistic and laboratory settings, has provided the foundation for social framework testimony on gender stereotyping and prejudice. In their literature review, Fiske, et al. (1991) showed that gender stereotyping is more or less likely under certain conditions. Not all of these conditions have to be present in any given application of social framework testimony, and other antecedents and consequences of gender stereotyping continue to be researched as well (Fiske & Borgida, 1999). The evidence reviewed by Fiske, et al. specifically found that gender stereotypes are more likely to be mentally activated and to affect perceptions, evaluations, and/or behavior when (1) the target person is isolated or only one of a few individuals in an otherwise homogeneous environment (e.g., Sackett, et al., 1991); (2) members of a previously excluded group move into an occupation that is nontraditional for their group, as when women move into occupational positions traditionally dominated by men (e.g., Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992); (3) the workplace is a sexualized environment in which sexual repartee and inappropriate sexualized behavior on the part of men toward women is tolerated if not commonplace (e.g., Rudman & Borgida, 1995); and (4) the mix of individuating information available about target individuals who are being judged and evaluated is ambiguous (e.g., Borgida, Rudman, & Manteufel, 1995; Swim, 1993) or the evaluative criteria used in performance appraisals are vulnerable to subjectivity and discretion on the part of decision makers (Arvey & Murphy, 1998; Bernardin, et al., 1995; Milkovich & Wigdor, 1991). Various organizational remedies for monitoring and reducing the effects of stereotyping were also identified (Fiske, et al., 1991). Decision makers, for example, are less likely to use gender stereotypes when they have adequate information, when they

have ample time to make judgments, and when they are held accountable for their decisions (e.g., when they are motivated or incented to be accurate in their appraisals).

The Nature of Gender Stereotypes

11. Stereotypes are "a set of attributes ascribed to a group and imputed to its individual members simply because they belong to that group" (Heilman, 1983, p.271). Stereotypes are formed from the normal cognitive processes of categorization and generalization, and, as such, they influence how people think about each other in everyday life. Because stereotypes, as defined, are overgeneralizations about groups, they can be misapplied when making judgments about specific individuals which can result in faulty judgments and discriminatory treatment. One of the distinguishing characteristics of gender stereotypes, relative to other group-based stereotypes, is that gender stereotypes have both descriptive and prescriptive components (Hunt, Borgida, Kelly, & Burgess, 2002). In fact, this distinction between the descriptive and prescriptive components of gender stereotypes is long-standing in the research literature (see Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Deaux, 1995; Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; Eagly, 1987; Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, & Heilman, 1991; Heilman, 2001). Heilman (2001) more recently has argued that understanding this distinction is also crucial to the claim that "gender stereotypes and the biased evaluations they produce inhibit women from progressing upward to the top of organizations..." (p.658).

12. The *descriptive component* of gender stereotypes refers to specific beliefs about the attributes and characteristics of men and women, whereas the *prescriptive component* is the basis for expectations for appropriate behavior for men and women. Both men and women may be "sanctioned and disliked" when they spurn traditional gender role prescriptions (Fiske, 1998, p.378). Indeed, some researchers have argued that gender stereotypes may contain an especially strong prescriptive component, compared to other social stereotypes (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Fiske, 1998; Fiske & Stevens, 1993; Heilman, 2001). Men are expected to display masculine behaviors, and women are

expected to engage in feminine behaviors. For example, research on the effects of gender stereotypes on hiring decisions suggests that women who are seeking stereotypical masculine jobs (e.g., jobs requiring physical strength or managerial responsibilities) should try to show employers that they have stereotypically masculine characteristics (i.e., that they are as physically capable, assertive, and generally as agentic as their male counterparts). However, recent research suggests a *backlash effect* in which these agentic women are penalized for violating the prescriptive stereotype that women should be communal (Rudman, 1998; Rudman & Glick, 1999; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Because women are expected to be rather submissive and nice, the social skills of agentic women are evaluated more harshly. As a result, agentic women are less likely than equally agentic men to be hired for "feminized" managerial jobs (i.e., managerial jobs requiring social skills; Rudman & Glick, 1999). Women applying for more masculine jobs therefore find themselves in a bind with important career implications (Hunt, et al., 2002). To be seen as competent, they must portray themselves as agentic, yet to be seen as interpersonally attuned and socially skilled, they cannot portray themselves as agentic. That is, less favorable reactions will be directed toward women's assertive and competent behavior unless "interpersonally facilitative behaviors consistent with the gender role" like nonverbal warmth are also present (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p.585).

In addition, research has shown that gender stereotypes may continue to affect employment decisions even after a person has been hired. Larwood, et al. (1988) demonstrated that gender stereotypes affect decisions about job assignments, with male employees being more likely than female employees to be chosen for important assignments unless there is a clear "signal" that assigning the task to a woman would be beneficial. These findings imply that stereotypes about women's work abilities may be perpetuated because women are not given ample opportunities to demonstrate their skills in important work contexts.

13. In general, research (e.g., Diekman & Eagly, 2000) indicates that people still believe

that men are agentic or achievement-oriented (e.g., independent, competent, active, and competitive) and women are communal or affiliation-oriented (e.g., nurturing, dependent, passive, non-competitive). There is some overlap between these descriptive and prescriptive components of gender stereotypes, though the extent of overlap is difficult to ascertain with precision (Burgess & Borgida, 1999). However, behavior that is prescribed, as noted by any number of researchers, *is* typically related to the characteristics that are positively valued for each sex. For example, the communal traits for which women are positively valued are also central to their "shoulds" (Heilman, 2001). But the communal stereotype associated with women can undermine perceptions of their competence within the workplace. People tend to believe that there is little variability within members of a group (e.g., women are seen as more similar to other women and men tend to be similar to other men). This psychological process associated with stereotyping in turn makes it more difficult for people to notice and use pertinent individuating information, such as a particular man or woman's job-related skills.

14. Other recent research has challenged the conclusion that the attributes *stereotypically* ascribed to men are considered more positive than those *stereotypically* ascribed to women. Eagly and her colleagues (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Eagly & Mladinic, 1994; Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1991) found a strong positive bias toward women which they labelled the "women are wonderful" effect. Both male and female respondents in the research rated women more favorably than men on general attitude measures, and the stereotypical attributes associated with women were evaluated more positively than the stereotypical attributes associated with men. However, there is an important qualification to this "women are wonderful" effect. Eagly and colleagues (e.g., Eagly & Mladinic, 1994) found that people evaluate women more positively than men largely because the positive characteristics associated with a communal orientation are assigned to women much more frequently than to men. In other words, people typically evaluate women positively because they are thinking about them in traditional ways (e.g., as nurturer). By

contrast, men are associated with agentic characteristics that, although less favorably evaluated, are associated with success in the world of paid employment. As a result, women are viewed as nice but incompetent, and men are seen as less nice but competent. 15. Several studies have also shown that the agentic gender stereotype (e.g., traits like independent, ambitious, competitive) associated with men is more closely related to people's expectations for certain occupations than is the communal gender stereotype (e.g., traits like nurturing, helpful, warm, deferential) associated with women (e.g., Glick, 1991). For example, research by Heilman and her colleagues (e.g., Heilman, et al., 1989; Heilman, 1995) suggests that the characteristics associated with women are not the same as the characteristics associated with successful managers. Heilman, et al. (1989) conducted a survey in which 268 managers rated numerous characteristics of "successful managers," "men in general," "women in general," "men managers," "women managers," "successful men managers," and "successful women managers." They found a strong positive correlation between the ratings of "men in general" and "successful managers." However, the characteristics of "women in general" and "successful managers" were unrelated. The correlation between ratings of women and "successful managers" increased when the women were described as managers or successful managers. Still, those correlations were significantly smaller than the corresponding correlations between men and "successful managers." Moreover, women described as managers or successful managers were increasingly likely to receive negative, hostile ratings on interpersonal skills (e.g., they were considered more devious, bitter, and quarrelsome) and rated as less rational (e.g., less logical, objective, and less able to separate emotions from ideas) than successful male managers (Heilman, Block, & Martell, 1995). These negative ratings of women have adverse implications for compensation decisions about women in managerial roles.

Heilman (1983) proposed a more general lack-of-fit model that she has tested over the years to account for such findings. In this framework, male-dominated jobs, like

some of those found in the aerospace industry, become associated with masculine characteristics (e.g., masculine skills, technical ability, personality attributes). Those characteristics eventually are seen as predictors of success in those occupations. Thus, gender stereotypes about women come into conflict with beliefs about important employee characteristics, leading employees to believe that women are unqualified for or less likely to succeed at stereotypically masculine occupations. This lack-of-fit model therefore predicts that gender stereotypes lead to an increased likelihood of hiring men, especially for traditionally masculine jobs (see, e.g., Davison & Burke, 2000, for findings in support of these predictions).

16. For women, certain deviations from the traditional female role are more heavily sanctioned than others. In a recent analysis, Eagly and Karau (2002) present a broader, more integrative role theory of gender prejudice that is supported by previous meta-analytic findings and other research in the field. In general, Eagly and Karau suggest that gender prejudice is a function of the incongruity that people perceive between characteristics of women and the requirements of occupational roles. For example, "Prejudice can arise when perceivers judge women as actual or potential occupants of leader roles because of inconsistency between the predominantly communal qualities that perceivers associate with women and the predominantly agentic qualities they believe are required to succeed as a leader. People thus tend to have dissimilar beliefs about leaders and women and similar beliefs about leaders and men" (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p.575). Prejudice, as defined in this way, is consistent with the way in which other stereotyping researchers define prejudice, as "a negative evaluation of a social group or a negative evaluation of an individual that is significantly based on the individual's group membership" (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003, p.414; see also Fiske, 1998).

17. More recently, Hunt, Borgida, Kelly, and Burgess (2002) provided an updated review of the scientific status of research on gender stereotyping since *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins* and the publication of Fiske, et al. (1991). Several areas of general scientific

consensus emerged from this analysis. First, there is general agreement about the *content* of gender stereotypes (e.g., communal attributes, agentic attributes) as well as the existence of various subcategories of women (e.g., "career women," "feminists," or "housewives"). Second, gender stereotypes have small to modest but consistent effects on judgments of women and men (including in the context of employment decisions), particularly when men and women behave in stereotype-*inconsistent* ways (i.e., when women are confrontational and assertive, and not passive, submissive, and relational, they are more likely to be seen as "gender nonconformists" by men and even by other women, see Heilman, 2001; Rudman & Glick, 2001). Third, gender stereotypes are more likely to be used in certain circumstances, such as when gender is salient (i.e., few women in a particular workforce or organization) and when decision makers are not motivated to make accurate judgments. Finally, Hunt, et al. concluded that there also was general agreement about certain psychological processes associated with gender stereotyping: that people automatically categorize others according to their memberships in social groups; that gender is a fundamental dimension of categorization; that categorization can lead to stereotype activation, of which individuals may be unaware (e.g., Bargh, 1999; Bargh, et al. 1995; Bargh, et al., 1996; Blair, 2002; Devine, 1989; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995); and that certain individual differences can influence the use of gender stereotypes (see, e.g., Dobbins, Cardy, & Truxillo, 1988; Glick & Fiske, 1996, 2001; Kawakami, Dion, & Dovidio, 1998). It is also the case that the strength of learned associations (e.g., Kawakami, Dovidio, Moll, Hermsen, & Russin, 2000) and different goals (e.g., knowledge or self-enhancement goals) can influence the activation and application of stereotypes when judging individuals (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Kunda & Spencer, 2003).

Illustrating How Stereotypes Affect Pay and Promotion Practices at Boeing

18. These areas of general scientific agreement from the research literature on gender stereotypes (Hunt et al., 2002), in conjunction with the various conditions previously

reviewed in Fiske, et al. (1991), provide a basis for examining the claims about adverse employment decisions at Boeing's Puget Sound facilities. The content of gender stereotypes, the consequences of not meeting prescriptive expectations, and the problematic role of subjectivity in making employment decisions, for example, are all themes that can be illustrated with case material from *Beck et al. v. The Boeing Company, et al.*.

19. First, there is good consensus in the research literature on gender stereotypes about the *content* of stereotypes (e.g., women, on average, are seen as having more communal attributes than men, and men, on average, are seen as having more agentic qualities than women). These stereotypic beliefs reflect what people believe women are like and what they are capable of and well-suited for, and these beliefs are rather pervasively held in our culture. Based on the case materials that I have reviewed to date, it is my opinion that the Boeing work environment is not immune to the presence and influence of such stereotypic beliefs and attitudes. In Cascio's declaration (in support of plaintiffs' motion for class certification), for example, he discusses in depth the organizational culture at Boeing, Boeing's compensation policies and practices, their performance review processes, promotion policies, the EEO complaint process, Boeing's monitoring of promotion and performance practices, and their compensation and performance record. On the basis of this extensive review, he suggests that, taken together, these policies and practices are "hostile to gender-related issues" (p.36). I share that assessment. In reviewing the focus group findings on corporate culture at Boeing, reported by R. Thomas Consulting, and their Cultural Assessment report conducted on behalf of Boeing, for example, Cascio concluded that "traditional stereotypes of women are prevalent" at Boeing (p.56).

20. Boeing, it seems to me, acknowledged the need for corporate culture change to counteract these longstanding traditional attitudes and values about women in the workplace (see, e.g., RTC736: "Women have to work harder, they perceive that they are

subject to more intense scrutiny"), by investing in efforts to more effectively manage diversity issues via their hiring of R. Thomas Consulting to conduct diversity workshops (see, e.g., Plaintiffs' Exhibits 30-31, RTC729-737). There are other examples of gender stereotypic beliefs in the case materials I reviewed consistent with those that turned up in the Cultural Assessment. "Women are poorer negotiators of their starting salaries than men" was one such belief offered as account for why there was such a robust salary disparity between men and women. Given the gender stereotype that women are more communal, less confrontational, and more deferential than men, it follows that women would be seen as deficient in their negotiating skills and less willing to advocate forcefully for their starting salaries or during the annual salary review process (unlike their male counterparts). In fact, Boeing does not dispute starting salaries for women at Boeing are less than the starting salaries for men. And, historically, the salaries of female employees never really caught up with the men. If women are seen by male managers as poor salary negotiators, then male managers might even believe that it is appropriate to lowball the annual salary adjustments of female employees which would be to the advantage of other male employees. This dynamic could be compounded by the activation of another gender stereotypic belief, that "men not women are the real family breadwinners" and that therefore they need higher starting salaries and more favorable annual adjustments. Again, Siskin's analyses are consistent with this dynamic.

21. Similarly, assumptions about who – men or women – is in greater need of overtime hours are also present in the case materials I reviewed (see, e.g., declaration of Michael P. Ward). Male managers making decisions about who should be given overtime would be inclined to favor other men for these opportunities based on these traditional beliefs about women. Especially in male-dominated occupational arenas, such as the positions covered by the IAM, men would prefer to share overtime hours with their male colleagues and to spend more time networking in "brotherhood." Again, Siskin's analyses support this hypothesis in that they demonstrate that women are systematically awarded less overtime

than men.

22. The declarations I read from salaried and hourly female employees across a spectrum of jobs at Boeing's Puget Sound facilities are also consistent with the activation and application of gender stereotypes in the Boeing work environment. They were replete with claims: about unequal pay, about the denial of training opportunities that could have enhanced chances for subsequent promotions, about sexualized workplaces that made the working environment less safe for female workers, about the subjectivity of managerial decision making about pay, promotion, training, and overtime, about overtime opportunities that disproportionately went to male colleagues, and about the repeated failures of female employees to secure available promotional opportunities. Although these claims are anecdotal, concerns about annual salary adjustments, competitive promotions, and overtime opportunities are also supported by Siskin's aggregate-level statistical analyses. For example, pay disparities were found between men and women even when salary adjustments to address disparities were taken into consideration. In B. Siskin's declaration, he reports that female managers consistently earn less than similarly situated male managers and that the statistical significance of this disparity remained after the Year 2000 salary adjustments (pp.17-18). Statistically significant disparities also were obtained for hourly overtime analyses (p.30; see also TBC01200890). Boeing's own Human Resources managers and experts have acknowledged the pattern of disparities between men and women in Boeing's promotion and pay practices. In her declaration, Marcella Fleming, Director of Employee Relations, Company Offices, for example, devoted considerable attention to defending Boeing's efforts to *improve* pay and promotion policies in light of observed compensation data showing pay disparities between men and women, and to putting into perspective many of the organizational difficulties, including compensation practices, that Boeing experienced after it acquired Rockwell and McDonnell Douglas. Similarly, Leonard Bierman's declaration (e.g., section 36) acknowledges the *existence* of various compensation efforts in the mid- and

late- 1990's that Boeing voluntarily made to adjust for salary disparities between men and women (engineers and technicians within SPEEA, non-managerial, non-represented employees, and for managers).

23. A second area of general consensus in the research literature on gender stereotypes is that gender stereotypes affect judgments of women, including employment decisions. When women work in occupations that are typically associated with men, they will behave in stereotype-inconsistent ways in order to try to succeed in these roles and to "fit into" the corporate culture. The Cultural Assessment reports conducted for Boeing by R. Thomas Consulting discussed the "inadequate inclusion of women and minorities at the top" (1998, RTC 985) and discussed themes like "*Fitting in, collaborating is important to advancement*" which emphasized the importance to Boeing employees of being "team players" ("In order to advance you need to be a 'team player.' For executives, being a team player means seek collaboration. For employees at all other organizational levels, it seems to imply 'don't rock the boat.' At the executive levels, there was admission that being a 'team player' could also mean 'fit in,' collaborate and also be similar and predictable." TBC 01179861). Being in the Boeing "family" in this sense means behaving in ways that fit in and get along with others. But if women are perceived as behaving in stereotype-inconsistent ways, then they can be tagged as gender non-conformists and "troublemakers" and be more vulnerable to negative evaluations and decisions. Such prescriptive gender stereotype "violations" are typically responded to in negative and punitive ways (see Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Heilman, 2001). For example, some of the women whose declarations raised concerns about sexualized work environments were working in male-dominated job areas. Complaining about sexual harassment, or discrimination, or salary disparities, are not seen by male managers as a "team" behavior in that filing a complaint involves an action against another or other team members. As Cascio discussed in his report, the EEO process at Boeing that should be addressing these issues did not serve these women well (see pp.18-19). Concerns

about biased or botched investigations, and reports of retaliation reflect the kind of "punishments" that are associated with being a woman in a job that requires masculine or stereotype-inconsistent characteristics.

24. Finally, a third area of general consensus in the research literature on gender stereotypes involves the extent to which pay and promotion practices are vulnerable to gender stereotypes when there is subjectivity and discretion on the part of decision makers. In Cascio's declaration, for example, he discusses the organizational culture at Boeing. He emphasizes the extent to which *subjectivity* is unchecked and ineffectively monitored. The concern about unchecked subjectivity is not a concern about the use of subjective performance evaluation measures which are standard in the field (see Arvey & Murphy, 1998; Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1998; Milkovich & Wigdor, 1991). This perception of unchecked subjectivity and discretion associated with Boeing's compensation practices does not appear to be unique to a plaintiffs' expert, either. Boeing recognized the need to control "subjectivity and discretion" as they affect compensation practices but suggested that they had accomplished this goal with the performance assessment system in place (see p.19, *Defendants' memorandum in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification*; also see declarations of Janders, Kundiger, Evans, and Glass). In his declaration opposing plaintiffs' motion for class certification, J. Janders refers to Boeing's salary-setting philosophy as a decentralized one of "controlled discretion" that ceded all compensation decisions to managers at the local level, who then had the discretion and "latitude" to use general compensation policy and salary planning guidelines. How this approach controls or checks "improper bias" is unclear. While Boeing states that it will not tolerate "improper bias" in its compensation practices (e.g., TBC01235805, "Boeing does not tolerate improper bias in compensation. Consequently, Boeing routinely monitors PAE review plans."), historically, there does not appear to be any discussion that informs decision makers about how to identify "improper bias" or how to counteract it when such bias is known. There is no discussion, for example, about

the nature of gender stereotypes and how they might influence compensation or other employment decisions (undermining the stated emphasis on job-relevant qualifications) that managers are asked to render. An OFCCP audit of MDC in 1997 (p.) advocated training managers to avoid bias, though few specifics were given (TBC01623361). Without appropriate checks on and controls for "improper bias," for example, a male manager evaluating an otherwise qualified female employee would be more likely to devalue her contributions. This adverse evaluation would be more likely to surface on those *PAE Review* performance criteria (see TBC 000007084 & TBC 000007085) that are more vulnerable to gender stereotyping and beliefs that women are on average less capable than men [e.g., Problem Solving (Judgment), Leadership (Initiative), Technical Skills and Knowledge, Quality and Productivity, and Enhancing Shareholder Value (Business Knowledge)].

Thus, consistent with research on the conditions under which gender stereotypes are more likely to influence judgments and evaluations, the extent of unchecked subjectivity and discretion documented at Boeing highlights a decisional context that is ripe for the activation and application of gender stereotypes, especially in light of the overwhelmingly male managerial group making decisions about individual female employees. Equally significant, from my perspective, is the inadequate guidance provided to managers when evaluating employee performance. This lack of effective monitoring of employment decisions about female employees makes it even more likely that decisions about pay and promotions at Boeing will be influenced by gender stereotypes. Salary review groups, in this regard, do not historically insure effective guidance and oversight. In fact, their operation strikes me as another example of unchecked subjectivity and discretion. There do not appear to be common, objective, or written performance criteria for these often large groups to use when making decisions about individual employees, and decisions about individual female employees remain vulnerable to the subjectivity of this decisional context. Cascio, in his declaration, makes

a very similar point about unmonitored subjectivity: "Since interviews, by their very nature, have components that are subjective, the failure to guide and circumscribe this discretion to ensure a uniform, valid approach to interviews interjects substantial and inevitable bias into the selection process" (p.11).

25. In summary, research on gender stereotyping represents an informative basis for examining the extent to which gender stereotypes play a role in understanding the plaintiffs' claims about salary decisions, overtime, and competitive promotions at Boeing.

References

Arvey, R., & Murphy, K. (1998). Personnel evaluation in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 141-168.

Ashmore, R.D., & Del Boca, F.K. (1981). Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping. In D.L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 1-35). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bargh, J.A. (1999). The cognitive monster: The case against the controllabililty of automatic stereotype effects. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp.361-382). New York: Guilford Press.

Bargh, J.A., Chen, M., & Burrows, L. (1996). Automaticity of social behavior: Direct effects of trait construct and stereotype activation on action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 230-244.

Bargh, J.A., Raymond, P., Pryor, J., & Strack, F. (1995). The attractiveness of the underling: An automatic power-sex association and its consequences for sexual harassment and aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 768-781.

Bernardin, H.J., Hennessey, H.W. Jr., & Peyrefitte, J. (1995). Age, racial, and gender bias as a function of criterion specificity: A test of expert testimony. *Human Resource Management Review, 5*, 63-77.

Blair, I.V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, 242-261.

Borgida, E. & Fiske, S.T. (eds.) (1995). Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment, and the law. *Journal of Social Issues, 51(1)*.

Borgida, E., Rudman, L.A., & Manteufel, L.L. (1995). On the courtroom use and misuse of gender stereotyping research. In E. Borgida & S.T. Fiske (Eds.), Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment and the law. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 181-192.

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5, 1-28.

Campion, M.A., Palmer, D.K., & Campion, J.E. (1998). Structuring employment interviews to improve reliability, validity, and users' reactions. *Current directions in psychological science*. 7(3), 77-82.

Crandall, C.S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129(3)*, 414-446.

Davison, H.K., & Burke, M.J. (2000). Sex discrimination in simulated employment contexts: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*, 225-248.

Deaux, K. (1995). How basic can you be? The evolution of research on gender stereotypes. Journal of Social Issues, 51(1), 11-20.

Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In Gilbert, Fiske, & Lindzey (eds.), *The Handbook of social psychology, 4th Edition (788-827)*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. *Psychological Review, 94*, 369-389.

Devine, P.G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5-18.

Diekman, A.B., & Eagly, A.H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 1171-1188.

Dobbins, G.H., Cardy, R.L. & Truxillo, D.M. (1988). The effects of purpose of appraisal and individual differences in stereotypes of women on sex differences in performance ratings: A laboratory and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 551-558.

Eagly, A.H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eagly, A.H., & Karau, S.J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109 (3),* 573-598.

Eagly, A.H., Karau, S.J., & Makhijani, M.G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 125-145.

Eagly, A.H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15,* 543-558.

Eagly, A.H., & Mladinic, A. (1994). Are people prejudiced against women? Some answers from research on attitudes, gender stereotypes, and judgments of competence. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp.1-35). New York: Wiley.

Eagly, A.H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than men? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15,* 203-216.

Eagly, A., Makhijani, M., & Klonsky, B. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111,* 3-22.

Fein, S., & Spencer, S.J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73,* 31-44.

Fiske, S.T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp.357-414). New York: McGraw Hill.

Fiske, S.T., & Borgida, E. (1999). *Social framework analysis as expert testimony in sexual harassment suits.* In S. Estreicher (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace: Proceedings of New York University 51st Annual Conference on Labor.* (575-583). Boston: Kluwer Law International.

Fiske, S.T., Bersoff, D.N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M.E. (1991). Social science research on trial: The use of sex stereotyping research in *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. American Psychologist, 46,* 1049-1060.

Fiske, S.T., & Stevens, L.E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 173-196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Gaertner, S., & Dovidio, J.F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp.61-89). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Glick, P. (1991). Trait-based and sex-based discrimination in occupational prestige, occupational salary, and hiring. *Sex Roles, 25,* 351-378.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 491-512.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56(2),* 109-118.

Goodman, J. (1993). Evaluating psychological expertise on questions of social fact. *Law and Human Behavior, 17(2),* 249-255.

Goodman, J., & Croyle, R.T. (1989). Social framework testimony in employment discrimination cases. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 7, 227-241.

Greenwald, A.G., & Banaji, M.R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102*, 4-27.

Heilman, M.E. (1983). Sex bias in work settings: The lack of fit model. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 5*, 269-298.

Heilman, M.E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10(6)*, 3-26.

Heilman, M.E., Block, C.J., & Martell, R.F. (1995). Sex stereotypes: Do they influence perceptions of managers? *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10(6)*, 237-252.

Heilman, M.E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57 (4)*, 657-674.

Heilman, M.E., Block, C.J., Martell, R.F., & Simon, M.C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 935-942.

Hunt, J.S., Borgida, E., Kelly, K.M., & Burgess, D. (2002). Gender stereotyping: Scientific status. In D.L. Faigman, D.H. Kaye, M.J. Saks, & J. Sanders (Eds.), Modern scientific evidence: The law and science of expert testimony, Volume 2. (pp. 384-426). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.

Kawakami, K., Dion, K. & Dovidio, J.F. (1998). Racial prejudice and stereotype activation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 407-416.

Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J.F., Moll, J., Hermsen, S., & Russin, A. (2000). Just say no (to stereotyping): Effects of training in the negation of stereotype associations on stereotype activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 871-888.

Kunda, Z., & Spencer, S.J. (2003). When do stereotypes come to mind and when do they color judgment? A goal-based theoretical framework for stereotype activation and application. *Psychological Bulletin, 129(4),* 522-544.

Larwood, L., Szwajkowski, E., & Rose, S. (1988). Sex and race discrimination resulting from manager-client relationships: Applying the rational bias theory of managerial discrimination. *Sex Roles, 18,* 9-29.

Milkovich, G.T., & Wigdor, A.K. (1991). *Pay for performance*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Monahan, J., & Walker, L. (1986). Social authority: Obtaining, evaluating, and establishing social science in law. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 134(3),* 477-517.

Monahan, J., & Walker, L. (1991). Judicial use of social science research. *Law and Human Behavior,* 15 (6), 571-584.

Monahan, J., & Walker, L. (1998). *Social science in law: Cases and materials.* Fourth Edition. Westbury, NY: The Foundation Press.

Monahan, J., & Walker, L. (1994). Judicial use of social science research after Daubert. *Shepard's expert and scientific evidence quarterly, 2 (2),* 327-342.

Mosteller, R.P. (1989). Legal doctrines governing the admissibility of expert testimony concerning social framework evidence. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 52,* 85-132.

Rudman, L.A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counter-stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 629-645.

Rudman, L.A. & Borgida, E. (1995). The afterglow of construct accessibility: The behavioral consequences of priming men to view women as sexual objects. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31, 493-517.

Rudman, L.A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle-managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 1004-1010.

Rudman, L.A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. Journal of Social Issues, *57 (4),* 743-763.

Sackett, P.R., DuBois, C.L., & Noe, A.W. (1991). Tokenism in performance evaluations: The effects of work group representation on male-female and White-Black differences in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 263-267.

Swann, W.B. Jr., Langlois, J.H., & Gilbert, L.A. (Eds.) (1999). *Sexism and stereotypes in modern society.* Washington, D.C.: APA Science Volumes.

Swim, J. (1993). In search of gender bias in evaluations and trait inferences: The role of diagnosticity and gender stereotypicality of behavioral information. *Sex Roles, 29,* 213-237.

Swim, J., Borgida, E., Maruyama, G., & Myers, D.G. (1989). Joan McKay and John McKay: Do gender stereotypes bias evaluations? *Psychological Bulletin, 105,* 409-429.

Tomkins, A.J., & Pfeifer, J.E. (1992). Modern social scientific theories and data concerning discrimination: Implications for using social science evidence in the courts. In D.K. Kagehiro & W.S. Laufer (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and law* (2nd ed., pp.385-407). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tomkins, A.J., & Cecil, J.S. (1994). Treating social science like law: An assessment of Monahan and Walker's social authority proposal. *Shepard's expert and scientific evidence quarterly, 2(2),* 343-387.

Vidmar, N.J., & Schuller, R.A. (1989). Juries and expert evidence: Social framework testimony. *Law and Contemporary Problems, 52,* 133-176.

Walker, L., & Monahan, J. (1987). Social frameworks: A new use of social science in law. *Virginia Law Review, 73,* 559-598.

Walker, L., & Monahan, J. (1988). Social facts: Scientific methodology as legal precedent. *California Law Review,* 76, 877-896.

Walker, L., & Monahan, J. (1996). Daubert and the Reference Manual: An essay on the future of science in law. *Virginia Law Review.*

Wiener, R.L. (1995). Social analytic jurisprudence in sexual harassment litigation: The role of social framework and social fact. *Journal of Social Issues, 51,* 167-180.

This report is based on documents that I have had the opportunity to review as of November 10, 2003. I also expect to continue to review additional materials as they become available.

Date 11/10/03 Signature Eugene Borgida

Appendix A: Case Material Reviewed to Date by Dr. Eugene Borgida

•Case material downloaded from McNaul, Ebel, Nawrot, Helgren & Vance website (http://www.mcnaul.com/):

Beck et al. v. The Boeing Company et al. First amended class action complaint.

Beck et al. v. The Boeing Company et al. Order on motions (1) to stay discovery and (2) for clarification of certification order. Dec. 21, 2001.

Beck et al. v. The Boeing Company et al. Opinion from the U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, Feb. 25, 2003.

Beck et al. v. The Boeing Company et al. Order on motion for class certification. Oct. 18, 2001.

•Case material mailed by McNaul, Ebel, Nawrot, Helgren & Vance:

Plaintiffs' motion for class certification.
Corrected plaintiffs' memorandum in support of class certification motion.
Corrected declaration of Christine Webber in support of class certification motion.
Exhibits submitted in support of motion for class certification (Ex. Nos. 1-89)
Declaration of Bernard R. Siskin
Declaration of Wayne Cascio in support of plaintiffs' motion for class certification
Declarations in support of class certification from:

- Elizabeth Anderson
- Patti Anderson
- Mary F. Beck
- Faith Bridgewater
- Sue Brundage
- Elaine Capulli
- Karla Carpenter
- Charlene Chapman
- Kim Clift
- Karla Coleman
- Diana Cook
- Mary Dean
- Teodosia Grosz
- Sharon Hoffbuhr
- Nena Holder
- Renee Jarvi
- Emma Jean Jones
- Wendy Kelly
- Sheryl Landon
- Aprill Linear
- Verlene Maholmes

Martha McFerren
Pamela Meeks
Evalean Moore
Fern Neatherlin
Terri Neuharth
Lorraine Ogden
Cheryl Lee Persinger
Sonya Phillips
Terri Phillips
Beneva Rimson
Ruby Ryherd
Sheilah Sage
Ellen Schaff
Shelley Sinclair
Esther Gramza Thiry
Rose Turner
Terri Wertz
Madonna Whittaker
Sandy Wilcynski
Linda Wilkerson
Angela Zasaretti-Smith

Defendants' memorandum in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification.

Declarations in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification:
Maureen O'Neill
Marcella R. Fleming
Tracey A. Quinn
Leonard J. Biermann
Malcolm K. Case
Cynthia Evans
William Gibbs
Steven J. Kundinger
Cindy Jorgensen
Jeffrey Janders

Overtime Appendix in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification and exhibits O-2, O-3, 0-4.

Promotions Appendix in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification and exhibits P-1, P-7, P-8, P-9, P-10, P-11, P-12, P-13, P-14, P-15, P-16, P-17, P-18, P-19.

EEO/Diversity Appendix in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification and exhibits E:1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10-12, 14-19, 21, 24-29, 31-33, 35.

Compensation Appendix in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for class certification and exhibits C: 1-7, 9, 11-20, 22-31, 33-39, 41, 57-59.

Plaintiffs' reply brief in support of motion for class certification
Reply declaration of Bernard R. Siskin
Reply declaration of Christine Webber in support of plaintiffs' reply brief in support of motion for class certification.
Exhibits submitted in support of plaintiffs' reply brief re: their motion for class certification (#s 89-96).
Order for additional briefing on issues related to class certification.
Plaintiffs' response to the Court's order for additional briefing on issues related to class certification.
Declaration of Amy G. Williams
Defendants' supplemental memorandum on class certification issues.
Order on motion for class certification.

R. Thomas Consulting, RTC 307-478, 706-1135

"Diversity task force: Strategic diversity management process" (TBC01180508-TBC01180562)

Copy of 6/21/01 Deposition of Kathleen Lundquist (without exhibits).

"Concordance key word in context printing for depositions" re: Marcella Fleming, January 5, 2001.

Declaration of Carol Jensen.

Declaration of Michael P. Ward

Email from James C. Hart, 1/09/98, "Staff Meeting Information" RE January 7, 1998 Staff Meeting Minutes.

APPENDIX B:

Borgida Litigation Consultation

Betty Dukes, Patricia Surgeson, Cleo Page, Christine K. Wapnoski, Deborah Gunter, Karen Williamson, and Edith Arana vs. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, Case No. C-01-2252 MJJ. Defense litigation consultant (5/22/02 to 3/21/03). Defense Counsel: David Copus (Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue) and Neal D. Mollen (Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker). No report, no deposition, no court testimony.

Mary F. Singleton, Shirley Rogers Jennings, Katherine Lynette Fritz, Gloria J. Glasscox, Maura K. Spragge, Janelle Spann v. The Regents of the University of California. Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda, No. 807233-1. Defense Counsel: Morrison & Foerster (Linda E. Shostak, Lindsay E. Harris, Erin Spiotta). Defense consultant and expert witness.

Teresa M. Downey v. The Coalition Against Rape and Abuse, Inc., Board of Chosen Freeholders, County of Cape May, The Herald Newspapers, Office of the Prosecutor, County of Cape May, and Stephen D. Moore, Raymond Batten, and Joseph R. Zelnick. U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 99-3370 (JS). Plaintiff's Counsel: Wong & Fleming, Princeton, NJ (Dan Fleming & Lawrence Fox). Expert reports filed December 30, 2002 and January 20, 2003. No deposition, No court testimony.

Her Majesty the Queen Against Dimitrios Pilarinos and Glen David Clark. In the Supreme Court of British Columbia, Canada. Court File No. CC0011402, Vancouver Registry. Affidavit (filed July 26, 2001) and Reply Affidavit (filed Sept. 21, 2001). No deposition, No court testimony. Retained by the Ministry of the Attorney General, Government of British Columbia, Canada (Richard W. de Boer and David L. Winkler, Criminal Justice Branch).

Barbara Agne vs. Sun Microsystems, Inc., Ron Lewis, Michael Little, Larry Orwin. Court of Common Pleas of Franklin County, Ohio, Case No. 98CVH-10-7922. Deposition, No report, no court testimony. Plaintiff's Counsel: Michael Garth Moore.

Terry Galpin v. American Greetings Corporation, Erwin Weiss, Magnivision and Steve Crellin; U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii, Civil No. CV-98-00880. Expert report filed June 1, 2000. No deposition, No court testimony. Plaintiff's Counsel: Davis, Levin, Livingston, and Grande (Michael K. Livingston).

Stacey M. French v. IES Utilities, Inc. U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Iowa, Cedar Rapids Div., Civil No. 98-25. Expert report filed October 1, 1999. Plaintiff's Counsel: Riccolo & Baker (John Riccolo). Expert report, No deposition, no court testimony.

Patricia L. Ray v. Miller Meester Advertising, Inc. and Robert Miller. Hennepin County, Minnesota, District Court File No. 9817380. Expert report filed on December 7, 1999. Plaintiff's Counsel: Messerli & Kramer (Susan Coler, now with Sprenger & Lang). State of Minnesota in Court of Appeals, C3-02-1605. Filed June 16, 2003 – Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded.

Margaret Ackerman v. Hanson, Lulic, & Krall. Hennepin County, Minnesota, District Court, Fourth Judicial Circuit, Court File No. EM 97-014036. Expert Report filed December 14, 1998. Plaintiff's counsel: Sprenger & Lang (Susan Stokes). Deposition/3-8-99, but No court testimony (case settled).

Sheri Sawyer Madison vs. IBP, Inc., Saul Villa, Marcelino and Ignacio Doe(s). U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, Central Division. File No. 4-96-CV-80712. Plaintiff's Counsel: Roxanne Conlin & Associates (Thomas J. Duff, Roxanne Conlin). No expert report, Deposition/10-29-98, Trial testimony/2/5/99.

Shelly Fisher v. RPS, Inc., and Cory Krebs. U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa. No. 4-96-CV-80257. Plaintiff's Counsel: Riccolo & Baker (John Riccolo) Deposition: 4-14-98, No Trial testimony.

EEOC v. Allen Bradley Co., Civil Action No. 94-C-1021, 1995, (E.D. Wis.). Plaintiff's Counsel: EEOC. Deposition, No trial testimony.

Sheila Rouse vs. Boehringer Mannheim U.S. Holdings, Inc. Boehringer Mannheim Corp., and Christopher Hildrebrand. U.S. District Court for the Sourthern District of Iowa, Central Division. Cause No. 4-92-10305. May and July, 1995. Plaintiff's Counsel: Roxanne Conlin & Associates (Roxanne Conlin). No expert report, Deposition, Trial testimony.

Sandra K. Huffman vs. Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Nicolas DeNicola, Ronald Flaa, and Timothy Saylor. Hennepin County, Minnesota, District Court, Fourth Judicial District, File No. 92-10995. Plaintiff's Counsel: Mackall, Crounse & Moore (Sheila Engelmeier). No expert report, Deposition, Trial Testimony.

Andrew Herman, et al. v. Westinghouse Electric Corp., Civil No. MGJ 93-285, *EEOC v. Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, Civil Action No. MJG-93-1004, November, 1995. Plaintiff's Counsel: EEOC. Deposition and Pre-trial hearing.

Jenson v. Eveleth Taconite Co. 824 F. Supp. 847 (D. Minn. 1993). Plaintiff's Counsel: Sprenger and Lang (Paul Sprenger and Jean Boler). Deposition and Trial testimony, No expert report.

Litigation consultant. Defense Counsel: Leonard, Street & Deinard (Minneapolis, MN). Class action sexual harassment case involving Stroh's Brewery (12/4/92).

APPENDIX C:
EUGENE BORGIDA

October 2003

Biographical Data:

Date of Birth: September 11, 1949

Place of Birth: New York City

Citizenship: U.S.A.

Office Address: Department of Psychology
N387 Elliott Hall
75 East River Road
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 625-3381
FAX: (612) 626-2079
E-Mail: borgi001@tc.umn.edu
http://www.psych.umn.edu/faculty/Borgida.htm

Home Address: 1787 Irving Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403
(612) 377-2499

Academic Training:

Undergraduate: Wesleyan University
Middletown, Connecticut
B.A., High Honors in Psychology and Sociology, 1971

Graduate: University of Michigan
Ph.D., 1976, Psychology

Professional Experience:

Professor of Psychology and Law, 1997-present

Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 1987-present

Chair, Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 1996-1999

Morse-Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor of Psychology, 1996-present

Fesler-Lampert Chair in Urban and Regional Affairs, 2002-2003

Associate Dean for Research and Planning, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota, 1992-1995

Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Minnesota, 1985-1991

Adjunct Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota, 1988-present

Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 1981-1986

Co-Director, Center for Research in Law and Psychology, University of Minnesota, 1989-1996

Co-Director, Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota 1995-present

Director of Graduate Studies, Political Psychology Ph.D. Minor, University of Minnesota, 2000-2001, 2003-2004.

Director, Social Psychology Doctoral Program, University of Minnesota, 1984-85; 1987-88, 1990-91, 1992-93, 1994-95, 2000-2001.

Visiting Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Toronto, 1982.

Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota, 1976-81.

Research Assistant, Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973-1976.

Research Assistant, American Institutes for Research, Washington, D.C. 1971-72.

Academic Honors and Awards:

High Honors in Psychology, Wesleyan University, 1971
Walkley Prize for Psychological Research, Wesleyan University, 1971
NIMH Trainee in Social Psychology, University of Michigan, 1972-1976
Faculty Summer Research Fellow, University of Minnesota, 1980
Bush Foundation Sabbatical Fellowship, 1988-89
Distinguished Teacher Award, College of Liberal Arts, 1989
Morse-Amoco Award for Outstanding Contributions to Undergraduate Education, 1988-89
The Heinz Eulau Award, 1989, American Political Science Association
Fellow, Division 8 (SPSP), Division 9 (SPSSI), and Division 1 (General Psychology) American Psychological Association
Ford Foundation Interdisciplinary Fellowship, Summer, 1990
The Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize, APA, 1994
Fellow, American Psychological Society, 1997
Scholar of the College, College of Liberal Arts, 2000-2003
Fesler-Lampert Chair in Urban and Regional Affairs, 2002-2003

Membership in Professional Associations:

Society for Experimental Social Psychology
American Psychological Association
American Psychological Society, Charter Member
Midwestern Psychological Association
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
Society for Personality and Social Psychology
American Psychology-Law Society
Judgment/Decisionmaking Society
International Society of Political Psychology

Major Research Interests:

Attitudes and Social Cognition
Psychology and Law
Political Psychology

Research Grants:

Horace Rackham Dissertation Grant, University of Michigan, 1975-1976.

Cognitive biases in the jury deliberation process. Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1976-1977, $4,000.

The effects of prior sexual history of the victim and implied victim consent on rape prosecution. Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1977-1978, $3,500.

Evidence in rape trials: A socio-legal analysis. National Institute of Mental Health, 1977-1980, $116,837.

Entrapment and equity: The effects of judicial instruction. Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1979-1980.

Impact assessment of project TYRO (Teaching Youth with Real Offenders). Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, Summer, 1980; 1980-1981. Center for Urban and Regional Planning, University of Minnesota, 1980-1981, $7,100.

Protocol analysis of juror decision making. Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1983-84, $6,500.

Ideological constraint, issue voting, and the nature of political reasoning. National Science Foundation, 1984-87, $195,000 (with J.L. Sullivan & J.H. Aldrich).

Ideological constraint, issue voting, and the nature of political reasoning. Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1984-85, $9,600.

Is voter decision-making candidate centered? A multi-method approach. Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1987-88, $4,000.

Children as witnesses in cases of child sexual abuse. National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services), 1987-1990; Subcontract with the NCJW Center for the Child, New York, $28,000.

Unrelated living kidney donation. National Institutes of Health. 1988-1993, $246,399.

The Minnesota Recycling Project. Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota, and the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners, 1988-89, $12,000 (with M. Snyder).

Assessing the effects of news media in the courtroom: A field experiment. National Science Foundation, 1990-1992, $150,000 (with S.D. Penrod).

Extended media effects of courtroom coverage: A field experiment. Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, 1992-93, $10,000.

Noncompliance in kidney transplantation: Assessment and intervention. National Institutes of Health. 1992-1997, $189,233 (with M.H. Gonzales).

Sexual harassment in academia: Procedural justice issues in informal versus formal dispute resolutions, 1992-93. Conflict and Change Center, HHH Institute, University of Minnesota, $1,900.

The media, the law, and highly publicized trials: Assessing the effects of the OJ Simpson trial on knowledge of and attitudes about the justice system. Sept., 1994, SPSSI Grant-in-Aid, $1,000.

Scientific evidence in sex discrimination litigation. U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 1995-1999, $30,000.

Electronic networks: Enhancing civic life or diverting scarce resources? Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, Program for Interactive Research, University of Minnesota, 1996-1997, $45,000 (with J.L. Sullivan).

Electronic networks: Enhancing civic life or diverting scarce resources? National Science Foundation, 1997-99, $100,358 (with J.L. Sullivan).

Electronic networks and civic life: A longitudinal study. National Science Foundation, 2000-2003, $400,487 and $71,000, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota (with J.L. Sullivan).

CLA (College of Liberal Arts) Scholarly Events Fund, SPSSI 2000 Convention: *Social issues for the 21st Century: Setting the agenda*, June 15-18, 2000, $3,000.

Expanding Undergraduate Research Opportunities, Center for the Study of Political Psychology, University of Minnesota, 2001-2002. Civic Engagement Task Force ($5,000) and the Graduate School, University of Minnesota ($7,500) – (with J.L. Sullivan).

Research assessment of the national high school civic engagement coalition, *Project 540*, The Pew Charitable Trusts, 6/1/02 – 3/31/04, $390,000 (with James Farr).

Understanding attitudes toward tobacco harm reduction. NIH Cancer Center and University of Minnesota Transdisciplinary Tobacco Use Research Center (TTURC), $15,000 in 2002-2003, $13,500 in 2003-2004.

Editorial and Professional Service:

Editorial Service:
Associate Editor, Psychological Documents, 1981-1985
Editorial Board, Cognitive Therapy and Research, 1983-1985
Consulting Editor, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1986-88
Editorial Board, Psychological Bulletin, 1988-1990
Editorial Board, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1987-1990
Associate Editor, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology/Attitudes and Social Cognition, 1990-93
Editorial Board, Law and Human Behavior, 1993-1996; 1996-1999, 1999-2002
Co-Editor, Political Psychology, 1997-2002, 2002-2007.
Editorial Board, Psychology, Public Policy, & Law, 1999-2002
Editorial Committee, Annual Review of Psychology, 2001-2005.

Reviewer:
American Journal of Political Science
American Psychologist
American Political Science Review
European Journal of Social Psychology
Journal of Applied Psychology
Journal of Applied Social Psychology
Journal of Experimental Psychology: General
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
Journal of Research in Personality
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
Psychological Bulletin
Psychological Review
Social Cognition
Social Psychology Quarterly
Cognitive Psychology
Law and Human Behavior
Journal of Personality

Reviewer, NSF Social/Developmental Program
Reviewer, NSF Law and Social Sciences Program
NSF Science Faculty Review Panel, 1979
NIMH Criminal and Violent Behavior Review Committee, 1980
Special Review Committee, N.I.H., 1984
Convention Program Committee, APA Division 8, 1979, 1985, 1988, 1989
Membership Chair, APA Division 41 (Psychology and Law), 1980-1984
Metropolitan Council, Criminal Justice Advisory Committee, 1983-1985

Program Committee, Midwestern Psychological Association, 1984-1987
SPSSI (Div. 9, APA) Policy Council, 1990-93
Society for Experimental Social Psychology (SESP), Executive Committee, 1991-1994
Advisory Panel, Social Psychology Program, National Science Foundation, 1997-2000
Kurt Lewin Award Committee, Division 9, 1998
Member-at-Large, Society of Personality and Social Psychology, Executive Committee, 1998-2000
Chair, SPSP Selection Committee for the Donald T. Campbell Award for Distinguished Research in Social Psychology, 1998-2001.
Publications Committee, American Psychological Society, 1998-2000
Board of Directors, American Psychological Society, 1999-2002
Conference Co-Chair, SPSSI (APA Division 9) 2000 Biennial Conference
Board of Directors, Social Science Research Council, 2000-2003.

Publications:

Borgida, E. (1972) National identity and the draft. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1, 8-9.

Nisbett, R.E., & Borgida, E. (1975). Attribution and the psychology of prediction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 932-943.

Nisbett, R.E., Borgida, E., Crandall, R., & Reed, H. (1976). Popular induction: *Information is not necessarily informative. In J. Carroll, & J. Payne (Eds.),* Cognition and social behavior. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1976. [Reprinted in D. Kahneman, P. Slovic, & A. Tversky (Eds), Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Cambridge University Press, 1982.]

Borgida, E., & Nisbett, R.E. (1977). The differential impact of abstract vs. concrete information on decisions. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 7, 258-271.

Borgida, E. (1978). Valuable sourcebook for attribution researchers. [Review of J.H. Harvey, W.J. Ickes, & R.F. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research, Volume 1]. Contemporary Psychology, 23 (4), 225-226.

Borgida, E. (1978). Scientific deduction—Evidence is not necessarily informative: A reply to Wells and Harvey. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 477-482.

Borgida, E., & White, P. (1978). Social perception of rape victims: The impact of legal reform. Law and Human Behavior, 2, 339-351.

Borgida, E. (1979). Character proof and the fireside induction. Law and Human Behavior, 3, 189-202.

Locksley, A., Borgida, E., Brekke, N., & Hepburn, C. (1980). Sex stereotypes and social judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 821-831.

Borgida, E. (1980) Evidentiary reform of rape laws: A psycholegal approach. (171-197) In P.D. Lipsett & B.D. Sales (Eds.), New directions in psycholegal research. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Borgida, E. (1980). Social judgment processes. [Review of M. Fishbein (Ed.), (1980), Progress in social psychology, Volume 1. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates]. Science, 209(4464), 1509.

Borgida, E., Locksley, A., & Brekke, N. (1981). Social stereotypes and social judgment. (153-169) In N. Cantor & J.F. Kihlstrom (Eds.), Cognition, social interaction and personality. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Borgida, E., & Brekke, N. (1981). The base rate fallacy in attribution and prediction. (63-95) In J. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research, Volume 3. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Borgida, E. (1981). Legal reform of rape laws: Social psychological and constitutional considerations. (211-241) In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology annual, Volume 2. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Borgida, E., & Campbell, B. (1982). Belief relevance and attitude-behavior consistency: The moderating role of personal experience. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 239-247. [Reprinted in D.A. Schroeder, D.E. Johnson, & T.D. Jensen (Eds.), Contemporary readings in social psychology. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publisher, 1985.]

Heath, L., Kendzierski, D., & Borgida, E. (1982). Evaluation of social programs: A multi-methodological approach combining a delayed treatment true experiment and multiple time series. Evaluation Review, 6, 233-246.

Tukey, D., & Borgida, E. (1983). An intra-subject approach to causal attribution. Journal of Personality, 51, 137-151.

Borgida, E., & Howard-Pitney, B. (1983). Personal involvement and the robustness of perceptual salience effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 560-570.

Penrod, S., & Borgida, E. (1983). Legal rules and lay inference. In L. Wheeler & P. Shaver (Eds.), Review of personality and social psychology, Volume 4. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Morier, D.M., & Borgida, E. (1984). The conjunction fallacy: A task specific phenomenon? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10, 243-252.

Frazier, P., & Borgida, E. (1985). Rape trauma syndrome evidence in court. American Psychologist, 40, 984-993.

Harkness, A.R., DeBono, K.G., & Borgida, E. (1985). Personal involvement and strategies for making contingency judgments: A stake in the dating game makes a difference. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 22-32.

Borgida, E., & Brekke, N. (1985). Psycholegal research on rape trials. In A. Burgess (Ed.), Research handbook on rape and sexual assault. New York: Garland Publishing Co.

Howard-Pitney, B., Borgida, E., & Omoto, A.M. (1986). Personal involvement: An examination of processing differences. Social Cognition, 4, 39-57.

Swim, J. & Borgida, E. (1987). Public opinion on the psychological and legal aspects of televising rape trials. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17 (5), 507-517. [Reprinted in L.S. Wrightman, C.E. Willis, & S. Kassin (Eds.), On the witness stand: Controversies in the courtroom. Sage, 1987]

Young, J., Borgida, E., Sullivan, J., & Aldrich, J. (1987). Personal agendas and the relationship between self-interest and voting behavior. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 64-71.

Borgida, E., Frazier, P., & Swim, J. (1987). Prosecuting sexual assault: The use of expert testimony on rape trauma syndrome. In A. Burgess & R. Hazelwood (Eds.), Practical aspects of rape investigations: A multidisciplinary approach. New York: Elsevier.

Borgida, E. & Park, R. (1988). The entrapment defense: Juror comprehension and decision making. Law and Human Behavior, 12 (1), 19-40.

Brekke, N. & Borgida, E. (1988). Expert psychological testimony in rape trials: A social-cognitive analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 372-386.

Omoto, A.M. & Borgida, E. (1988). Guess who might be coming to dinner?: Personal involvement and racial stereotyping. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24, 571-593.

Frazier, P. & Borgida, E. (1988). Juror common understanding and the admissibility of rape trauma syndrome evidence in court. Law and Human Behavior, 12, 101-122.

Borgida, E., & DeBono, K.G. (1989). Social hypothesis-testing and the role of expertise. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15, 212-221.

Aldrich, J.H., Sullivan, J.L., & Borgida, E. (1989). Foreign affairs and issue voting: Do presidential candidates "Waltz before a blind audience?". American Political Science Review, 83, 125-141.

Swim, J., Borgida, E., Maruyama, G., & Myers, D. (1989). McKay vs. McKay: Is there a case for gender biased evaluations? Psychological Bulletin, 105, 409-429.

Borgida, E., Gresham, A., Swim, J., Bull, M., & Gray, E. (1989). Expert testimony in child sexual abuse cases: An empirical investigation of partisan orientation. Family Law Quarterly, 23 (3), 433-450.

Sullivan, J.L., Aldrich, J.H., Borgida, E., & Rahn, W. (1990). Candidate appraisal and human nature: Man and superman in the 1984 election. Political Psychology, 11 (3), 459-484.

Borgida, E., DeBono, K.G., & Buckman, L.A. (1990). Cameras in the courtroom: The effects of media coverage on witness testimony and juror perceptions. Law and Human Behavior, 14 (5), 489-509

Rahn, W., Aldrich, J.H., Borgida, E., & Sullivan, J.L. (1990). A social-cognitive model of candidate appraisal. In J. Ferejohn & J. Kuklinski (Eds.), Information and democratic processes. (136-159) Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Borgida, E., Simmons, R.G., Conner, C., & Lombard, K. (1990). The Minnesota living donor studies: Implications for organ procurement. In J. Shanteau and R.J. Harris (Eds.), Organ donation and transplantation: Psychological and behavioral factors. (108-121) Washington, D.C.: APA Publications.

Young, J., Thomsen, C.J., Borgida, E., Sullivan, J.L., & Aldrich, J.H. (1991). When self-interest makes a difference: The role of construct accessibility in political reasoning. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 27, 271-296.

Fiske, S.T., Bersoff, D.N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M.E. (1991). Social science research on trial: The use of sex stereotyping research in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. American Psychologist, 46, 1049-1060.

Borgida, E., Conner, C., & Manteufel, L. (1992). Understanding living kidney donation: A behavioral decision making perspective. (pp. 183-211) In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (eds.), Helping and being helped: Naturalistic Studies. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Borgida, E., Gresham, A., Kovera, M., & Regan, P. (1992). Children as witnesses in court: The influence of expert psychological testimony. (pp. 131-165) In A. Burgess (ed.), Rape and Sexual Assault Research Handbook, Vol. III. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Frazier, P.A., & Borgida, E. (1992). Rape trauma syndrome: A review of case law and psychological research. Law and Human Behavior, 16, 293-311. {Reprinted in R. R. Hazelwood & A. W. Burgess (eds.), Practical aspects of rape investigation: a multidisciplinary approach. New York: CRC Press, 1995.}

Miene, P., Park, R., & Borgida, E. (1992) Juror decision making and the evaluation of hearsay evidence. Minnesota Law Review, 76, 683-701.

Kovera, M.B., Borgida, E., Gresham, A., Swim, J., & Gray, E. (1993). *Do child sexual* abuse experts hold pro-child beliefs? A survey of the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 6 (3), 1-22.

Miene, P., Borgida, E., & Park, R. (1993). The evaluation of hearsay evidence: A social psychological approach. (pp. 151-166) In N.J. Castellan (ed.), Individual and group decision making. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Publishers.

Fiske, S.T., Bersoff, D.N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M.E. (1993). What constitutes a scientific review? A majority retort to Barrett and Morris on gender stereotyping. Law and Human Behavior, 17 (2), 217-233. {Reprinted in Walsh, M. R. (in press) Women, men, and gender: Ongoing debates. New Haven: Yale University Press.}

Fiske, S.T., Bersoff, D.N., Borgida, E., Deaux, K., & Heilman, M.E. (1993). Accuracy and objectivity on behalf of the APA. American Psychologist, 48, 55-56.

Swim, J., Borgida, E., & McCoy, K. (1993). Videotaped vs. in-court witness testimony: Is protecting the child witness jeopardizing due process? Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23 (8), 603-631.

Robertson, B.A., Sullivan, J.L., & Borgida, E. (1993). The political psychology program at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. Political Psychology, 14 (4), 743-746.

Rahn, W.M., Aldrich, J.H., & Borgida, E. (1994). Individual and contextual variations in political candidate appraisal. American Political Science Review, 88, 193-199.

Lavine, H., Borgida, E. & Rudman, L.A. (1994). Social cognition. In V.S. Ramachandran (ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior, Vol. IV. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc., 213-223.

Thomsen, C.J., Borgida, E., & Lavine, H. (1995). The causes and consequences of personal involvement. In R.E. Petty & J.A. Krosnick (Eds.), Attitude strength and consequences. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Publishers, 191-214.

Rudman, L.A., Gonzales, M.H., & Borgida, E. (1995). *My transplant is my life:* Compliance status as a moderator of differential susceptibility to item context effects. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 340-348.

Borgida, E. & Fiske, S.T. (eds.) (1995). Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment, and the law. Journal of Social Issues, 51 (1).

Borgida, E. & Rudman, L.A. (1995). "Gender and the mainstream". Contemporary Psychology, 40 (1), 48-49.

Rudman, L.A. & Borgida, E. (1995). The afterglow of construct accessibility: The behavioral consequences of priming men to view women as sexual objects. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31, 493-517.

Rudman, L.A., Borgida, E., & Robertson, B. (1995). Suffering in silence: Procedural justice versus gender socialization issues in University sexual harassment grievance procedures. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17 (4), 519-541.

Borgida, E., Rudman, L.A., & Manteufel, L.L. (1995). On the courtroom use and misuse of gender stereotyping research. In E. Borgida & S.T. Fiske (Eds.), Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment and the law. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 181-192.

Thomsen, C.J., & Borgida, E. (1996). Throwing the baby out with the bath water? Let's not overstate the overselling of the base rate fallacy. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 19, 39-40.

Kovera, M.B. & Borgida, E. (1996). Children on the witness stand: The use of expert testimony and other procedural innovations in U.S. child sexual abuse trials. In B.L. Bottoms & G.S. Goodman (eds.), International Perspectives on Child Witnesses. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 201-220.

Lavine, H., Sullivan, J.L., Borgida, E., & Thomsen, C.J. (1996). The relationship of national and personal issue salience to attitude accessibility on foreign and domestic policy issues. Political Psychology, 17, 293-316.

Morier, D., Borgida, E., & Park, R.C. (1996). Improving juror comprehension of judicial instructions on the entrapment defense. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26, 1838-1866.

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1997) Sexual harassment: An experimental test of sex-role spillover theory. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23, 63-75.

Kovera, M.B., Gresham, A.W., Borgida, E., Gray, E., & Regan, P.C. (1997). Does expert psychological testimony inform or influence juror decision-making? A social cognitive analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 1-13.

Frazier, P.A., & Borgida, E. (1997). Rape trauma syndrome. In D.L. Faigman, D. Kaye, M.J. Saks, & J. Sanders (Eds.), Scientific evidence reference manual, St. Paul, MN: West Publishing, 402-435.

Kovera, M.B., & Borgida, E. (1997). Expert testimony in child sexual abuse trials: The admissibility of psychological science. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 11, 105-129.

Burgess, D., & Borgida E. (1997). Refining sex-role spillover theory: The role of gender subtypes and harasser attributions. Social Cognition, 15, 291-311.

Reidel, E., Wagoner, M.J., Dresel, L., Sullivan, J.L., & Borgida, E. (1998). Electronic communities: Assessing equality of access in a rural Minnesota community. Social Science Computer Review, 16, 370-390.

Kovera, M.B., & Borgida, E. (1998). Expert scientific testimony on child witnesses in the age of Daubert. In S.J. Ceci & H. Helmbrooke (eds.) What can (and should) an expert tell the court? The art, science, and ethics of being an expert witness. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 185-216.

Lavine, H., Thomsen, C.J., Zanna, M.P., & Borgida, E. (1998). On the primacy of affect in the determination of attitudes and behavior: The moderating role of affective-cognitive ambivalence. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 34, 398-421.

Rudman, L. A., Gonzales, M. H., & Borgida, E. (1999). Mishandling the gift of life: Noncompliance in renal transplant patients. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29 (4), 835-852.

Fiske, S. T. and Borgida, E. (1999). Social framework analysis as expert testimony in sexual harassment suits. In S. Estreicher (ed.), Sexual Harassment in the Workplace. (pp.575-583). Boston: Kluwer Law International. (Reprinted in J.L. Beauvois, Connexion, "Proces pour harcelement sexuel: Un cadre d'analyse sociale a l'usage des experts.")

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (2000). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 5(3), 1-28.

Lavine, H. Borgida, E., and Sullivan, J. L. (2000). On the relationship between attitude involvement and attitude accessibility: Toward a cognitive-motivational model of political information processing. Political Psychology, 21, 81-106.

Borgida, E., & Mobilio, L. (2000). Social motivation. Encyclopedia of Psychology (A. Kazdin, Ed.). (347-350) APA & Oxford University Press.

Hunt, J.S., & Borgida, E. (2001). Is that what I said? Developmental differences in witnesses reponses to modifications. Law and Human Behavior, 25,(6), 583-603.

Sullivan, J.L., Borgida, E., Jackson, M.S., Riedel, E., Oxendine, A., & Gangl, A. (2002). Social capital and community electronic networks: For-profit vs. for-community approaches. American Behavioral Scientist, 45(5), 868-886.

Borgida, E., Sullivan, J.L., Oxendine, A., Jackson, M.S., Riedel, E., & Gangl, A. (2002). Civic culture meets the digital divide: The role of community electronic networks. Journal of Social Issues, 58 (1), 125-141.

Hunt, J.S., Borgida, E., Kelly, K.A., & Burgess, D. (2002). Gender stereotyping: Scientific status. In D. Faigman, D.H. Kaye, M.J. Saks, & J. Sanders (Eds.), Modern scientific evidence: The law and science of expert testimony. (pp.374-426). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.

Borgida, E., & Hunt, J.S. (2003). Psychology and law. Chapter in S.E. Taylor, L.A. Peplau, & D.O. Sears, Social Psychology. (pp.496-514). Eleventh Edition. Upper Sadle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall Publishers.

Haney, B., Borgida, E., and Farr, J. (2002). Citizenship and civic engagement in public problem-solving. In M. X. Delli-Carpini, L. Huddy, and R.Y. Shapiro (eds.), Research in Micropolitics: New Directions in Political Psychology. (pp.225-252). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Sullivan, J.L., Borgida, E., Jackson, M.S., Riedel, E., & Oxendine, A.R. (2002). A tale of two towns: Assessing the role of political resources in a community electronic network. Political Behavior, 24 (1), 55-84.

Riedel, E., Gangl, A., Oxendine, A., Jackson, M., Sullivan, J.L., & Borgida, E. (in press). The role of the Internet in national and local news media use. Journal of On-Line Behavior.

Oxendine, A., Borgida, E., Sullivan, J.L., & Jackson, M.S. (in press). The importance of trust and community in developing and maintaining a community electronic network. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies.

Borgida, E., Sullivan, J.L., & Riedel, E. (Eds.). The political psychology of democratic citizenship. Edited volume under review with Cambridge University Press.

Manuscripts in preparation/under review:

Oyamot, C.M., & Borgida, E. (2003). Can values moderate right-wing authoritarian propensities? The case of attitudes toward immigrants. Manuscript under review at Political Psychology.

Oyamot, C.M., Borgida, E., Wagner, U., & van Dick, R. (2003). Right-wing authoritarians and the structure of attitudes toward immigrants. Manuscript in preparation for JPSP.

Sinclair, H.C., & Borgida, E. (2003). Courtship persistence: Social antecedents, legal consequences. Manuscript in preparation for PSPR.

Sinclair, H.C., & Borgida, E. (2003). Classifying crimes by classifying victims: Examining lay conceptions of hate crimes. Manuscript under review at PSPB.

Sinclair, H.C., & Borgida, E. (2003). Culture, courtship, and legal consequences: An archival analysis of anti-stalking statutes. Manuscript under review at Criminal Justice and Behavior.

Sinclair, H.C., Borgida, E., & Chalmers, C. (2002). The effects of *Daubert* on the admissibility of expert witness testimony in sexual harassment cases. Manuscript under review at Law and Human Behavior.

Borton, J.L.S., Gonzales, M.H., Borgida, E., Haney, B., & Peterson, D. (2003). A prospective study of treatment nonadherence in renal transplant recipients. Manuscript under review at Health Psychology.

Borgida, E., & Stark, E. (2003). Social-political Cognition and the new media. Chapter in preparation for K.O. Doyle & F. Kaslow (Eds.), Psychology and the new media.

Borgida, E., Sullivan, J.L., Jackson, M., Oxendine, A., & Schneider, M. (2003). "Community electronic networks and civic life." Chapter in preparation for P. Shane & P. Muhlberger (Eds.), Prospects for electronic democracy. Routledge.

Colloquia and Conference Presentations:

Nisbett, R.E., Borgida, E., Crandall, R., & Reed, H. (1975, April). Popular induction: Information is not necessarily informative. Paper presented at the 12th Carnegie-Mellon Symposium on Cognition.

Borgida, E. (1976). Character testimony in the law: What kind of evidence is informative? Paper presented at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Borgida, E., Swann, W.B., Jr., & Campbell, B. (1977). Attitudes and behavior: The specificity hypothesis revisited. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

Borgida, E., Oskner, P., & Tompkins, A. (1978). Perception of rape victims: The impact of evidentiary reform. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, Toronto.

Borgida, E., Ludden, C., & Bush, G. (1978). Evidentiary reform of rape laws. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, Toronto.

Borgida, E. (1978, October). Discussant, 1978 Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology: Cognition, affect and social relations: Developmental perspectives.

Borgida, E., Locksley, A., & Brekke, N. (1979, March 30-April 1). Cognitive and evaluative aspects of sex stereotyping. Paper presented at the Symposium on Personality and Cognition, Princeton University.

Borgida, E., & Ludden, C. (1979, April). The rape victim in the legal system. Paper presented at the Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation Conference. Sponsored by the Governor's Crime Control Planning Board, State of Minnesota. (Reprinted in Proceedings of the 1979 Research and Evaluation Conference on Criminal Justice in Minnesota. Published by the Crime Control Planning Board, State of Minnesota, 1980.)

Borgida, E., & Brekke, N. (1980, June). Toward a process analysis approach to jury deliberation. Symposium on Psychology and Law: Jury Research. Law and Society Association annual meeting. University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Borgida, E., & Park, R. (1980, November). The entrapment defense and jury decision making. Paper presented at the symposium on "Contemporary research on the American criminal jury" at the American Society of Criminology meetings, San Francisco.

DeBono, K.G., & Borgida, E. (1982, May). Hypothesis-testing and the role of expert knowledge. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Howard-Pitney, B., & Borgida, E. (1982, May). Personal involvement and the generalizability of salience effects. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Gangestad, S., & Borgida, E. (1982, May). Intuitive prediction and intuitive regression: Accounting for predictor information. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Borgida, E. (1982, May). Moderator, Invited symposium on "Social Cognition and Social Judgment." Annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Borgida, E. (1982, May). Discussant, Symposium on "Social psychology in the courtroom: Empirical investigations of trial practice attorney mythology." Annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Penrod, S., & Borgida, E. (1982, July). Social cognition and the law of evidence. Paper presented at the International Conference on Psychology and Law, University College, Swansea, England.

Borgida, E. (1982, February). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, University of Waterloo.

Borgida, E. (1982, March). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, University of Toronto.

Borgida, E. (1982, April). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, University of Rochester.

Borgida, E. (1982, June). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.

Borgida, E. (1982, June). Invited Address: The Minnesota Women Lawyers Association, "The psychological study of courtroom behavior," St. Paul, Minnesota.

Borgida, E. (1983, January). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychiatry, Hennepin County Medical Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Psychiatric syndrome evidence in court.

Borgida, E., & DeBono, K.G. (1983, June). Cameras in the courtroom. Symposium on Perceptions of Law, Justice, and the Courts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Law and Society Association. Denver, Colorado.

Brekke, N., Borgida, E., & Mensing, D.K. (1983, May). Expert scientific testimony in rape trials. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E. (1983, April). Invited Lecture, School of Law, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota. Psychology and Law.

Borgida, E. (1983, September). Invited Colloquium: Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Psychological syndrome evidence in court.

Borgida, E. (1983, October). Invited Colloquium: Technology, Institutions and Efficiency *in the American Economy Study Group*, University of Minnesota. Social science research and institutional design: A legal reform case.

Borgida, E., Brekke, N., & Frazier, P. (1983, October). Syndrome evidence in court. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, Chicago.

Borgida, E. (1983, November). *Invited Symposium*: William Mitchell College of Law, St. Paul, Minnesota. Cable TV program: Cameras in the Courtroom: Effects on witness.

Borgida, E. (1983, December). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Center for the Study of Families and Children, Vanderbilt University. Base rates and the adjudication of criminal behavior: The case of rape trauma syndrome.

Borgida, E. (1984, March). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, New York University.

Borgida, E. (1984, May). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, University of Virginia.

Young, J., & Borgida, E. (1984, May). Personal agendas and the influence of self interest on voting behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E. (1984). Discussant, Symposium on "Gender and public policy." Annual meetings of the American Psychological Association, Toronto.

Aldrich, J.H., Borgida, E., & Sullivan, J.L. (1984). On the nature and role of long-term attitudes in public opinion and political behavior. Paper presented at the 1984 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Borgida, E. (1984, October). Invited Participant, Jurist in Residence Program on Expert Testimony, School of Law, University of Minnesota.

Borgida, E. (1984, November). Invited Lecture, School of Law, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota. Expert Scientific Testimony.

Omoto, A.M., & Borgida, E. (1985, May). Ethnic stereotyping. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Swim, J., Borgida, E., & Morse, C. (1985, May). Televising rape trials: Public opinion and legal policy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Howard-Pitney, B., Borgida, E., & Omoto, A.M. (1985, May). Personal involvement and perceptual salience: A cognitive response analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E. (1985, May). Moderator, Invited Address by Thomas Cook. Recent attacks on well-known validity distinctions: An appreciative rejoinder. Annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E., Aldrich, J.H., & Sullivan, John L. (1985, August). Thinking about politics. Paper presented in the symposium on "Advances in Political Psychology" at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, California.

Morier, D., & Borgida, E. (1986, May). Examining the robustness of conjunctive reasoning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Brekke, N., & Borgida, E., (1986, May). On the admissibility of rape trauma syndrome evidence. Invited Symposium on Jury Research at the annual meeting of the Law and Society Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E. (1986, May). "Waltzing before a blind audience" and other political tales. Presentation at the Fifth Annual Conference on Social Cognition, Nags Head Conference Center, Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina.

Borgida, E., & Frazier, P. (July, 1986). The status of rape trauma syndrome evidence in court. Presentation to the Hennepin County (Minnesota) Attorney's Sexual Assault Task Force, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Borgida, E., & Omoto, A.M. (August, 1986). Racial stereotyping and prejudice: The role of personal involvement. Paper presented at the Invited Symposium on "Motivated social cognition" at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Frazier, P., & Borgida, E. (August, 1986). Juror common understanding and the admissibility of rape trauma syndrome evidence in court. Paper presented at the Invited Symposium on Jury Decision Making at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Swim, J., Borgida, E., & Maruyama, G. (August, 1986). Sex discrimination: A meta-analysis of the literature. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Borgida, E. (October, 1986). Discussant at the XXI Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology, Panel on "Pregnancy and health risks: How to intervene."

Aldrich, J., Borgida, E., Rahn, W.M., & Sullivan, J.L. (July, 1987). Paper presented at the Invited Symposium on "Political Information Processing" at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, San Francisco.

Aldrich, J., Borgida, E., Sullivan, J., Thomsen, C., & Young, J. (August, 1987). Paper presented at the Invited Symposium on "Experimental Studies on Political Cognition" at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

Young, J., Thomsen, C., Borgida, E., Sullivan J., & Aldrich, J. (May, 1987). The impact of chronic and temporary accessibility of self-interest on memory for political information. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E., Young, J., Thomsen, C., Sullivan, J., & Aldrich, J. (August, 1987). Chronic and temporary construct accessibility of self-interest in political reasoning. Paper presented at the Invited Symposium on "Political attitudes, political cognition, and political persuasion" at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Borgida, E. (November 13, 1987). Using expert witnesses: Analysis and effects of testimony. Invited Address at the Project Impact Conference II: Interests of the Child and Interests of the Public—Child and Adolescent Sexual Abuse and the Legal System. Sponsored by the Government Training Service, State of Minnesota, Brainerd, Minnesota.

Borgida, E. (April, 1988). The uses of expert psychological testimony in court: A social psychological perspective. Invited Paper presented at the 1988 meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association.

Borgida, E. (1988, March). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, Macalester College.

Borgida, E. (May, 1988). Invited consultant, American Psychological Association, Amicus curiae project, Hopkins v. Price Waterhouse, U.S. Supreme Court.

Borgida, E. (1988, May). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, University of Maryland.

Thomsen, C.J. & Borgida, E. (August, 1988). Forming impressions of intergroup rival and allies: More on the flexibility of the social perceiver. Invited symposium on the "Motivational Determinants of Intergroup Attitudes." Annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Borgida, E. & Rahn, W. (August, 1988). Is voter decision-making candidate centered? Invited symposium on "Experimental studies of political learning and persuasion." Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Frazier, P. & Borgida, E. (August, 1988). Multiple victimization experiences in rape victims. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Borgida, E., Simmons, R.G., Conner, C., & Lombard, K. (October 2-4, 1988). The Minnesota study of unrelated living donors. Paper presented at the International Conference on Psychological Research on Organ Donation. Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

Borgida, E. (1988, October 18). Social psychology in the courtroom: Understanding 'common understanding' of rape trauma and child sexual abuse. Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

Borgida, E., Conner, C., Lengnick, S., & Lombard, K. (April, 1989). Understanding kidney donation: Donor-recipient closeness and decision-making processes. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Sociological Society. St. Louis, Missouri.

Gresham, A., Borgida, E., Swim, J., French, S., & Bull, M.A. (May, 1989). Juror common understanding of child sexual abuse and children as witnesses. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E. (February 3, 1990). Predicting and understanding living kidney donation. Invited paper at the Seventh Annual Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology: "Helping and being helped in the real world." The Claremont Colleges, Claremont, California.

Borgida, E. (February 18, 1990). Expert testimony and juries: Educational or prejudicial? Invited symposium on the Psychology of Jury Decision Making, American Association for the Advancement of Science, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Borgida, E. (March 3, 1990). Invited Colloquium: Department of Psychology, Johns Hopkins University.

Bull, M.A., Borgida, E., Gresham, A.W., & Swim, J. (May 4, 1990). Expert testimony in child sexual abuse cases: An empirical investigation of partisan orientation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Borgida, E., & Thomsen, C.J. (July, 1990). Social cognition and politics: Some thoughts on the role of priming and cognitive accessibility in political reasoning. Invited paper, International Society of Political Psychology, Washington, D.C.

Kojetin, B.A., Borgida, E., & Snyder, M. (August, 1990). Understanding recycling attitudes, habit, and behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Miene, P.K., Park, R., Borgida, E., & Anderson, J. (August, 1990). The evaluation of hearsay evidence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Borgida, E., Conner, C., & Manteufel, L.(August, 1990). Living kidney donation: Testing the theory of planned behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Borgida, E. (Sept. 10-15, 1990). Invited participant, First European Conference on Social Cognition. Max-Planck Institute for Psychology, Munich, West Germany.

Swim, J., Borgida, E., & McCoy, K. (August, 1991). The impact of a child's videotaped testimony on juror and jury decision making. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.

Borgida, E. (June, 1991). Invited Address, Annual meeting of the American Psychological Society. Living kidney donation and the "gift of life": A social psychological perspective. Washington, D.C.

Gresham, A.W., Bull, M., Regan, P.C., & Borgida, E. (June, 1991). The influence of expert testimony and child witness demeanor on jury decision making. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.

Lengnick, S., Borgida, E., & Kojetin, B. (June, 1991). Value relevance in commitment to donating a kidney. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.

Miene, P.K., Borgida, E., & Park, R. The psychology of hearsay evidence,. Invited paper presented at the Hearsay Reform Conference, School of Law, University of Minnesota, September 6-7, 1991.

Borgida, E. (November 20, 1991). Invited Colloquium on news media coverage of the courts, School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Minnesota.

Kovera, M.B., Levy, R., Borgida, E., & Penrod, S. (March, 1992). Expert witnesses in child sexual abuse cases: Effects of expert testimony and cross examination. Paper presented at the 1992 meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, San Diego, California.

Borgida, E. (March 18, 1992). Invited Lecture: The use of research on sex stereotyping in discrimination litigation. Minnesota Chapter of the National Employment Lawyers Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Regan, P.C., Otto, A.L., Lengnick, S.L., Manteufel, L., Penrod, S.D., & Borgida, E. (April 30, 1992). The impact of direct experience with electronic media coverage on jurors' attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Lavine, H., Thomsen, C., Borgida, E, & Sullivan, J.L. (April, 1992). A test of the single versus dual evaluation model of attitude accessibility. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Rudman, L., Gonzales, M.H., & Borgida, E. (August, 1992). Mishandling the gift of life: Noncompliance in renal transplant recipients. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington D.C.

Kovera, M.B., & Borgida, E. (August, 1992). Children on the witness stand: A persuasion analysis of jurors' perceptions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington D.C.

Borgida, E. (April 29, 1992). Invited Symposium: Television and the legal process. Forum sponsored by the Silha Center for the Study of Media Ethics and Law, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Borgida, E., (May 20-31, 1992). Invited Speaker, Children as witnesses in court: The use and abuse of psychological data. NATO Advanced Study Institute on "The child witness in context: Cognitive, social and legal perspectives." Lucca, Italy.

Borgida, E. (July 10, 1992). Invited Colloquium on theory and research on personal involvement. Department of Psychology, University of Michigan.

Borgida, E., Penrod, S., Manteufel, L., Lengnick, S., Otto, A., & Regan, P. (September 16-19, 1992). Invited Symposium on Media and the Law, The Third European Conference of Law and Psychology. The effects of news media in the courtroom: A field experiment. Oxford University, Oxford, England.

Borgida, E., Lavine, H., Thomsen, C.J, & Sullivan, J.L. (August, 1992). Invited Symposium on "Self-interest and judgment". Directional and motivational effects of self-interest on attitudes and policy preferences. Annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Borgida, E. & Rudman, L.A. (October 9, 1992) Master status and the Swedish Bikini Team: Out of the court-room and into the laboratory. Invited symposium on sexual harassment research, Society for Experimental Social Psychology, San Antonio, Texas.

Borgida, E. (October 27, 1992) Invited Colloquium on media coverage of the courts. Institute of Criminology, University of Toronto.

Borgida, E. (October 28, 1992) Invited Colloquium on gender stereotyping and sexual harassment research, Department of Psychology, University of Toronto.

Borgida, E. (November 9, 1992) Invited Colloquium on gender stereotyping and sexual harassment research, Department of Psychology, Yale University.

Borgida, E. (November 11, 1992) Invited Colloquium on gender stereotyping and sexual harassment research, Department of Psychology, Wesleyan University

Borgida, E. (March 12, 1993) Expert testimony in sexual harassment cases. Invited address to the American Bar Association's Section of Labor and Employment Law, Committee on Employee Rights and Responsibilities. Palm Beach Gardens, Florida.

Borgida, E. (March 18, 1993) The Raymond G. Johnson Memorial Lectureship in Psychology, Macalester College, St. Paul, MN. "Social science on trial: On the use of research on sex stereotyping and sexual harassment in court."

Borgida, E. (April 2, 1993) Invited Colloquium on gender stereotyping and sexual harassment research, Department of Psychology, Rice University.

Borgida, E. (April 15, 1993) Invited Colloquium on gender stereotyping and sexual harassment research, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.

Borgida, E. (May 6, 1993) Invited Colloquium on gender stereotyping and sexual harassment research, Department of Psychology, Northwestern University.

Lavine, H., Sullivan, J.L., Borgida, E., & Thomsen, C.J. (July, 1993) Revisiting the issue salience - attitude accessibility hypothesis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Boston, MA.

Manteufel, L.L., Smith, B.C., Borgida, E., & Penrod, S.D. (March, 1994). Cameras in the courtroom: Does Court TV educate the public? Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the American Psychology–Law Society, Sante Fe, N.M.

Borgida, E. (Nov. 4, 1994). Invited Colloquium, Department of Psychology, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.

Borgida, E. (Nov. 18, 1994). Invited Colloquium, Department of Psychology, Reed College, Portland, OR.

Borgida, E. (Dec. 3, 1994). Invited Colloquium on gender stereotyping and sexual harassment, Department of Psychology University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Robertson, B.A., Rudman, L.A., & Borgida, E. (June, 1994). Sexual harassment in academia: Procedural justice vs. socialization issues in dispute resolution. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.

Brock, J.M, & Borgida, E. (June, 1994). Q-sort methodology yields two underlying factors of family-expressed prejudice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.

Silverman, J.L., Haney, B.A., Gonzales, M.H., Borgida, E., & Rudman, L.A. (June, 1995). A longitudinal study of noncompliance with medical regimens: The case of kidney transplantation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, New York, N.Y.

Mobilio, L.J., & Borgida, E. (May, 1995). "If only's" and "should have's": A study of counterfactual thinking and judgments of victim blame. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (May, 1995). Sexual harassment: An experimental test of sex-role spillover theory. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern* Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Haney, B.A., Borgida, E., & Farr, J. (July, 1995). Project Public Achievement: Assessing the impact of an experiential civic education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Washington, D.C.

Rudman, L.A., Borgida, E., & Seales, L. (June, 1995). Set/Reset in action: Undermining the behavioral consequences of priming sexism in men. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, New York, N.Y.

Manteufel, L.L., Borgida, E., & Penrod, S.D. (June, 1995). The media, the law, and cameras in court: Assessing media effects of the OJ Simpson trial on knowledge of and attitudes about the justice system. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Law and Society Association, Toronto, Canada.

Borgida, E. (June, 1995). Invited graduate student workshop on "Gender stereotypes and the courts." Annual meeting of the Law and Society Association, Toronto, Canada.

Kovera, M. B., Borgida, E., & Gresham, A. W. (March, 1996). The impact of child witness preparation and expert testimony on juror decision making. Paper presented at the *1996 Mid-Year Conference of the American Psychology-Law Society, Hilton Head,* S. C.

Burgess, D. & Borgida, E. (May, 1996). Sex-role spillover theory: Scientific and legal issues. Paper presented at the SPSSI 60th Anniversary Conference: Social issues theory, research and action, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Borgida, E. (May 11, 1996). Gender stereotyping, sexual harassment, and the law. Invited paper at the annual meeting of the Minnesota Psychological Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Borgida, E. (June 29, 1996). On the significance of Lewin's other dictum: Nothing's so theoretical as a good practical problem. Invited symposium paper at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, San Francisco, CA.

Borgida, E. (May 9, 1997). Giving psychology away? The case of gender stereotyping and sexual harassment. Invited paper, annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Oyamot, C.M., Wyman, M.A., & Borgida, E. (May 10, 1997). A comparison of psychological and national choice models in the prediction of xenophobic attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Borgida, E., & Burgess, D. (May 25, 1997). Refining sex-role spillover theory: Psychological and legal implications. Invited symposium, "Empirical and theoretical developments in the psycholegal study of workplace sexual harassment." American Psychological Society, Washington, D.C.

Hunt, J., & Borgida, E. (March 6, 1998). Beyond leading questions: Modifications in eyewitness interviews. Paper presented at the American Psychology – Law Society, Redondo Beach, CA.

Burgess, D. & Borgida, E. (August, 1998). How perceiver gender and occupational context shape perceptions of sexual harassment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Borgida, E. (October 2, 1998). Invited colloquium: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. Department of Psychology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

Hunt, J. S., and Borgida, E. (April 17, 1999). Developmental differences in witnessess' responses to modifications. Invited symposium, Society for Research in Child Development, Biennial Meeting, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Borgida, E., Dresel, L., Jackson, M., Riedel, E., and Sullivan, J. L. (July 18-21, 1999). A tale of two towns: Assessing the role of political resources in a community electronic network. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Ammazzalorso, H. L. and Borgida, E. (August, 1999). Expressing positive intergroup attitudes: The unlikely host of prejudiced reactions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Borgida, E., Sullivan, J.L., Jackson, M., Riedel, E., & Gangl, A. (2000). Internet access and civic life: A research agenda for political and social psychology. Invited symposium on Political Social Psychology, 12th annual meeting of the American Psychological Society, June 8-11, 2000, Miami Beach, FL.

Sinclair, H.C., Borgida, E., & Chalmers, C. (2000). Assessing legal gatekeeping of psychological science in sexual harassment cases. Paper presented at the first annual meeting of the Society of Personality and Social Psychology, Feb. 3-6, 2000, Nashville, TN.

Borgida, E. (February 3, 2000). Invited colloquium. Department of Psychology, George Washington University.

Hunt, J.S., & Borgida, E. (2000). Getting ready to talk to the cops: Expectations about investigative interviews. Paper presented at the American Psychology- Law Society 2000 Biennial Conference, March 9-12, 2000, New Orleans, LA.

Hunt, J.S., & Borgida, E. (2000). Do expectations about conversation rules affect eyewitness testimony? Paper presented at the American Psychology- Law Society 2000 Biennial Conference, March 9-12, 2000, New Orleans, LA.

Borgida, E. (March 15, 2000). Invited colloquium. Department of Psychology, Georgetown University.

Borgida, E. (April 24, 2000). Invited Faculty Workshop, University of Minnesota School of Law.

Borgida, E. (2000). Discussant for Invited Symposium on "Sex of expert witness: An empirical and experiential view." Biennial conference of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), Minneapolis, MN, June 16-18.

Sinclair, H.C., Borgida, E., & Henley, C. (2000). A new measure of courtship persistence: Psychometrics and a research agenda. Poster presented at the 2000 SPSSI Convention, June 16-18, 2000, Minneapolis, MN.

Sinclair, H.C., Borgida, E., Polovitz, J., & Tichauer, J. (2000)."Special relationships": Predictors of sentences in stalking cases. Poster presented at the 2000 SPSSI Convention, June 16-18, 2000, Minneapolis, MN.

Tichauer, J.L., Sinclair, H.C., Borgida, E., & Polovitz, J. (2000). Stalking stereotypes and their impact on judgments of stalking situations. Poster presented at the 2000 SPSSI Convention, June 16-18, 2000, Minneapolis, MN.

Gangl, A., Jackson, M., Riedel, E., Borgida, E., Sullivan, J.L., & Oxendine, A. (2000). Bridging the digital divide: The role of political capital in community electronic networks. Paper presented at the 23rd annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Seattle, WA., July 1-4, 2000.

Borgida, E. (2001). Gender stereotyping: Implications for theory development and discrimination law. Invited Symposium on "Social psychology and law: Current trends, research, and influences on litigation. 2nd annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, TX, February 1-3, 2001.

Borgida, E., & Sinclair, H.C. (2001). The nature and measurement of courtship persistence: Implications for understanding sexual harassment. Poster presented at the 2nd annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Antonio, TX, February 1-3, 2001.

Yoshida, E., & Borgida, E. (2001). The influence of friendships on attitudes toward racial outgroups. Poster to be presented at the 73rd annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL, May 3-5, 2001.

Oyamot, C., & Borgida, E. (2001). Ambivalence and the authoritarian: Competing values and attitudes toward immigrants. Paper to be presented at the 24th annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Cuernavaca, Mexico, July 15-18, 2001.

Borgida, E. (2001). Discussant, Contrasting and complementary approaches to political behavior: Excerpts from the forthcoming *Handbook of Political Psychology*. Invited Symposium, 24th annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Cuernavaca, Mexico, July 15-18, 2001.

Borgida, E., & Sinclair, H.C. (2002). Courtship persistence: Social antecedents, legal consequences. Invited Symposium, American Psychology-Law Society Biennial Conference, Austin, Texas, March, 2002.

Sinclair, H.C., & Borgida, E. (2002). Classifying crimes by classifying victims: Investigating lay conceptions of hate crime. Invited paper, American Psychology-Law Society Biennial Conference, Austin, Texas, March, 2002.

Sinclair, H.C., Borgida, E., & Collins, W.A. (2002). Exploring the antecedents and consequences of courtship persistence. Invited Symposium on "Stalking and courtship persistence: Classifications and social-personality predictors." Biennial meeting of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Toronto, Canada, June 2002.

Borgida, E. (June 2003). Invited Symposium on "Stereotyping evidence: The forgotten method of proof." Fourteenth annual meeting of the National Employment Lawyers Association, Vail, Colorado, June 25-28, 2003.

Borgida, E. (October 2003). Payoffs for theory development are available, though not always accessible. Invited Symposium on "The payoffs of political psychology for basic theory-building in social psychology." Annual meeting of the Society of Experimental Social Psychology, Boston, MA, October 2-4, 2003.