

Cultural models of self and social class disparities at organizational gateways and pathways

Sarah SM Townsend and Mindy Truong

Attaining a college degree has traditionally been assumed to be key to upward social and professional mobility. However, college graduates from working-class backgrounds achieve less career success in professional, white-collar workplaces compared to those from middle-class backgrounds. Using a cultural models approach, we examine how the independent cultural beliefs and practices promoted by professional organizations disadvantage people from working-class backgrounds, who espouse interdependent beliefs and practices. Our review illustrates how this disadvantage can manifest in two ways. First, despite relative equality in objective qualifications, it can occur at organizational gateways (e.g., interview and hiring decisions). Second, even after people from working-class backgrounds gain access to an organization, it can occur along organizational pathways (e.g., performance evaluations and assignment to high-profile tasks).

Address

University of Southern California, Marshall School of Business, United States

Corresponding author: Townsend, Sarah SM (sarah.townsend@usc.edu)

Current Opinion in Psychology 2017, 18:xx–yy

This review comes from a themed issue on **Inequality and social class**

Edited by **Hazel Markus** and **Nicole Stephens**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.005>

2352-250X/© 2017 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Attaining a college degree has traditionally been assumed to be key to upward social and professional mobility in the United States. However, college graduates must also be able to leverage their degrees for career success. Unfortunately, when people from working-class backgrounds are hired into professional workplaces, they are likely to be less successful than their middle-class counterparts (e.g., they are paid lower salaries; [1,2]). In the current review, we examine social class differences in career outcomes and experiences by taking a cultural models approach (e.g., [3,4]). We draw on theoretical and empirical work on social class and cultural models of self. This work illuminates how the independent cultural beliefs and practices embodied in white-collar workplaces do not

match the interdependent cultural beliefs and practices espoused by people from working-class backgrounds and thereby disadvantage these individuals in professional organizations. Specifically, we consider how these cultural mismatches and the disadvantages associated with them can manifest at organizational gateways and along organizational pathways [5]. Organizational gateways are points of access; disadvantage means lacking a fair opportunity to gain access (e.g., when working-class applicants are not invited to interview despite sufficient qualifications). By contrast, organizational pathways are opportunities for achievement once people have gained access; disadvantage means lacking a fair opportunity to succeed or advance (e.g., when working-class employees are overlooked for promotions despite excellent performance records).

Social class and cultural models of self

People's social class backgrounds shape what it means to be a 'good' person and what constitutes normatively 'good' behaviors and actions (i.e., cultural models of self; e.g., [3,4,6]). Due to variation in both material resources (e.g., income, access to high-quality education) and social resources (e.g., relationships with family and friends), middle-class and working-class contexts tend to promote different cultural models of self (e.g., [7,8,9]).¹ Specifically, people who grow up in middle-class contexts often have access to more material resources and face fewer risks and uncertainty compared to those who grow up in working-class contexts [10–12]. Specifically, people from middle-class backgrounds are subject to few environmental constraints and have ample opportunity to make choices and control their contexts. Over time, these ways of being foster an *independent model of self*, which emphasizes the individual self and promotes norms of confidence, decision-making based on unique personal preferences, and attempts to influence the situation to bring it into line with one's desires [13–17]. In contrast, people from working-class backgrounds face material and social conditions that often require that they adjust themselves to their contexts and rely on close others for support. Over

¹ We define being from a middle-class background as having grown up in a household where at least one parent or guardian held a 4-year college degree and where parents or guardians were likely to have had relatively prestigious occupations and high levels of income. We define being from a working-class background as having grown up in a household in which no parent or guardian held a 4-year college degree and where parents or guardians were likely to have had relatively low prestige occupations and low levels of income.

time, these ways of being foster an *interdependent model of self*, which emphasizes one's relationship to others and promotes norms of being tough and strong, adhering to rules and standards, and constraining one's behaviors during interactions with authority figures [18–22].

Independent and interdependent models are both valid ways of perceiving and acting in the world. However, institutions are often set up and operate primarily according to one model or the other. When individuals enter contexts that promote a model of self that differs from the one on which they rely, they experience a *cultural mismatch* (e.g., [23,24]). Given that workplaces are often set up according to the cultural model of self held by their founders and the majority of their members, professional or white-collar workplaces are likely to rely on independent models of self [25**]. Although college affords students from working-class backgrounds opportunities to learn and practice some elements of an independent model, social class differences in models of self persist through graduation (Phillips *et al.*, unpublished). As a result, people from working-class backgrounds are likely to experience a cultural mismatch between the independent model prevalent in organizational settings and their interdependent model of self. As we discuss below, this cultural mismatch may lead people from working-class backgrounds to experience disadvantage at the organizational gateways and pathways required for career success.

Cultural mismatch at organizational gateways

Given that the primary factors that determine passage through an organizational gateway are education, relevant professional experience, and personal contacts (e.g., referrals; [26]), objective social class differences in qualifications partially explain social class disparities at these points of access. Indeed, people from working-class backgrounds, compared to those from middle-class backgrounds, are less likely to attain 4-year college degrees, more likely to attend lower status colleges and universities, and more likely to lack valuable social networks and relevant professional experiences (e.g., internships; [27–30]). What we suggest here, however, is that even when controlling for objective factors such as education, contacts, and professional experience, a cultural mismatch will occur between organizations' and hiring managers' independent models of self and working-class job seekers' interdependent models. Specifically, we theorize that, due to the importance placed on cultural fit at organizational gateways, this mismatch will lead working-class applicants to be disadvantaged.

Perceived cultural fit between the applicant and the organization or the hiring manager is a major criterion in interview and hiring decisions [31–33]. Given that candidates typically hold similar objective qualifications in terms of education and experience, hiring managers assign substantial weight to the subjective fit criteria and

often use cultural fit as a formal evaluative criterion [34,35**]. We theorize that the cultural mismatch between organizations' and hiring managers' independent models of self and working-class job seekers' interdependent models will disadvantage these applicants because they will be more likely to be perceived as lacking cultural fit. For example, confidence in decision-making, a characteristic more consistent with norms of independence than norms of interdependence [15,17], is often used during the resume selection and interview process to indicate fit and professional demeanor [36,37]. In addition, job applicants who possess independent (*i.e.*, agentic) skills are rated as more competent and more likely to be hired than applicants who present themselves as more interdependent (*i.e.*, communal; [38]). Illustrating this value, Deloitte's website encourages interviewees to 'be confident' and 'sell yourself,' advising: "Make sure you can speak confidently about any experiences you've had in the workplace and in the classroom . . . be sure to sell yourself by promoting your skills and abilities" (Deloitte Interview tips; URL: <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/careers/articles/about-deloitte-careers-interview-tips.html>). Applicants from working-class backgrounds may be uncomfortable and inexperienced at displaying confidence and engaging in self-promotion, behaviors that are inconsistent with norms of interdependence.

Although not focused on cultural models of self *per se*, research in sociology on the influence of social-class in the hiring process has also demonstrated how cultural fit disadvantages applicants from working-class backgrounds. In a study using a sample of elite law firms, male applicants whose resumes signaled they were from higher class backgrounds (e.g., they had participated in extracurricular activities such as sailing) received more interview invitations than male applicants whose resumes signaled they were from lower class backgrounds (e.g., they had participated in extracurricular activities such as track and field; [39]). Focusing on this type of cultural fit (*i.e.*, alignment of applicants' extracurricular activities with White middle/upper-class culture) disadvantages applicants from working-class backgrounds who are less likely than applicants from middle-class backgrounds to have engaged in the requisite activities.

Cultural mismatch along organizational pathways

Despite disadvantages at organizational gateways, some working-class applicants are able to beat the odds and gain employment in professional organizations. However, given that organizations tend to operate according to an independent model of self, the experience of cultural mismatch is likely to disadvantage employees from working-class backgrounds along organizational pathways [25**,40**]. Although social class disparities created by cultural mismatches have been explored in the context of

pathways in higher education (*e.g.*, [24,41]), little research in psychology examines how cultural mismatches shape social class outcomes in the workplace. We focus on the following three key factors that we theorize are likely to contribute to these mismatches in the workplace: personality and interaction styles, leveraging existing relationships, and building a broad network. Further, given the importance of these factors in promoting career success, we propose that cultural mismatches in these areas will hinder the success of employees from working-class, compared to middle-class, backgrounds.

Personality and interaction styles

One predictor of career achievement emphasized in the management literature is possession of the ‘right’ personality characteristics, including, being proactive [42–44] and agentic [45,46]. In order for individuals to attain upward mobility in their organizations, it is important to challenge authority, exert influence, and use impression-management skills [43]. Another predictor of career achievement is engaging in the ‘right’ interaction styles. Employees are often rewarded for challenging the status quo as they attempt to promote positive organizational change [47], and for their use of political skill, interpersonal influence, and ingratiation in interactions with others [48]. Although employees from working-class backgrounds who make it through organizational gateways may possess a strong work ethic and the ability to adjust to or be gritty in the face of suboptimal circumstances, these desirable personality characteristics and interaction styles do not match the traits and behaviors that are most often rewarded in organizations (*e.g.*, [14,24]).

In turn, we theorize that employees from working-class backgrounds are disadvantaged along this organizational pathway by cultural mismatch in the following two ways. First, given the interdependent norms of respecting authority and complying with rules and norms, employees from working-class backgrounds may be less likely to challenge coworkers’ or managers’ ideas, or offer dissenting opinions, behaviors that are praised in most organizations [47]. Similarly, employees from working-class backgrounds may be less likely to possess the strong sense of personal mastery that is often critical in obtaining leadership positions [49]. Second, given the interdependent norms of being authentic and loyal, employees from working-class backgrounds may feel uncomfortable and inauthentic performing the self-serving interpersonal tactics rewarded in organizational pathways [50*,51]. For example, when high power positions require disingenuous or calculating behaviors, people from working-class backgrounds report lower desire for those positions, compared to people from middle-class backgrounds [50*].

Leveraging existing relationships

One of the most crucial skills for upward career mobility is the ability to tap into existing relationships for

information and social capital [52,53]. For example, important pathway events, such as employee evaluations, are influenced by employees’ ability to leverage relationships, which calls for understanding others and influencing them for one’s own objectives [54,55]. Compared to the politically inept, employees who engage in ingratiation behaviors are rated by their supervisors as being more helpful, considerate, and cooperative in the workplace [56]. In turn, building rapport with one’s supervisor over time can improve one’s chances at attaining future promotions [57]. Importantly, these various methods of leveraging existing relationships are consistent with independent, but not interdependent, norms.

We theorize that employees from working-class backgrounds face cultural mismatches, and are, therefore, disadvantaged along this organizational pathway in two ways. First, the behaviors required for strategically leveraging existing relationships, particularly those with weak ties and authority figures (*e.g.*, bosses and managers), are mismatched with norms of interdependence. For example, people from working-class backgrounds are less likely than those from middle-class backgrounds to both seek help from authority figures and approach such individuals directly, when they do seek help [21,22]. Instead, people from working-class contexts are likely to turn to trusted, strong, and close relationships even in situations in which it would be most effective to turn to a broader and more dispersed network (*i.e.*, job loss; [58*]). Second, given that managers are often from middle-class backgrounds, their models of self are likely to mismatch the models held by employees from working-class backgrounds. Such dissimilarity may decrease understanding, make these cross-class interactions difficult, and, ultimately, hamper employees’ career success by decreasing their ability to leverage these relationships. Indeed, research shows that career mentorship is less beneficial for the early career promotions of employees from working-class backgrounds than it is for their middle-class counterparts [59*].

Building a broad network

Finally, career success in professional organizations also requires the ability to cultivate and maintain a broad network [60,61] with weak ties [62]. In order to build and maintain this type of network, employees need to focus on increasing the number and diversity of their contacts, participate in networking events and social functions, and develop relationships with the ‘right’ people (*i.e.*, those who have the potential to benefit one’s career; [63]). Importantly, these behaviors, which treat others as resources and connections to be used for personal gain, are consistent with norms of independence, but do not match norms of interdependence.

We theorize that people from working-class backgrounds face a cultural mismatch along this organizational

pathway and are, therefore, disadvantaged. For example, forging relationships for the sake of building self-serving connections aligns closely with the independent norm of influencing others, but is less consistent with interdependent norms of responding to the needs, preferences, and interests of others [51]. As a result of this inconsistency and, perhaps, their low trust of others outside of their immediate social circle (*i.e.*, family and close friends; [64]), people from working-class backgrounds may feel uncomfortable engaging in networking behaviors. Consistent with this, people from working-class backgrounds are more likely than those from middle-class backgrounds to indicate that building weak ties makes them feel uncomfortable [50^{*}]. Unsurprisingly, relative to people from middle-class backgrounds, people from working-class backgrounds tend to have smaller networks that are denser and less diverse [7,65]. In addition, their strong ties may be less helpful for professional development than the strong ties held by people from middle-class backgrounds [66,67].

Conclusion

The research reviewed supports the notion that people from working-class backgrounds face obstacles both at organizational gateways and along organizational pathways. Despite comparable qualifications, and even after gaining access, social class disparities persist due to a mismatch between the independent models of self valued in professional organizations and the interdependent models espoused by job applicants and employees from working-class backgrounds. Importantly, we do not mean to suggest that interdependent models of self are ineffective or inferior *per se*—they are a disadvantage only due to their mismatch with independent models that predominate professional organizations.

In order to maximize individual, group, and firm performance, it may be necessary for organizations to capitalize on valuable interdependent skills held by working-class employees (*e.g.*, high emotional intelligence; [68,69]) and encourage interdependent behaviors such as collaboration and working toward shared goals [70,71]. Consistent with the notion that interdependence can be beneficial, recent research suggests that leaders from working-class backgrounds (*i.e.*, whose parents had lower incomes) can be more effective than those from middle-class backgrounds in some organizational contexts (*i.e.*, the United States Army; [72]). Thus, as organizations seek routes to improved performance, they should leverage the benefits of interdependence by broadening the skillsets required for hiring and career advancement to include interdependent behaviors and explicitly educating applicants and employees from working-class backgrounds about the independent ‘rules of the game’ required to successfully pass through organizational gateways and pathways [73].

Conflict of interest statement

Nothing declared.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Brittany Torrez for assistance with manuscript preparation and proofreading.

References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
- of outstanding interest

1. Laurison D, Friedman S: **The class pay gap in higher professional and managerial occupations.** *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 2016, **81**:668-695 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122416653602>.
2. Bartik TJ, Hershbein BJ: **Degrees of poverty: family income background and the college earnings premium.** *Employ. Res. Newsl.* 2016, **23**:1-3 [http://dx.doi.org/10.17848/1075-8445.23\(3\)-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.17848/1075-8445.23(3)-1).
3. Markus HR, Kitayama S: **Culture and the self: implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation.** *Psychol. Rev.* 1991, **98**:224-253 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224>.
4. Markus HR, Kitayama S: **Cultures and selves: a cycle of mutual constitution.** *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* 2010, **5**:420-430 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691610375557>.
In this review paper, the authors provide definitions for self, culture, independence, and interdependence. In addition, the authors discuss how individuals both shape and are shaped by their sociocultural contexts (*i.e.*, the cycle of mutual constitution).
5. Chugh D, Brief AP: **1964 was not that long ago: a story of gateways and pathways.** In *Diversity at Work*. Edited by Brief AP. Cambridge University Press; 2008:318-340.
This chapter addresses the question of why race and gender segregation still remains in organizations by distinguishing between organizational gateways and organizational pathways.
6. Cross SE, Madson L: **Models of the self: self-construals and gender.** *Psychol. Bull.* 1997, **122**:5-36 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.122.1.5>.
7. Argyle M: *The Psychology of Social Class*. New York, NY: Routledge; 1994.
8. Kohn ML, Schooler C: **Class, occupation, and orientation.** *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 1969, **34**:659-678 <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy1.usc.edu/stable/2092303>.
9. Markus HR, Conner A: *Clash! 8 Cultural Conflicts That Make Us Who We Are*. New York, NY: Hudson Street Press; 2013.
This book explains how independent and interdependent cultural clashes (*i.e.*, mismatches) occur between people of different backgrounds (*e.g.*, social class, race, gender, religion, *etc.*) in the increasingly multicultural workplaces and communities.
10. Day JC, Newburger EC: *The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings*. Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census (DOC); 2002.
11. Evans GW, Gonnella C, Marcynyszyn LA, Gentile L, Salpekar N: **The role of chaos in poverty and children's socioemotional adjustment.** *Psychol. Sci.* 2005, **16**:560-565 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.01575.x>.
12. Kraus MW, Piff PK, Keltner D: **Social class, sense of control, and social explanation.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 2009, **97**:992-1004 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016357>.
13. Lareau A: **Invisible inequality: social class and childrearing in black families and white families.** *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 2002, **67**:747-776 <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy1.usc.edu/stable/3088916>.
14. Markus HR, Kitayama S: **Culture, self, and the reality of the social.** *Psychol. Inq.* 2003, **14**:277-283 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2003.9682893>.

15. Snibbe AC, Markus HR: **You can't always get what you want: educational attainment, agency, and choice.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 2005, **88**:703-720 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.4.703>.
16. Stephens NM, Fryberg SA, Markus HR: **When choice does not equal freedom: a sociocultural analysis of agency in working-class American contexts.** *Soc. Psychol. Pers. Sci.* 2011, **2**:33-41 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1948550610378757>.
17. Stephens NM, Markus HR, Townsend SS: **Choice as an act of meaning: the case of social class.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 2007, **93**:814-830 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.814>.
18. Chen E, Matthews KA: **Cognitive appraisal biases: an approach to understanding the relation between socioeconomic status and cardiovascular reactivity in children.** *Ann. Behav. Med.* 2001, **23**:101-111 http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15324796ABM2302_4.
19. Lachman ME, Weaver SL: **The sense of control as a moderator of social class differences in health and well-being.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 1998, **74**:763-773 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.763>.
20. Lamont M: *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2000.
21. Calarco JM: **"I need help!" Social class and children's help-seeking in elementary school.** *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 2011, **76**:862-882 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122411427177>.
22. Kim YK, Sax LJ: **Student-faculty interaction in research universities: differences by student gender, race, social class, and first-generation status.** *Res. High. Educ.* 2009, **50**:437-459 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9127-x>.
23. Stephens NM, Fryberg SA, Markus HR, Johnson CS, Covarrubias R: **Unseen disadvantage: how American universities' focus on independence undermines the academic performance of first-generation college students.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 2012, **102**:1178-1197 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027143>.
24. Stephens NM, Townsend SSM, Markus HR, Phillips LT: **A cultural mismatch: independent cultural norms produce greater increases in cortisol and more negative emotions among first-generation college students.** *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 2012, **48**:1389-1393 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.008>.
25. Stephens NM, Markus R, Phillips LT: **Social class culture cycles: how three gateway contexts shape selves and fuel inequality.** *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 2014, **65**:611-634 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115143>.
- This review paper integrates research from psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, anthropology, and education to demonstrate how social class culture cycles operate in gateway contexts (*i.e.*, home, school, and workplace). It discusses how middle-class norms and expectations produce disadvantages for working-class employees in middle-class occupations and workplaces.
26. Behrenz L: **Who gets the job and why? An explorative study of employers' recruitment behavior.** *J. Appl. Econ.* 2001, **4**:255-278.
27. Cahalan M, Perna L: *Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the United States: 45 Year Trend Report.* Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education; 2015. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED555865.pdf>.
28. Engle J, Tinto V: *Moving Beyond Access: College Success for Low-income, First-generation Students.* Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education; 2008.
29. Hoxby C, Avery C: **The missing "one-offs": the hidden supply of high-achieving, low-income students.** *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity.* 2012.
30. Gardner P: *The Debate over Unpaid College Internships.* Intern Bridge; 2011.
31. Bowen DE, Ledford GE, Nathan BR: **Hiring for the organization, not the job.** *Acad. Manag. Perspect.* 1991, **5**:35-51.
32. Chatman JA: **Matching people and organizations: selection and socialization in public accounting firms.** *Adm. Sci. Q.* 1991, **36**:459-484.
33. Kristof-Brown AL: **Perceived applicant fit: distinguishing between recruiters' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit.** *Pers. Psychol.* 2000, **53**:643-671 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00217.x>.
34. Rivera LA: **Hiring as cultural matching: the case of elite professional service firms.** *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 2012, **77**:999-1022 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122412463213>.
35. Rivera LA: **This book uncovers the hiring processes of prestigious firms through interviews and observation of hiring practices and argues that applicant evaluations made by employers of elite companies are biased towards those from privileged backgrounds. It reveals how social class impacts social mobility by demonstrating that elite employers look for qualifications that signal affluence..** *Pedigree: How Elite Students Get Elite Jobs.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 2015.
36. Bennett R: **Employers' demands for personal transferable skills in graduates: a content analysis of 1000 job advertisements and an associated empirical study.** *J. Vocat. Educ. Train.* 2002, **54**:457-476 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13636820200200209>.
37. Urtasun A, Núñez I: **Work-based competences and careers prospects: a study of Spanish employees.** *Pers. Rev.* 2012, **41**:428-449 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483481211229366>.
38. Rudman LA, Glick P: **Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: the hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle managers.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 1999, **77**:1004-1010 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.1004>.
39. Rivera LA, Tilcsik A: **Class advantage, commitment penalty: the gendered effect of social class signals in an elite labor market.** *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 2016, **81**:1097-1131 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122416668154>.
40. Stephens NM, Dittmann AD, Townsend SSM: **Social class and models of competence: how gateway institutions disadvantage working-class Americans and how to intervene.** In *Handbook of Competence and Motivation (2nd Edition): Theory and Application.* Edited by Elliot A, Dweck C, Yeager D. Guilford Press; 2017:512-528.
- This chapter examines how different social class contexts promote divergent views of what it means to be competent (*i.e.*, models of competence). In addition, the authors demonstrate how the prevailing middle-class model of competence in schools and workplaces can disadvantage and undermine working-class individuals.
41. Stephens NM, Markus HR, Fryberg SA: **Social class disparities in health and education: reducing inequality by applying a sociocultural self model of behavior.** *Psychol. Rev.* 2012, **119**:723-744 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029028>.
42. Crant JM: **The Proactive Personality Scale and objective job performance among real estate agents.** *J. Appl. Psychol.* 1995, **80**:532-537 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.4.532>.
43. Seibert SE, Crant JM, Kraimer ML: **Proactive personality and career success.** *J. Appl. Psychol.* 1999, **84**:416-427 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416>.
44. Thompson JA: **Proactive personality and job performance: a social capital perspective.** *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2005, **90**:1011-1017 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1011>.
45. Abele AE: **The dynamics of masculine-agentic and feminine-communal traits: findings from a prospective study.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 2003, **85**:768-776 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.768>.
46. Mollaret P, Miraucourt D: **Is job performance independent from career success? A conceptual distinction between competence and agency.** *Scand. J. Psychol.* 2016, **57**:607-617 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12329>.
47. Whiting SW, Podsakoff PM, Pierce JR: **Effects of task performance, helping, voice, and organizational loyalty on**

- performance appraisal ratings.** *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2008, **93**:125-129 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.125>.
48. Pfeffer J: *Power in Organizations*. Boston, MA: Pitman; 1981.
49. Barling J, Weatherhead JG: **Persistent exposure to poverty during childhood limits later leader emergence.** *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2016, **101**:1305-1318 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000129>.
50. Belmi P, Laurin K: **Who wants to get to the top? Class and lay theories about power.** *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 2016, **111**:505-529 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000060>.
- This paper demonstrates that people with relatively low social class (*i.e.*, people from working-class backgrounds) are less likely to pursue positions of power because they are less willing to engage in political behaviors compared to those with relatively high social class (*i.e.*, people from middle-class or upper-class backgrounds). The paper also provides a helpful list of lay theories on what is necessary for acquiring power in organizations.
51. Williams JC: **The class culture gap.** In *Facing Social Class: How Societal Rank Influences Interaction*. Edited by Fiske ST, Markus HR. Russell Sage Foundation; 2012:39-58.
52. Lin N, Ensel WM, Vaughn JC: **Social resources and strength of ties: structural factors in occupational status attainment.** *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 1981, **46**:393-405 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2095260>.
53. Seibert SE, Kraimer ML, Liden RC: **A social capital theory of career success.** *Acad. Manage. J.* 2001, **44**:219-237 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3069452>.
54. Ferris GR, Treadway DC, Kolodinsky RW, Hochwarter WA, Kacmar CJ, Douglas C, Frink DD: **Development and validation of the political skill inventory.** *J. Manag.* 2005, **31**:126-152 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271386>.
55. Mintzberg H: *Power in and Around Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; 1983.
56. Treadway DC, Ferris GR, Duke AB, Adams GL, Thatcher JB: **The moderating role of subordinate political skill on supervisors' impressions of subordinate ingratiation and ratings of subordinate interpersonal facilitation.** *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2007, **92**:848-855 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.848>.
57. Wayne SJ, Liden RC, Kraimer ML, Graf IK: **The role of human capital, motivation and supervisor sponsorship in predicting career success.** *J. Organ. Behav.* 1999, **20**:577-595 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3100430>.
58. Smith EB, Menon T, Thompson L: **Status differences in the cognitive activation of social networks.** *Organ. Sci.* 2012, **23**:67-82 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0643>.
- The authors develop a dynamic cognitive model of network activation among people who are low and high in subjective socioeconomic status (SES). They found that when under threat of a job loss, people low in subjective SES activated smaller and more narrow networks compared to people high in subjective SES.
59. Whitely W, Dougherty TW, Dreher GF: **Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress.** *Acad. Manage. J.* 1991, **34**:331-350 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/256445>.
- The paper focuses on the influence of career mentorship and socioeconomic background on early career outcomes. In addition, the paper also briefly discusses alternative influences of career progress like human capital, job-organizational characteristics, motivational factors, and demographic factors.
60. Burt RS: **The network structure of social capital.** *Res. Organ. Behav.* 2000, **22**:345-423 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(00\)22009-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(00)22009-1).
61. Claussen J, Grohsjean T, Luger J, Probst G: **Talent management and career development: what it takes to get promoted.** *J. World Bus.* 2014, **49**:236-244 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2013.11.007>.
62. Granovetter MS: **The strength of weak ties.** *Am. J. Sociol.* 1973, **78**:1360-1380 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/225469>.
63. Forret ML, Dougherty TW: **Networking behaviors and career outcomes: differences for men and women?** *J. Organ. Behav.* 2004, **25**:419-437.
64. Ross CE, Jang SJ: **Neighborhood disorder, fear, and mistrust: the buffering role of social ties with neighbors.** *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 2000, **28**:401-420 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1005137713332>.
65. Campbell KE, Marsden PV, Hurlbert JS: **Social resources and socioeconomic status.** *Soc. Netw.* 1986, **8**:97-117 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733\(86\)80017-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733(86)80017-X).
66. Bowman NA, Kitayama S, Nisbett RE: **Social class differences in self, attribution, and attention: socially expansive individualism of middle-class Americans.** *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 2009, **35**:880-893 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167209334782>.
67. Smith SS: **"Don't put my name on it": social capital activation and job-finding assistance among the black urban poor.** *Am. J. Sociol.* 2005, **111**:1-57 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/428814>.
68. Kraus MW, Côté S, Keltner D: **Social class, contextualism, and empathic accuracy.** *Psychol. Sci.* 2010, **21**:1716-1723 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797610387613>.
69. Stellar JE, Manzo VM, Kraus MW, Keltner D: **Class and compassion: socioeconomic factors predict responses to suffering.** *Emotion* 2012, **12**:449-459 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026508>.
70. Hambrick DC: **Fragmentation and the other problems CEOs have with their top management teams.** *Calif. Manage. Rev.* 1995, **37**:110-127 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/41165801>.
71. Woolley AW, Chabris CF, Pentland A, Hashmi N, Malone TW: **Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups.** *Science* 2010, **330**:686-688 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1193147>.
72. Martin SR, Côté S, Woodruff T: **Echoes of our upbringing: how growing up wealthy or poor relates to narcissism, leader behavior, and leader effectiveness.** *Acad. Manage. J.* 2016, **59**:2157-2177 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0680>.
73. Stephens NM, Hamedani MG, Destin M: **Closing the social-class achievement gap: a difference-education intervention improves first-generation students' academic performance and all students' college transition.** *Psychol. Sci.* 2014, **25**:943-953 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797613518349>.