Settling for Less: Restricted Awards Steer Women and Students of Color Away From More Lucrative Opportunities

Sianna A. Ziegler

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

University of Washington

2015

Committee:

Sapna Cheryan

Yuichi Shoda

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Psychology

University of Washington

Abstract

Settling for Less: Restricted Awards Steer Women and Students of Color Away From More Lucrative Opportunities

Sianna Alia Ziegler

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Professor Sapna Cheryan

Psychology Department

Three studies examined how the presence of a scholarship open only to members of underrepresented groups (i.e., women or people of color) impacts their decision to apply for more lucrative scholarships with no eligibility restrictions. Both people of color (Study 1) and women (Studies 2 and 3) were less likely to apply for a more lucrative scholarship open to everyone when given a choice between it and a smaller scholarship with demographic restrictions. In Study 3, women chose the smaller, restricted award over a more lucrative, unrestricted one even when the applicant pool for both opportunities was the same size. Several alternative explanations for their choice are explored.

Settling for Less: Restricted Awards Steer Women and Students of Color Away From More Lucrative Opportunities

One strategy that has been employed as a solution to gender and racial disparities in financial aid and award selection is the creation of restricted awards and scholarships that specifically target women and students of color. These restricted awards are abundant. At the University of Washington, 37 of the academic scholarships listed in the school's scholarships database are open exclusively to women and 59 are open exclusively to non-White students (University of Washington Office of Merit Scholarships Fellowships & Awards). Together these restricted scholarships represent nearly twenty percent of the academic scholarships available to students. A study of private scholarships available to students at the University of Arizona found that over half have demographic restrictions or requirements (though this number includes other demographic characteristics such as state of residence in addition to race and gender; Salcedo, 2012).

Having awards and scholarships that are restricted to women and students of color has advantages. Minority students receive a disproportionately small share of private scholarship dollars (Kantrowitz, 2011) and are less likely to receive merit-based aid than White students, even controlling for academic characteristics (Salcedo, 2012). And in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—fields in which women remain underrepresented (Hill, Corbett, & St. Rose, 2010)—women receive disproportionately fewer awards for scholarly research than do men (Lincoln, Pincus, Koster, & Leboy, 2012). Restricted awards are a straightforward method of addressing these disparities. They may also help close larger gaps in degree completion among students of color. A report commissioned by Congress found that minority-

restricted scholarships are "valuable tools in recruiting and retaining minority students" (General Accounting Office, 1994, p. 13).

In addition to their obvious practical benefits, the receipt of scholarships and awards has psychological benefits as well (Frey, 2006; Nora, Barlow, & Crisp, 2006). The recognition that they signal may be especially beneficial to women and students of color in settings where other signs indicate they do not belong (Davies, Spencer, & Steele, 2005; Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, Ditlmann, & Crosby, 2008). The existence of these awards can also serve as a counterweight to discrimination in selection processes for unrestricted opportunities (Bielby, 2000; Lincoln et al., 2012).

While identity-restricted awards have clear benefits and are helpful in addressing existing disparities, in some cases they may inadvertently perpetuate inequality rather than reducing it. The possibility explored in the present work is that the presence of these awards may be more attractive to eligible students than unrestricted awards, making it less likely they devote time and effort to applying for them. When restricted awards are of equal or greater value than unrestricted awards, this is of course not problematic. However, we hypothesized that the presence of restricted awards would make women and students of color less likely to choose unrestricted awards even when they are *more* lucrative than restricted awards. As a result, unrestricted awards may be more likely to go to members of dominant groups, perpetuating the very inequality the restricted opportunities were put in place to remedy.

Why might restricted scholarships draw women and students of color away from more lucrative opportunities? The most obvious explanation is that these students are simply making a pragmatic decision based on their assumptions about their chances of winning. People are motivated to seek potential profits, but they also weigh the costs and benefits of courses of action

(Scott, 2000). In estimating their probability of winning a scholarship, students likely take into consideration the number of other people they think they will be competing against in addition to the cost of entering (in time and effort) and the amount that is at stake. Because a smaller portion of the population is eligible for restricted scholarships, students may assume that the total number of applicants for these scholarships will be smaller than that of unrestricted scholarships. As a result, women and people of color may think they have a higher likelihood of winning restricted scholarships than unrestricted ones based on numbers alone, and they may be willing to trade a bigger payoff for a smaller one when the smaller payoff has a higher perceived likelihood.

However, a great deal of psychology research has established that human beings often do not make what objective observers may consider an "optimal" choice (e.g., Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). People's choices are heavily influenced by psychological factors. For instance, whether individuals choose a reward that is seen as more desirable or one that is seen as more feasible varies based on how psychologically distant the reward is perceived to be (Trope, Liberman, & Wakslak, 2007). Therefore, we hypothesized that there is more to this choice than just one's perceived likelihood of winning, and that even when the applicant pool is the same size as that of a more lucrative, unrestricted award, women and people of color would still be drawn to an award targeted at members of their group.

What are other possible reasons women and people of color would choose a smaller scholarship restricted to them over a more lucrative one with no such demographic restrictions? First, restricted scholarships may be perceived as easier to get for reasons other than numbers alone. The quality of the competition for restricted scholarships may also be seen as different from that of unrestricted ones. Because women and non-Asian minorities are stereotyped as

lower in competence (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002), women and minorities themselves may expect applicants for restricted scholarships to be less qualified. This could make competing against a pool of applicants that is limited to other women or people of color seem easier and therefore more appealing than competing against a pool of applicants that includes members of dominant groups who are stereotyped as relatively more competent.

Second, restricted scholarships offer reassurance that a particular identity will not be a disadvantage in the selection process, as it might be for unrestricted awards. Black and female students use situational cues to determine whether potential evaluators are likely to judge them on the basis of negative stereotypes about their group (Wout, Shih, Jackson, & Sellers, 2009) and restricted awards likely remove such concerns. Finally, restricted scholarships may also be appealing not only because they signal that one's identity is *not* a disadvantage, but also because they signal that one's identity is in fact appreciated and valued by the selection committee. Cues that communicate that diversity is valued can make people of color feel greater comfort and trust (Purdie-Vaughns et al., 2008) and lead to greater psychological engagement (Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009).

Restricted scholarships may be especially appealing to women and minorities whose group membership is more important to their identity or who are higher in gender- or race-based rejection sensitivity—the tendency to anticipate experiencing discrimination based on their gender or race. These individuals may be particularly attuned to the possibility of bias in the selection process for unrestricted awards (Mendoza-Denton, Shaw-Taylor, Chen, & Chang, 2009; Sellers & Shelton, 2003).

Study Overview

The first two studies seek to establish whether people of color (Study 1) and women (Study 2) choose a less lucrative scholarship that is restricted to their group over a larger, unrestricted one. Study 1 also examines whether minorities who are more highly identified with their race or ethnicity are more likely to make this choice. Study 3 attempts to answer the question of *why* it is that women and minorities make this choice. We test the simple applicant pool size explanation by holding the number of applicants constant for both kinds of scholarship and seeing if women continue to choose the less lucrative, restricted scholarship. We also examine whether perceptions of the quality of applicants differ between restricted and unrestricted awards and whether restricted awards make women feel their identity is valued. by the selection committee. Finally, we examine whether women who worry that they will be judged on the basis of their group membership or women whose gender identity is more central to them are more likely to choose restricted opportunities. Although we did not have specific hypotheses about how restricted scholarships would be perceived, in all three studies we examine whether restricted awards differ from unrestricted ones in their perceived prestige and competitiveness.

Study 1

In Study 1, we examined whether adults who identified as Black, Latino, Native American, or another non-White or Asian race or ethnicity were more likely to apply for a scholarship restricted to them than a more lucrative scholarship without demographic restrictions. Although this sample was not restricted to students, we excluded Asian Americans from our sample because our larger focus is on awards and scholarships in higher education and Asian Americans are not underrepresented in higher education in the U.S. (Pew Research Center,

2013). We also looked at whether participants whose racial and ethnic identity was more important to them would be particularly likely to choose the restricted scholarship. Finally, we examined whether the restricted scholarship was perceived as less competitive and prestigious than unrestricted awards.

Method

Participants

One-hundred-ninety-five adults completed the study through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) and were paid $0.30. After removing participants who failed the manipulation checks, 163 remained. All participants were current U.S. residents who reported being Black (53%), Latino (34%), Native American (6%), or belonging to another non-White or Asian race or ethnicity (7%). Over half were female (56%). Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 61 (M = 29.21, SD = 9.96).

Procedures and Measures

In order to verify that participants were eligible for the minority-restricted scholarship, participants first completed demographic measures. Those who reported being White or Asian were excluded from further participation. Participants then read descriptions of two scholarships (see Appendix A for scholarship descriptions). All participants read a description of a $5,000 scholarship with no eligibility restrictions and were randomly assigned to read a description of a $2,500 scholarship that either also had no eligibility restrictions or was restricted to members of underrepresented racial or ethnic minorities. Order of presentation of scholarships was counterbalanced. After reading the scholarship descriptions, participants were asked to recall the amount of each scholarship and who was eligible for the scholarship (i.e., anyone or only underrepresented minorities). If a participant answered one of these questions incorrectly the

scholarship description was presented again and the participant was given another chance to answer the question correctly. Participants were also asked whether they were personally eligible for each scholarship.

Participants then responded to two forced choice items asking which of the two scholarships they would choose to apply for if they could only apply for one and which of the two scholarships they would have the best chance of getting (on both items the $5,000 scholarship was scored as 0 and the $2,500 scholarship was scored as 1). Participants were also asked how likely they would be to apply for each scholarship, how likely they would be to apply for *both* scholarships, how likely they were to get each scholarship (all rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Very Unlikely* and *Very Likely*), and how competitive and prestigious they thought each scholarship was (both rated on a seven-point scale anchored at *Not At All* and *Extremely*).

In order to assess how important participants' racial or ethnic group membership was to their identity, participants indicated their agreement with the four-item Importance to Identity subscale of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). The items were "The racial/ethnic group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am"; "Overall, my race/ethnicity has very little to do with how I feel about myself" (reversed); "My race/ethnicity is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am" (reversed); and "In general, belonging to my race/ethnicity is an important part of my self image". The items were averaged so that higher scores indicate greater importance to identity (α = .75).[1]

[1] Participants also rated their similarity to other applicants and their agreement with the statement that each scholarship was "for people like me" but these items were not used because of ambiguity in how they may have been interpreted by participants (e.g. "people like me" could refer to other minorities but could also refer to others with similar GPA and other academic credentials)

Results

Manipulation Checks

Twenty-seven participants indicated that they were not eligible for one or both of the scholarships. Five other participants incorrectly recalled the amount of and/or incorrectly recalled who was eligible for at least one of the scholarships after being given a second chance to read the description. Subsequent analyses are reported omitting data from these participants.[2]

Dependent Variables

Applying and winning. When the smaller scholarship was not restricted, most participants (86.5%) chose the more lucrative scholarship. However, as hypothesized, when the smaller scholarship was restricted to people of color, significantly fewer (56.8%) chose the more lucrative scholarship, χ^2 (1, N = 163) = 18.16, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .33$. Fewer participants felt they had a better chance of getting the $5,000 scholarship when the smaller scholarship was restricted (14.9%) than when neither scholarship was restricted (41.6%), χ^2 (1, N = 163) = 13.87, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .29$. Participants in both conditions were equally likely to say they would apply for both scholarships, $t(1, 161) = 1.18$, $p > .05$. Choice of scholarship was moderately positively correlated with believing one had a better chance of receiving that scholarship in both conditions ($2,500 unrestricted: $r = .33$, $p < .01$; $2,500 restricted: $r = .37$, $p < .01$).[3]

To examine whether participants' likelihood of applying for the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was no main effect of scholarship amount, $F(1, 161) = 2.51$, $p > .05$, and no main effect of condition, $F(1, 161) = 1.60$, $p > .05$. However, there was an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 161)$

[2] While including these participants does not change the direction of results for the forced choice items, some of the conclusions drawn from analyses of the continuous items do differ. Results with these participants included can be found in Appendix C.
[3] Because of the large number of correlations examined, the critical alpha was set at .01 rather than .05 for all three studies.

= 5.35, p = .046, η_p^2 = .02. When both scholarships were unrestricted, participants were more likely to apply for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 6.00, SD = 1.44) than for the $2,500 one ($M$ = 5.54, SD = 1.58), F(1, 161) = 7.12, p = .008, η_p^2 = .04. But when the $2,500 scholarship was restricted, participants were equally likely to apply for it (M = 6.04, SD = 1.30) and for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.99, SD = 1.54), F(1, 161) = 0.08, p > .05.

To examine whether participants' perceived likelihood of getting the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating their likelihood of getting the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 4.72, SD = 1.63) higher than their likelihood of getting the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 4.07, SD = 1.8), F(1, 161) = 43.06, p < .001, η_p^2 = .21. There was no main effect of condition, F(1, 161) = 0.37, p > .05. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, F(1, 161) = 7.98, p = .005, η_p^2 = .05. Participants rated their likelihood of getting the $5,000 scholarship the same regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: M = 4.00, SD = 1.83; $2,500 not restricted: M = 4.13, SD = 1.88), F(1, 161) = 0.21, p > .05. However, participants rated their likelihood of getting the $2,500 scholarship as marginally higher when it was restricted (M = 4.96, SD = 1.42) than was it was not restricted (M = 4.52, SD = 1.77), F(1, 161) = 3.03, p = .08, η_p^2 = .02. Participants saw themselves as more likely to get the $2,500 scholarship than the $5,000 scholarship in both conditions (both ps <.01).

Prestige and competitiveness. To examine whether the scholarships differed in prestige, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.20, SD = 1.46) as more prestigious than the

$2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 4.50, SD = 1.50) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 161) = 62.21$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .28$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 161) = 0.98$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 161) = 0.54$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in competitiveness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 6.39, SD = 1.01) as more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 5.40, SD = 1.48), $F(1, 161) = 83.89$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .34$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 161) = 0.75$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 161) = 6.33$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. As expected, participants rated the $5,000 scholarship as equally competitive regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: M = 6.33, SD = 1.04; $2,500 not restricted: M = 6.46, SD = 0.98), $F(1, 161) = 0.70$, $p > .05$. However, participants rated the $2,500 scholarship as marginally *less* competitive when it was restricted (M = 5.18, SD = 1.44) than was it was not restricted (M = 5.60, SD = 1.49), $F(1, 161) = 3.31$, $p = .07$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. The $5,000 scholarship was rated as significantly more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship in both conditions (both ps <.001).

Potential Moderators

Importance of race/ethnicity to identity. Contrary to our hypothesis, the importance of participants' racial or ethnic group membership was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (both rs < .10, ps > .05). Further, among participants in the restricted condition, importance to identity was not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for the restricted scholarship (r = .17, p = .15). Participants whose racial or ethnic group membership was more important to their identity *did* rate themselves as more likely to get the smaller

scholarship when it was restricted, but this correlation fell short of significance under our more conservative alpha of .01 ($r = .29$, $p = .014$).

Discussion

When people of color are presented with the choice of two scholarships that do not limit eligibility based on demographics, they overwhelmingly chose the more lucrative award. However, when the smaller award was restricted to underrepresented minorities, the choice appears to have become a more difficult one. While a majority of participants still chose the more lucrative award, almost a third more chose the smaller award than did so when neither scholarship was restricted. Looking at the continuous measures of likelihood of applying reveals that, while participants were more likely to say they would apply for the more lucrative scholarship than the smaller scholarship when neither was restricted, when the smaller scholarship was restricted to underrepresented minorities, participants of color were equally likely to say they would apply for it and the more lucrative one.

Why might the restricted scholarship have held more appeal for our participants of color than an equivalent, unrestricted award? One possibility is that participants simply chose the scholarship they felt they had the better chance of getting. Indeed, participants thought they were somewhat more likely to get a restricted scholarship than an equivalent, unrestricted scholarship and also perceived the less lucrative scholarship to be marginally less competitive when it was restricted than when it was not. However, a majority of participants felt they had a better chance of getting the smaller scholarship than the more lucrative scholarship in both conditions, and yet a majority of participants in both conditions chose the more lucrative scholarship anyway.

We had hypothesized that the restricted scholarship might have more appeal for minorities whose racial or ethnic group membership was more important to them. However, we

found no relationship between the importance of one's ethnic identity and the likelihood one would apply for or choose the restricted scholarship, suggesting that participants who were more weakly identified were just as likely to apply for the restricted scholarship as those whose ethnic or racial identity mattered more to them.

In sum, Study 1 found evidence that (at least some) minorities find scholarships restricted to their group to have greater appeal than an unrestricted award that is worth twice as much money and which they perceive to be more prestigious. This means that, at least when minority students must choose between scholarships or have limited time and energy to apply for scholarships, the presence of less lucrative, restricted scholarships likely reduces the number of minorities applying for larger, unrestricted rewards. As a result, the proportion of minority students in the applicant pool for these unrestricted awards may be lower than it would be otherwise, making it less likely that members of underrepresented groups go on to win unrestricted awards.

Study 2

In Study 2, we examined whether women were also more likely to apply for a scholarship restricted to them than a more lucrative scholarship without demographic restrictions. We again examined whether the restricted scholarship was perceived as less competitive and prestigious than unrestricted awards.

Method

Participants

Ninety-six women participated in exchange for partial credit in a psychology course. After removing participants who failed the manipulation checks, 82 participants (M_{age} = 19.27,

SD = 1.01) remained. Of these, 57% were Asian, 29% were White, 7% were Latino, 1% was Black, and 5% reported another ethnicity.

Procedures and Measures

All participants read a description of a $5,000 scholarship with no eligibility restrictions and were randomly assigned to read a description of a $2,500 scholarship that either also had no eligibility restrictions or was restricted to women. Order of presentation of scholarships was counterbalanced. After reading the scholarship descriptions, participants were asked to recall the amount of each scholarship and whether they were personally eligible for each scholarship. Participants then responded to two forced choice items asking which of the two scholarships they would choose to apply for if they could only apply for one and which of the two scholarships they would have the best chance of getting (on both items the $5,000 scholarship was scored as 0 and the $2,500 scholarship was scored as 1). Participants were also asked how likely they would be to apply for each scholarship, how likely they would be to apply for *both* scholarships, how likely they were to get each scholarship (all rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Very Unlikely* and *Very Likely*), and how competitive and prestigious they thought each scholarship was (both rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Not At All* and *Extremely*).[4]

Results

Manipulation Checks

Three participants incorrectly recalled the amount of at least one of the scholarships. Fifteen participants responded that they were not eligible for one or both of the scholarships. Subsequent analyses are reported omitting data from these participants.[5]

[4]Participants also rated their similarity to other applicants and their agreement with the statement that each scholarship was "for people like me."
[5]Results with these participants included can be found in Appendix D.

Dependent Variables

Applying and winning. When the smaller scholarship was not restricted to women, over two thirds of women (73.7%) chose the more lucrative scholarship. However, as hypothesized, when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women, significantly fewer (36.4%) chose the more lucrative scholarship, χ^2 (1, N = 82) = 11.42, p = .001, φ = .37. The percentage of participants who felt they had a better chance of getting the less lucrative scholarship than the larger one did not differ between conditions, χ^2 (1, N = 82) = 1.53, p > .05. Participants in both conditions were equally likely to say they would apply for both scholarships, t(1, 80) = 1.12, p > .05. Choice of scholarship was strongly positively correlated with believing one had a better chance of receiving that scholarship when the $2,500 scholarship was restricted, r = .42, p = .005, but these items were not correlated when it was unrestricted, r = .28, p > .01.

To examine whether participants' likelihood of applying for the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was no main effect of scholarship amount, F(1, 80) = 0.55, p > .05. There was no main effect of condition, F(1, 80) = 1.11, p > .05. There was also no interaction between scholarship amount and condition, F(1, 80) = 1.33, p > .05.

To examine whether participants' perceived likelihood of getting the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating their likelihood of getting the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 3.59, SD = 1.28) higher than their likelihood of getting the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 3.02, SD = 1.27) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, F(1, 80) = 14.96, p < .001, η_p^2 = .16.

There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 80) = 1.80$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 80) = 0.05$, $p > .05$.

Prestige and competitiveness. To examine whether the scholarships differed in prestige, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.23$, $SD = 1.32$) as more prestigious than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 1.26$) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 80) = 34.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 80) < 0.01$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 80) = 0.08$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in competitiveness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 1.27$) as more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 5.37$, $SD = 1.36$), $F(1, 80) = 16.36$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .17$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 80) = 0.26$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 80) = 1.12$, $p > .05$.

Discussion

To an even greater degree than participants of color in Study 1, women gravitated to a scholarship that was limited to them over an unrestricted one worth twice as much money and perceived to be more prestigious. Whereas the majority of women chose the more lucrative award when neither scholarship had demographic restrictions, when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women the majority of our participants chose it over the larger award.

As in Study 1, even though in both conditions participants thought they had a better chance of getting the smaller award, they only chose the scholarship they thought they had a better change of getting when it was restricted. Unlike in Study 1, the scholarship that was restricted to women was not perceived to differ in competitiveness from an equivalent, unrestricted award. In both cases, the more lucrative scholarship was seen as more competitive, but when the smaller award was not restricted, women appeared more willing to compete. However, this was only true when women were forced to choose between the two scholarships. They rated themselves as equally likely to apply for both scholarships, regardless of whether the smaller was restricted or not. Thus, it may be that awards that are restricted to women only draw them away from competing for unrestricted awards when it is not possible for them to apply for both types of opportunities.

Neither Study 1 nor Study 2 can rule out that women and people of color may be making a choice based simply on the assumption that the applicant pool for restricted awards may be much smaller than the applicant pool for unrestricted awards. To address this, we control for the number of applicants in Study 3, as well as testing other potential reasons that restricted awards hold more appeal than more lucrative, unrestricted ones.

Study 3

In Study 3, we examined whether women were still more likely to apply for a scholarship restricted to women than a more lucrative, unrestricted scholarship even when the size of the applicant pool for both scholarships was held constant. Similar to Study 1, we examined whether women whose gender identity was more important to them were more likely to choose the restricted scholarship. We also examined a number of other potential contributors to women's choice, including whether applicants for the restricted scholarship were seen as lower in quality

and whether women who expect their gender to be the basis for discrimination in general are more likely to choose restricted awards. We also examined concerns about bias and stereotype threat in the selection process as well as the perceived fairness of the selection committee for both scholarships. Finally, we examined whether the restricted award makes women feel their identity is valued by the selection committee and whether this is correlated with their choice of the smaller, restricted award.

Method

Participants

One hundred women participated in exchange for partial credit in a psychology course. After removing participants who failed the manipulation checks, 85 participants (M_{age} = 19.99, *SD* = 1.16) remained. Of these, 63.5% were Asian, 29% were White, 3% were Latino, 1% was Black, and 3.5% reported another ethnicity.

Procedures and Measures

All participants read a description of a $5,000 scholarship with no eligibility restrictions and were randomly assigned to read a description of a $2,500 scholarship that either also had no eligibility restrictions or was restricted to women. Participants also read that both scholarships had received the same number of applicants the previous year and that the same number of winners would be selected for both scholarships. Order of presentation was counterbalanced. After reading the scholarship descriptions, participants were asked to recall the amount of each scholarship, who was eligible for the scholarship (i.e., both men and women or only women), the number of scholarships that would be given out, and the number of applicants each had the prior year. If a participant answered one of these questions incorrectly the scholarship description was

presented again and the participant was given another chance to answer the question correctly. Participants were also asked whether they were personally eligible for each scholarship.

Participants then responded to two forced choice items asking which of the two scholarships they would choose to apply for if they could only apply for one and which of the two scholarships they would have the best chance of getting (on both items the $5,000 scholarship was scored as 0 and the $2,500 scholarship was scored as 1). Participants were also asked how likely they would be to apply for each scholarship, how likely they would be to apply for *both* scholarships, how likely they were to get each scholarship (all rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Very Unlikely* and *Very Likely*), and how competitive and prestigious they thought each scholarship was (both rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Not At All* and *Extremely*).

Participants completed four items assessing their perceptions of the quality of other applicants for each scholarship. These items were: "How likely are applicants for Scholarship __ to get into graduate school?"; "How likely are applicants for Scholarship __ to receive other scholarships?"; "How likely are applicants for Scholarship __ to find a job after graduating?"; and "How likely are applicants for Scholarship __ to find a good job after graduating?" Items were averaged so that higher scores indicate applicants are perceived to be higher quality (all rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Very Unlikely* and *Very Likely;* $5,000 scholarship: α = .84; unrestricted $2,500 scholarship: α = .89; restricted $2,500 scholarship: α = .81). Participants were also asked to estimate the average GPA (on a 4.0 scale) and math and verbal SAT score (out of 800) of applicants for both scholarships. Math and verbal SAT scores were summed to create a total SAT score estimate.

Three items measured participants' concerns that the selection process for each scholarship might be biased against women. These items were: "How concerned would you be that you might not get Scholarship __ because of your gender?"; "How concerned would you be that the Scholarship __ selection committee might be less likely to select you because of your gender?"; and "How concerned would you be that the Scholarship __ selection committee might be biased in favor of applicants of another gender?" Items were averaged so that higher scores indicate greater fears about bias (all rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Very Unconcerned* and *Very Concerned;* $5,000 scholarship: $\alpha = .94$; unrestricted $2,500 scholarship: $\alpha = .95$; restricted $2,500 scholarship: $\alpha = .72$).

Participants completed one item asking for which scholarship they thought the selection process would be fairer for applicants. They could choose the $5,000 scholarship, the $2,500 scholarship, or respond that they thought the process would be equally fair for both. Participants also competed three items assessing the perceived fairness of *each* scholarship. These items were: "How would you rate the overall fairness of the judges for Scholarship __?"; "How much do you think recipients of Scholarship __ will be selected in an unfair or fair manner?"; and "How fair do you think the scholarship selection process for Scholarship __ will be for applicants?" Items were averaged so that higher scores indicate greater fairness (all rated on a seven-point scale anchored at *Very Unfair* and *Very Fair;* $5,000 scholarship: $\alpha = .89$; unrestricted $2,500 scholarship: $\alpha = .91$; restricted $2,500 scholarship: $\alpha = .84$).

Four items assessed the extent to which participants felt their identity was valued by the selection committee for each scholarship. These items were: "How much do you think you would be respected by the Scholarship __ selection committee?"; "How much do you think you would be valued by the Scholarship __ selection committee?"; "How much do you think your

identity would be valued by the Scholarship __ selection committee?"; and "How much do you think your gender identity would be valued by the Scholarship __ selection committee?" Items were averaged so that higher scores indicate greater valuing of identity (all rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Not at all* and *Very much;* $5,000 scholarship: α = .73; unrestricted $2,500 scholarship: α = .71; restricted $2,500 scholarship: α = .67).

To assess concerns about stereotype threat, or being judged on the basis of negative stereotypes of their group, participants rated their agreement with the statement "I worry that the Scholarship __ selection committee would draw conclusions about me based on what they think about my gender group" on a seven-point scale anchored at *Strongly Disagree* and *Strongly Agree.*[6]

We used two scales to measure the importance of participants' gender to their identity. Participants completed the four-item Importance to Identity subscale of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) used in Study 1, but modified to reflect their gender rather than their racial/ethnic group (e.g. "My gender is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am"). Items were averaged so that higher scores indicate greater importance to identity (all rated on seven-point scales anchored at *Strongly Disagree* and *Strongly Agree;* α = .78). Participants also completed the In-Group Identification scale (Leach et al., 2008), which includes subscales assessing five facets of in-group identification: 1) the centrality of one's in-group identity to their self concept (three items, α = .85), 2) feelings of solidarity with the in-group (three items, α = .76), 3) satisfaction with one's in-group (four items, α = .85), 4) self-stereotyping based on one's in-group (two items, r = .86), and 5) perceptions of in-group homogeneity (two items, r = .79).

[6] Participants also rated their agreement with the statement, "I worry that the Scholarship __ selection committee would draw conclusions about my gender group based on my application" but this item was weakly correlated with the other stereotype threat item for the $2,500 scholarship that was restricted to women (r = .45).

Finally, participants completed the 11-item Gender Based Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (London, Downey, Romero-Canyas, Rattan, & Tyson, 2012), which measures individual differences in women's tendency to anticipate facing exclusionary treatment based on their gender ($\alpha = .95$). Items were averaged so that higher scores indicate greater sensitivity to gender-based exclusionary treatment.[7]

Results

Manipulation Check

One participant incorrectly recalled who was eligible for one of the scholarships even after reading the description a second time. Fourteen participants responded that they were not personally eligible for one or both of the scholarships. Subsequent analyses are reported omitting data from these participants. [8]

Dependent Variables

Applying and winning. When the smaller scholarship was not restricted to women, a majority of women (72.1%) chose the more lucrative scholarship. However, as hypothesized, when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women, significantly fewer (33.3%) chose the more lucrative scholarship, $\chi^2 (1, N = 85) = 12.81$, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .39$. The percentage of participants who felt they had a better chance of getting the less lucrative scholarship did not differ between conditions ($2,500 not restricted: 79.1%; $2,500 restricted: 73.8%), $\chi^2 (1, N = 85) = 0.33$, $p > .05$. Participants in both conditions were equally likely to say they would apply for both scholarships, $t(1, 83) = 0.15$, $p > .05$. Choice of scholarship was strongly positively

[7] Participants also rated their similarity to other applicants, their agreement with the statement that each scholarship was "for people like me," and four items assessing perceptions that participants' gender would give them either an advantage or a *dis*advantage in applying for each scholarship. Results from some of these latter items suggested participants may have misunderstood the questions, and they did not hang together with one another or, in the case of the disadvantage question, with the concerns about bias items. Full text of these items can be found in Appendix B.

[8] Results with these participants included can be found in Appendix E.

correlated with believing one had a better chance of receiving that scholarship when the $2,500 scholarship was restricted, $r = .84$, $p = .001$, but these items were not correlated when the $2,500 scholarship was not restricted, $r = .19$, $p > .01$.

To examine whether participants' likelihood of applying for the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was no main effect of scholarship, $F(1, 83) = 0.46$, $p > .05$, nor was there a main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 0.66$, $p > .05$. However, there was an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 83) = 13.28$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .14$. Participants were equally likely to say they would apply for the $5,000 scholarship regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: $M = 4.88$, $SD = 1.66$; $2,500 not restricted: $M = 5.16$, $SD = 1.66$), $F(1, 83) = 0.61$, $p > .05$. However, participants were more likely to say they would apply for the $2,500 scholarship when it was restricted to women ($M = 5.52$, $SD = 1.27$) than was it was not restricted ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.86$), $F(1, 83) = 5.38$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. Furthermore, when neither scholarship was restricted, participants were more likely to say they would apply for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.16$, $SD = 1.66$) than for the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.86$), $F(1, 83) = 4.46$, $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. But, when the smaller scholarship was restricted, they were more likely to say they would apply for it ($M = 5.52$, $SD = 1.27$) than the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 1.66$), $F(1, 83) = 9.22$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$.

To examine whether participants' perceived likelihood of getting the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating their likelihood of getting the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.47$) higher than their likelihood of getting the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 1.40$),

$F(1, 82) = 9.46$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 82) = 0.12$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 82) = 0.15$, $p > .05$.

Prestige and competitiveness. To examine whether the scholarships differed in prestige, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 1.43$) as more prestigious than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 1.35$) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 83) = 16.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .17$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 0.12$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 83) = 10.06$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$. In the control condition, participants rated the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.23$, $SD = 1.49$) as more prestigious than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 1.39$), $F(1, 83) = 26.78$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .24$. However, when the $2,500 scholarship was restricted to women ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.28$), it did not differ in prestige from the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.36$), $F(1, 83) = 0.43$, $p > .05$. Participants rated the $5,000 scholarship as equally prestigious regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: $M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.36$; $2,500 not restricted: $M = 5.23$, $SD = 1.49$), $F(1, 83) = 0.55$, $p > .05$. The $2,500 scholarship was also rated as equally prestigious regardless of whether it was restricted to women ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.28$) or not ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 1.39$), $F(1, 83) = 2.06$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in competitiveness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 6.27$, $SD = 0.84$) as more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 5.76$, $SD = 0.96$), $F(1, 83) = 26.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .24$. There was no main

effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 0.40$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 83) = 2.98$, $p > .05$.

Potential Mediators

Quality of other applicants. To examine whether the other applicants for the restricted scholarships were seen as lower in quality than applicants for the unrestricted scholarships, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating applicants for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.73$, $SD = 0.96$) as higher quality than applicants for the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 5.41$, $SD = 0.98$) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 83) = 19.97$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 0.03$, $p > .05$, and no interaction between condition and scholarship amount, $F(1, 83) = 1.16$, $p > .05$.

We also conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA to examine whether applicants for the restricted scholarship were perceived to have lower grades than applicants for the unrestricted scholarships. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants estimating the average GPA of applicants for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.20$) to be higher than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.24$), $F(1, 83) = 37.03$ $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .31$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 0.20$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 83) = 8.15$, $p = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. However, examination of simple effects revealed that, although applicants for the $5,000 scholarship were estimated to have a slightly higher average GPA in the $2,500 restricted

condition and this pattern was reversed for the $2,500 scholarship, neither of these differences were significant (both Fs < 3.00, ps > .05).

Finally, we also conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA to examine whether applicants for the restricted scholarship were perceived to have lower SAT scores than applicants for the unrestricted scholarships. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants estimating the average SAT score of applicants for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 1348.76, SD = 133.39) to be higher than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 1307.33, SD = 141.06), $F(1, 83) = 18.17$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 1.17$, $p > .05$. However, there was an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 83) = 9.50$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$. When neither scholarship was restricted, applicants for the more lucrative scholarship were estimated to have higher SAT scores (M = 1378.40, SD = 115.85) than applicants for the smaller scholarship (M = 1307.60, SD = 126.07), $F(1, 83) = 27.29$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .25$. But when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women, applicants for it (M = 1307.05, SD = 156.47) were not estimated to have lower SAT scores than applicants for the more lucrative, unrestricted scholarship (M = 1318.43, SD = 133.39), $F(1, 83) = 0.69$ $p > .05$.

Concern about bias. To examine whether participants' concerns about encountering bias in the selection process were greater for the unrestricted scholarships, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants expressing lower concern about encountering bias in the selection process of the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 2.16, SD = 1.45) than the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 2.50, SD = 1.50), $F(1, 83) = 4.73$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 0.24$, $p > .05$.

However, there were an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 83) = 8.12$, $p = .006$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. Applicants' concerns about encountering bias did not differ between the two scholarships when both scholarships were unrestricted ($2,500: $M = 2.32$, $SD = 1.50$; $5,000: $M = 2.21$, $SD = 1.40$), $F(1, 83) = 0.23$, $p > .05$. But, in line with our hypotheses, when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women, applicants' concerns about encountering bias were lower for the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 1.99$, $SD = 1.40$) than for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.55$), $F(1, 83) = 12.48$, $p = .001$. Additionally, when the smaller scholarship was restricted, concerns about bias in the selection process for the $5,000 award were marginally higher ($M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.55$) than they were when the smaller scholarship was also unrestricted ($M = 2.21$, $SD = 1.40$), $F(1, 83) = 3.41$, $p = .07$.

However, contrary to our hypothesis, concerns about encountering bias in the selection process for the more lucrative scholarship were not correlated with choice of scholarship or the likelihood of applying for either scholarship in either condition (all rs < .25, ps > .01). Similarly, concerns about encountering bias were not correlated with perceived likelihood of receiving either scholarship (all rs < .25, ps > .01).

Concerns about stereotype threat. To examine whether participants' concerns about encountering stereotype threat were greater for the unrestricted scholarships, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was no main effect of scholarship amount, $F(1, 83) = 2.50$, $p > .05$. However, there was a main effect of condition, with participants who read about the restricted $2,500 scholarship reporting higher concerns about stereotype threat ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.01$) than participants who did not read about a restricted scholarship, ($M = 2.17$, $SD = 1.27$),

$F(1, 83) = 4.88$, $p = .03$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. There was no interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 83) = 2.92$, $p > .05$.

Contrary to our hypothesis, greater concern about stereotype threat in the selection process for either of the scholarships was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (all rs < .20, ps > .01). Further, concerns about being judged based on gender by either committee were not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for either scholarship (all rs < .25, ps > .01).

Fairness. The distribution of participants who said the scholarships were equally fair or that one was fairer than the other differed by condition, $\chi^2 (1, N = 85) = 6.43$, $p = .04$, $\varphi = .28$. Fewer participants said the selection process for the two scholarships would be equally fair when the $2,500 scholarship was restricted (47.6%), than when neither scholarship was restricted (74.4%), $p < .05$. However, the proportion of participants who said the selection process for the $5,000 scholarship would be more fair did not differ by condition ($2,500 unrestricted: 11.6%, $2,500 restricted: 23.8%), nor did the proportion who said the selection process for the $2,500 scholarship would be more fair ($2,500 unrestricted: 14.0%, $2,500 restricted: 28.6%), both ps > .05.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in perceived fairness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. Unexpectedly, there was no main effect of scholarship, $F(1, 83) = 1.10$, $p > .05$, no main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 2.59$, $p > .05$, and no interaction, $F(1, 83) = 0.05$, $p > .05$.

Contrary to our hypothesis, perceptions of fairness were not correlated with scholarship choice (all rs < .35, ps > .01) or with the likelihood of applying for either scholarship in either

condition (all *r*s < .15, *p*s > .01). Similarly, perceptions of fairness were not correlated with perceived likelihood of receiving either scholarship (all *r*s < .25, *p*s > .01).

Valuing identity. To examine whether participants felt their identity would be valued more by the selection committee of the restricted scholarship, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, such that participants felt their identity would be valued more by the selection committee for the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.03$) than by the selection committee for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.96$), $F(1, 83) = 17.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .17$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 83) = 2.82$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 83) = 23.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .22$. In the control condition, participants felt their identity would be valued equally by both selection committees ($2,500: $M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.97$; $5,000: $M = 4.25$, $SD = 1.01$), $F(1, 83) = 0.26$, $p > .05$. However, as hypothesized, when the smaller scholarship was restricted, participants felt their identity would be valued more by the selection committee for the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 0.96$) than the selection committee for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.91$), $F(1, 83) = 39.73$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .32$.

Although participants felt the selection committee for the restricted $2,500 scholarship would value their identity more, contrary to our hypothesis, feeling that a selection committee valued one's identity was not correlated with choosing that scholarship or with the likelihood of applying for that scholarship (all *r*s < .35, *p*s > .01). When the $2,500 scholarship was restricted, participants who felt a selection committee valued their identity *did* see themselves as more likely to get that scholarship ($5,000 scholarship: $r = .44$, $p = .003$; $2,500 scholarship: $r = .61$, p

< .001), but this was not the case when both scholarships were unrestricted (both *r*s < .30, *p* > .01).

Potential Moderators

Importance of gender to identity. Contrary to our hypothesis, the importance of participants' gender to their identity was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (both *r*s < .20, *p*s > .01). Further, among participants in the restricted condition, importance to identity was not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for the restricted scholarship ($r = -.02$, $p > .01$). Unlike in Study 1, participants whose gender identity was more important to them also did not rate themselves as more likely to get the smaller scholarship, (both *r*s <. 05, *p*s > .01). None of the In-Group Identification subscales correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition or with likelihood of applying for the smaller scholarship when it was restricted (all *r*s < .20, *p*s > .01).

Gender based rejection sensitivity. Contrary to our hypothesis, gender based rejection sensitivity was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (both *r*s < .25, *p*s > .01). Further, among participants in the restricted condition, it was not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for the restricted scholarship ($r = .09$, $p > .01$). Women higher in gender based rejection sensitivity also did not rate themselves as any less likely to get either of the unrestricted scholarships (all *r*s < .15, *p*s > .01).

Discussion

Once again, when neither scholarship was restricted, a majority of women chose the bigger scholarship. However, even though the number of applicants for both scholarships was held constant, when the less lucrative scholarship was restricted to women, the majority of women still chose it over the larger award. This suggests that the appeal of restricted awards is

not purely about the size of the applicant pool and students' assumptions about their odds of winning.

When neither scholarship was restricted, women were also more likely to apply for the more lucrative award than the smaller one. But this pattern was reversed when the smaller scholarship was restricted. As in Studies 1 and 2, even though participants in both conditions thought they were more likely to get the smaller award, they only chose the award they thought they were more likely to get—and that they rated as less competitive—when it was restricted to women. Unlike in the previous studies, however, women rated the $2,500 award as no less prestigious than the $5,000 award when the former was restricted, so while they opted to apply for a scholarship worth half as much money, in this case they were not sacrificing perceived prestige as well.

Once again, the evidence does not point to women choosing the restricted award because they saw the quality of the competition to be less imposing. The $5,000 scholarship was perceived to be more competitive than the smaller award regardless of condition, and the two $2,500 scholarships were seen as equally competitive. Moreover, applicants for the restricted $2,500 award were seen as no lower in quality and estimated to have no lower average GPAs than applicants for the unrestricted $2,500 award. And applicants for the restricted scholarship were estimated to have average SAT scores no lower than applicants for the larger award.

The appeal of restricted awards does not appear to be about the size or quality of the applicant pool, so what does explain it? As in Study 1, the importance of the identity the scholarship is restricted based on to one's self concept does not seem to matter. Nor do concerns about bias. Although the presence of a restricted award marginally increased concerns about bias in the selection process for the more lucrative award, these concerns were unrelated to

participants' choice and likelihood of applying for each scholarship. Similarly, women who chronically anticipate facing rejection because of their gender or who were concerned about being judged based on their gender weren't any more likely to choose the restricted award over the unrestricted award, any more likely to say they would apply for the restricted award, or any *less* likely to say they would apply for unrestricted award.

We also found no evidence that the appeal of restricted scholarships is related to perceptions of fairness. Women did not think the selection process would be any less fair for the unrestricted awards than for the restricted award. Additionally, although about a third of participants in the restricted condition did think the process would be fairer for the restricted award, perceptions of fairness were not related to choice or likelihood of applying for either scholarship. Finally, while participants clearly felt the selection committee for the restricted award would value their identity more than the selection committee for the unrestricted awards, this too did not seem to explain their decision to choose the smaller, restricted over a more lucrative, unrestricted award or their likelihood of applying for either award.

General Discussion

Across multiple studies, we found that scholarships that are restricted based on race or gender draw women and people of color away from more lucrative, unrestricted opportunities. But while it is clear from these studies that awards restricted to members of underrepresented groups appeal to those who are eligible for them, we still don't know why it is that restricted awards hold so much appeal.

One possibility we considered is whether their appeal was based on pragmatic considerations. However, it does not appear to be simply based on the assumption that the odds of winning restricted awards are better, as we find women choose a restricted award over a more

lucrative, unrestricted one even when the applicant pools for both opportunities are the same size. It also does not appear to be because other applicants for restricted awards are seen as lower in caliber and therefore easier to compete against.

We also examined the possibility that restricted scholarships are appealing because they offer reassurance that a marginalized identity will not be a disadvantage. However, we found no evidence that concerns about bias or fairness explained why participants chose a restricted award over a more lucrative, unrestricted one. Furthermore, restricted scholarships did not appear to hold more appeal for participants whose gender or ethnic identity was more important to them or women who are higher in gender-based rejection sensitivity.

Finally, we examined whether the appeal of restricted scholarships is based on making women and minorities feel their identity is valued. While women indeed felt that their identity was valued more by the selection committee of scholarships restricted to women, this perception was not related to their choices.

So why were our participants willing to settle for a scholarship that was worth half as much when it was restricted to a group they belonged to? One possibility is that their appeal is based on conveying a sense of belonging, which past research suggests is important for interest (Cheryan, Plaut, Davies, & Steele, 2009). On the other hand, perhaps it is less about perceptions of the restricted scholarship itself and more about the impact their presence has. For example, perhaps reminding women and people of color of their membership in a marginalized group makes them less ambitious or more risk-averse. Finally, though we looked at a variety of measures that got at how difficult participants thought it would be to win, we did not assess how difficult they thought it would be to apply. It may be that restricted scholarships seem easier to

apply for, as they provide a salient lens through which to frame one's experiences in application materials such as essays and personal statements.

Limitations and Future Directions

One limitation of the current work is that we asked participants what choice they *thought* they would make and to estimate how likely they would be to apply for fictional scholarships. We found the strongest effect when participants were forced to choose between the two scholarships, a choice that may not accurately reflect the reality that most students encounter when they are considering applying for aid. Moreover, participants may have limited insight into what they would actually do outside of the laboratory when real time and money are at stake. To remedy this limitation, in the future we plan to investigate what participants do when they are applying for actual scholarships, with an opportunity to win money but also in an environment in which entering to win requires time and effort on their part.

The current work also has yet to rule out possibility that this effect is not unique to underrepresented groups—opportunities restricted based on identities that are not marginalized may also hold appeal. Future work could examine whether, for example, men or people who play the violin also choose an opportunity based on that identity over a more lucrative, unrestricted one.

Implications

Our findings suggest that restricted scholarships present the greatest potential problem when students have to choose between restricted and unrestricted awards and when the unrestricted awards are more lucrative and/or seen as more prestigious. In these cases, women and students of color may be losing out on financial aid and aiming for opportunities that are perceived by others as less impressive.

Though our work has focused exclusively on the decisions that women and minorities make themselves, the effect we have uncovered may not be limited to students' own choices. Our findings may also be relevant when others make choices for students, for example when graduate advisors nominate students for fellowships or when undergraduate advisors choose which students to inform about certain opportunities.

In addition to drawing eligible individuals away from more lucrative opportunities, restricted awards and scholarships may present other potential problems as well. The very presence of these restricted opportunities may make people less likely to notice and see as problematic inequality in unrestricted awards and scholarships (Brady, Kaiser, Major, & Kirby, 2014; Kaiser et al., 2013; Lincoln et al., 2012). These restricted opportunities may also marginalize the contributions and achievements of women and people of color (Lincoln et al. 2012).

However, we do not mean to suggest that restricted opportunities should be eliminated. In spite of their potential problems, these awards have clear benefits. Instead, to counter the potential problems stemming from the availability of these opportunities, it is important to raise awareness of these drawbacks and to work to make restricted awards no less valued and no less valuable than unrestricted awards. Finally, when applying for both types of awards is allowed and feasible, it is important to urge students who are eligible to aim for both types of opportunities, rather than encouraging them to settle for less.

References

Bielby, W. T. (2000). Minimizing workplace gender and racial bias. *Contemporary Sociology*, 120-129.

Brady, L. M., Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., & Kirby, T. A. (2014). It's fair for us: Diversity structures cause women to legitimize discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Cheryan, S., Plaut, V. C., Davies, P. G., & Steele, C. M. (2009). Ambient belonging: How stereotypical cues impact gender participation in computer science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(6), 1045-1060. doi: 10.1037/a0016239

Davies, P. G., Spencer, S. J., & Steele, C. M. (2005). Clearing the air: Identity safety moderates the effects of stereotype threat on women's leadership aspirations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(2), 276.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 878.

Frey, B. S. (2006). Giving and receiving awards. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1*(4), 377-388.

General Accounting Office. (1994). *Higher education: Information on minority-targeted scholarships*. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office.

Hill, C., Corbett, C., & St. Rose, A. (2010). *Why So Few? Women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*: ERIC.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society, 47*(2), 263-291.

Kaiser, C. R., Major, B., Jurcevic, I., Dover, T. L., Brady, L. M., & Shapiro, J. R. (2013). Presumed fair: Ironic effects of organizational diversity structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*(3), 504.

Kantrowitz, M. (2011). *The distribution of grants and scholarships by race*. Retrieved from http://www.finaid.org/scholarships/20110902racescholarships.pdf

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., . . . Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(1), 144.

Lincoln, A., Pincus, S., Koster, J., & Leboy, P. (2012). The Matilda effect in science: Awards and prizes in the United States, 1990s and 2000s. *Social Studies of Science*, 307-320.

London, B., Downey, G., Romero-Canyas, R., Rattan, A., & Tyson, D. (2012). Gender-based rejection sensitivity and academic self-silencing in women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(5), 961.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*(3), 302-318.

Mendoza-Denton, R., Shaw-Taylor, L., Chen, S., & Chang, E. (2009). Ironic effects of explicit gender prejudice on women's test performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(1), 275-278.

Nora, A., Barlow, L., & Crisp, G. (2006). Examining the tangible and psychosocial benefits of financial aid with student access, engagement, and degree attainment. *American Behavioral Scientist, 49*(12), 1636-1651.

Pew Research Center. (2013). The Rise of Asian Americans. Washington, D.C.

Plaut, V. C., Thomas, K. M., & Goren, M. J. (2009). Is multiculturalism or color blindness better for minorities? *Psychological Science, 20*(4), 444-446.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., Steele, C. M., Davies, P. G., Ditlmann, R., & Crosby, J. R. (2008). Social identity contingencies: How diversity cues signal threat or safety for African Americans in mainstream institutions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(4), 615.

Salcedo, R. H. (2012). *Third party scholarships and the students who receive them: Increasing opportunity or perpetuating inequality?* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Arizona. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10150/228176

Scott, J. (2000). Rational choice theory. In G. Browning, A. Halcli & F. Webster (Eds.), *Understanding contemporary society: Theories of the present* (pp. 126-139). London: SAGE Publications.

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(5), 1079.

Trope, Y., Liberman, N., & Wakslak, C. (2007). Construal levels and psychological distance: Effects on representation, prediction, evaluation, and behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Consumer Psychology, 17*(2), 83.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science, 211*(4481), 453-458.

University of Washington Office of Merit Scholarships Fellowships & Awards. General Scholarship Search. Retrieved December 12, 2014, from http://expd.washington.edu/scholarships/search

Wout, D. A., Shih, M. J., Jackson, J. S., & Sellers, R. M. (2009). Targets as perceivers: How people determine when they will be negatively stereotyped. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(2), 349.

Table 1. *Study 1 Means and Standard Deviations (N = 163)*

	Condition	***Mean***	***SD***
Likely Apply $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	6.00	1.44
	$2,500 Restricted	5.99	1.54
Likely Apply $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.54	1.58
	$2,500 Restricted	6.04	1.30
Likely Apply Both	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.82	1.46
	$2,500 Restricted	6.08	1.33
Likely Get $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.13	1.88
	$2,500 Restricted	4.00	1.83
Likely Get $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.52	1.77
	$2,500 Restricted	4.96	1.42
Competitive $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	6.33	1.04
	$2,500 Restricted	6.46	0.98
Competitive $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.60	1.49
	$2,500 Restricted	5.18	1.44
Prestige $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.12	1.57
	$2,500 Restricted	5.28	1.33
Prestige $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.38	1.61
	$2,500 Restricted	4.65	1.40

Table 2. *Study 1 Correlations, $2,500 Unrestricted Condition (N = 89)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Choice (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	--										
2. Best Chance (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	.33**	--									
3. Likely Apply $5,000	-.30**	-.29**	--								
4. Likely Apply $2,500	.14	.07	.47**	--							
5. Likely Apply Both	-.09	-.23*	.65**	.51**	--						
6. Likely Get $5,000	-.29**	-.58**	.34**	.03	.37**	--					
7. Likely Get $2,500	-.15	-.41**	.33**	.12	.50**	.88**	--				
8. Competitive $5,000	-.06	-.13	.32**	.12	.21*	.06	.06	--			
9. Competitive $2,500	.06	-.09	.14	.33**	.18	-.05	-.08	.53**	--		
10. Prestige $5,000	.07	-.02	.17	.34**	-.01	-.01	.00	.25*	.19	--	
11. Prestige $2,500	.22*	-.08	.12	.41**	.11	.03	.07	.15	.20	.78**	--
12. CSE Identity	.03	-.08	.00	-.02	.12	.17	.21	.18	.09	.05	.01

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.

Table 3. *Study 1 Correlations, $2,500 Restricted Condition (N = 74)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Choice (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	--										
2. Best Chance (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	.37**	--									
3. Likely Apply $5,000	-.42**	-.10	--								
4. Likely Apply $2,500	.10	.07	.29*	--							
5. Likely Apply Both	-.30**	-.03	.80**	.39**	--						
6. Likely Get $5,000	-.36**	-.34**	.42**	.02	.38**	--					
7. Likely Get $2,500	-.05	-.07	.26*	.50**	.33**	.51**	--				
8. Competitive $5,000	-.08	.12	.35**	.28*	.37**	.03	.09	--			
9. Competitive $2,500	-.15	-.16	.27*	.33**	.28*	.24*	.09	.26*	--		
10. Prestige $5,000	-.08	-.14	.21	.10	.13	.21	.00	.32**	.45**	--	
11. Prestige $2,500	-.10	-.19	.15	.23	.12	.30*	.23*	.14	.57**	.62**	--
12. CSE Identity	-.03	.05	.11	.17	.17	.06	.29*	.03	.06	-.15	-.02

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.

Table 4. *Study 2 Means and Standard Deviations (N = 82)*

	Condition	***Mean***	***SD***
Likely Apply $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.89	2.02
	$2,500 Restricted	5.02	1.65
Likely Apply $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.82	1.75
	$2,500 Restricted	5.39	1.48
Likely Apply Both	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.08	2.25
	$2,500 Restricted	4.57	1.70
Likely Get $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	2.87	1.28
	$2,500 Restricted	3.16	1.26
Likely Get $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	3.39	1.28
	$2,500 Restricted	3.75	1.26
Competitive $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	6.16	1.13
	$2,500 Restricted	5.86	1.37
Competitive $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.34	1.38
	$2,500 Restricted	5.39	1.35
Prestige $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.21	1.60
	$2,500 Restricted	5.25	1.04
Prestige $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.45	1.50
	$2,500 Restricted	4.41	1.02

Table 5. *Study 2 Correlations, $2,500 Unrestricted Condition (N = 38)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Choice (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	--									
2. Best Chance (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	.28	--								
3. Likely Apply $5,000	-.33*	-.09	--							
4. Likely Apply $2,500	.10	.03	.65**	--						
5. Likely Apply Both	-.35*	-.23	.74**	.56**	--					
6. Likely Get $5,000	.02	-.16	.29	.44**	.22	--				
7. Likely Get $2,500	.24	.09	.30	.48**	.34*	.30	--			
8. Competitive $5,000	.08	.13	.20	.25	.18	-.21	-.08	--		
9. Competitive $2,500	.20	.12	.10	.23	.18	-.07	-.06	.35*	--	
10. Prestige $5,000	.19	-.07	.18	.33*	.21	-.04	.12	.52**	-.02	--
11. Prestige $2,500	.18	-.09	-.05	.25	.21	-.04	.06	.23	.21	.63**

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.

Table 6. *Study 2 Correlations, $2,500 Restricted Condition (N = 44)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Choice (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	--									
2. Best Chance (0 = $5,000, 1 = $2,500)	.42**	--								
3. Likely Apply $5,000	-.08	.10	--							
4. Likely Apply $2,500	.36*	.19	.31*	--						
5. Likely Apply Both	.12	.20	.71**	.34*	--					
6. Likely Get $5,000	.06	-.02	.41**	.04	.49**	--				
7. Likely Get $2,500	.27	.13	.37*	.19	.38*	.63**	--			
8. Competitive $5,000	.06	.09	-.02	.24	-.02	-.22	-.06	--		
9. Competitive $2,500	.15	.03	.07	.30	.21	.00	-.12	.44**	--	
10. Prestige $5,000	.05	.00	.02	.22	-.08	-.14	-.02	.30*	.16	--
11. Prestige $2,500	.03	-.03	-.05	.23	.01	-.03	.17	.22	.27	.41**

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
.

Table 7. *Study 3 Means and Standard Deviations (N = 85)*

	Condition	***Mean***	***SD***
Likely Apply $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.16	1.66
	$2,500 Restricted	4.88	1.66
Likely Apply $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.72	1.86
	$2,500 Restricted	5.52	1.27
Likely Apply Both	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.70	2.05
	$2,500 Restricted	4.76	1.95
Likely Get $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	3.05	1.27
	$2,500 Restricted	3.00	1.53
Likely Get $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	3.51	1.49
	$2,500 Restricted	3.33	1.48
Competitive $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	6.30	0.77
	$2,500 Restricted	6.24	0.91
Competitive $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.63	1.00
	$2,500 Restricted	5.90	0.91
Prestige $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.23	1.49
	$2,500 Restricted	5.00	1.36
Prestige $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.49	1.39
	$2,500 Restricted	4.90	1.28
Applicant Quality $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.75	0.96
	$2,500 Restricted	5.71	0.97
Applicant Quality $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.36	1.00
	$2,500 Restricted	5.47	0.97
GPA $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	3.72	0.17
	$2,500 Restricted	3.65	0.23
GPA $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	3.56	0.23
	$2,500 Restricted	3.59	0.26
SAT $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	1378.40	115.85
	$2,500 Restricted	1318.43	144.35
SAT $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	1307.60	126.07
	$2,500 Restricted	1307.05	156.47
Bias $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	2.21	1.40
	$2,500 Restricted	2.80	1.55
Bias $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	2.32	1.50
	$2,500 Restricted	1.99	1.40
Fairness $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	5.02	1.15
	$2,500 Restricted	4.70	1.20
Fairness $2,500	$2,500 Restricted	5.16	1.03
	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.79	1.01
Value Identity $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.25	1.01
	$2,500 Restricted	4.18	0.91
Value Identity $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	4.19	0.97
	$2,500 Restricted	4.91	0.96
Stereotype Threat $5,000	$2,500 Unrestricted	2.16	1.33
	$2,500 Restricted	3.02	1.50
Stereotype Threat $2,500	$2,500 Unrestricted	2.19	1.35
	$2,500 Restricted	2.43	1.55

Table 8. *Study 3 Correlations, $2,500 Unrestricted Condition (N = 42)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
1. Choice (0 = $5k, 1 = $2.5k)	--																									
2. Best Chance (0 = $5k. 1 = $2.5k)	.19	--																								
3. Likely Apply $5k	-.16	-.09	--																							
4. Likely Apply $2.5k	.04	.05	.62**	--																						
5. Likely Apply Both	-.19	.06	.57**	.78**	--																					
6. Likely Get $5k	-.19	-.12	.32*	.44**	.32*	--																				
7. Likely Get $2.5k	.07	.02	.28	.46**	.31*	.74**	--																			
8. Competitive $5k	-.11	.05	.15	.21	.18	-.07	-.16	--																		
9. Competitive $2.5k	-.08	-.02	-.03	.15	.11	.03	-.35*	.40**	--																	
10. Prestige $5k	.04	-.07	.12	.15	.17	-.29	-.18	.47**	.20	--																
11. Prestige $2.5k	.16	-.03	.07	.23	.12	-.27	-.23	.50**	.46**	.80**	--															
12. App. Qual $5k	.14	.03	-.25	.09	.01	.10	.03	.34*	.41**	.03	.23	--														
13. App. Qual $2.5k	-.14	.07	-.18	.10	.20	-.03	-.18	.32*	.38*	.12	.22	.75**	--													
14. GPA $5k	.06	.16	-.05	.16	-.01	.17	.26	.14	-.12	-.09	-.08	.26	.32*	--												
15. GPA $2.5k	-.05	-.01	.12	.22	.14	.11	.03	.28	.06	.04	.08	.17	.36*	.79**	--											
16. SAT $5k	-.02	.07	-.05	.11	.04	.04	.14	.31*	-.05	-.05	-.08	.42**	.43**	.75**	.57**	--										
17. SAT $2.5k	-.07	.08	-.05	.06	.08	-.06	.04	.27	.01	.08	.03	.32*	.44**	.63**	.60**	.87**	--									
18. Bias $5k	-.14	-.10	.12	.08	.05	.05	.19	.13	-.05	.09	.02	.04	-.15	-.15	-.24	-.03	-.09	--								
19. Bias $2.5k	-.13	-.12	.08	.02	-.03	-.05	.14	.07	-.13	.02	-.07	-.02	-.19	-.15	-.24	-.06	-.12	.94**	--							
20. Fairness $5k	.34*	.08	-.07	.13	-.05	.08	.04	-.07	.07	-.21	-.05	.26	.25	.39**	.30	.27	.20	-.48**	-.39**	--						
21. Fairness $2.5k	.19	-.09	-.05	.12	-.04	.22	.07	.04	.15	-.21	.02	.20	.19	.29	.28	.29	.20	-.50**	-.46**	.82**	--					
22. Value ID $5k	.09	-.06	.04	.10	.03	.25	.06	-.01	.17	-.35*	-.29	.02	.00	.14	.10	.09	-.07	-.20	-.13	.375*	.56**	--				
23. Value ID$2.5k	.31*	.00	.12	.24	.16	.16	.16	.00	.06	-.16	-.12	-.01	-.09	.07	.13	-.04	-.17	-.26	-.16	.38*	.49**	.76**	--			
24. Ster. Threat $5k	-.12	-.15	.12	.13	.16	.11	.16	.07	.03	.04	.06	.07	-.13	-.23	-.34*	-.06	-.13	.78**	.70**	-.44**	-.40**	-.13	-.26	--		
25. Ster. Threat $2.5k	-.09	-.14	.21	.20	.22	.28	.36*	.06	-.04	.01	-.06	.13	-.13	.02	-.18	.03	-.10	.75**	.67**	-.26	-.31*	-.01	-.08	.81**	--	
26. CSE Identity	.16	.02	.14	.16	.10	-.04	.03	.15	.06	.19	.21	-.19	.00	-.05	-.06	-.14	-.16	-.17	-.16	.15	.13	.18	.23	-.17	-.10	--
27. Gender RS	-.22	-.44**	.342*	.10	-.03	.11	-.02	-.03	.25	-.03	.02	-.14	-.21	-.26	-.06	-.26	-.26	.26	.28	-.26	-.22	-.01	-.08	.19	.14	-.02

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 9. *Study 3 Correlations, $2,500 Restricted Condition (N = 43)*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
1. Choice (0 = $5k, 1 = $2.5k)	--																									
2. Best Chance (0 = $5k. 1 = $2.5k)	.84**	--																								
3. Likely Apply $5k	-.14	.02	--																							
4. Likely Apply $2.5k	.01	.21	.71**	--																						
5. Likely Apply Both	-.09	.04	.84**	.72**	--																					
6. Likely Get $5k	-.41**	-.29	.61**	.44**	.63**	--																				
7. Likely Get $2.5k	-.15	-.09	.58**	.46**	.57**	.66**	--																			
8. Competitive $5k	.25	-.02	-.13	.04	-.09	-.19	-.01	--																		
9. Competitive $2.5k	.09	-.12	-.07	-.13	-.07	-.05	-.23	.59**	--																	
10. Prestige $5k	.04	-.20	.21	.20	.26	.22	.10	.46**	.57**	--																
11. Prestige $2.5k	.03	-.09	.29	.20	.31*	.25	.16	.42**	.56**	.74**	--															
12. App. Qual $5k	.27	.14	.15	.19	.15	.14	.09	.36*	.49**	.37*	.55**	--														
13. App. Qual $2.5k	.27	.08	.09	.08	.12	.05	.05	.38*	.52**	.37*	.41**	.81**	--													
14. GPA $5k	.30	.12	-.09	-.07	-.02	-.22	-.21	.28	.30	.09	.05	.35*	.56**	--												
15. GPA $2.5k	.19	.10	-.29	-.29	-.26	-.25	-.342*	.17	.26	-.20	-.20	.12	.34*	.73**	--											
16. SAT $5k	.24	.16	-.11	-.11	-.15	-.18	-.13	.23	.36*	.12	.18	.38*	.42**	.60**	.41**	--										
17. SAT $2.5k	.23	.14	-.37*	-.36*	-.42**	-.26	-.19	.15	.21	-.21	-.15	.15	.28	.45**	.68**	.74**	--									
18. Bias $5k	-.22	-.07	.18	.11	.16	.24	.14	-.18	-.14	-.09	-.08	-.23	-.33*	-.52**	-.31*	-.47**	-.24	--								
19. Bias $2.5k	.01	.15	.04	.03	.00	-.20	-.18	-.29	-.23	-.34*	-.28	-.06	-.08	.15	.14	.09	.10	.05	--							
20. Fairness $5k	-.09	-.15	.06	-.10	-.11	.03	.04	.06	.14	-.03	.13	.37*	.27	.39*	.23	.48**	.25	-.55**	.01	--						
21. Fairness $2.5k	-.13	-.16	.08	-.13	.01	.20	.22	.09	.33*	.25	.44**	.28	.27	.02	-.03	.32*	.12	-.24	-.27	.44**	--					
22. Value ID $5k	.03	-.05	.30	.21	.32*	.44**	.42**	.11	.07	.23	.43**	.43**	.30	.01	-.03	-.02	-.04	.08	.06	.09	.24	--				
23. Value ID$2.5k	-.05	.00	.35*	.31*	.32*	.51**	.61**	.16	.09	.21	.42**	.28	.16	-.12	-.27	.09	-.10	-.01	-.12	.16	.52**	.62**	--			
24. Ster. Threat $5k	-.20	-.14	.18	.10	.16	.34*	.12	-.13	.08	.12	.09	-.07	-.12	-.53**	-.23	-.49**	-.25	.78**	-.10	-.48**	-.10	.13	.08	--		
25. Ster. Threat $2.5k	.00	-.01	-.22	-.12	-.26	-.09	.03	-.18	-.20	-.50**	-.37*	.15	.03	.15	.17	.06	.31*	.03	.33*	.23	-.28	.19	-.02	-.09	--	
26. CSE Identity	-.06	-.11	.13	-.02	.10	.12	.00	.28	.43**	.27	.18	.25	.37*	.30	.13	.12	.00	-.07	-.08	.14	.310*	.01	.13	-.06	-.12	--
27. Gender RS	-.16	.06	.17	.09	.20	-.02	.18	-.32*	-.27	-.16	-.28	-.28	-.22	-.16	-.18	-.17	-.16	.18	.37*	-.20	-.18	-.16	-.19	.03	.01	-.05

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Appendix A

Scholarship Descriptions, Study 1

Scholarship F (Unrestricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to anyone.
What: This award provides each recipient with a scholarship of $5,000.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational/career goals and how you would benefit from this scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Scholarship J (Unrestricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to anyone.
What: This award provides each recipient with a scholarship of $2,500.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational/career goals and how you would benefit from this scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Scholarship J (Restricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to members of an underrepresented ethnic or racial minority.
What: This award provides each recipient with a scholarship of $2,500.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational/career goals and how you would benefit from this scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Scholarship Descriptions, Study 2

Andrews Scholarship (Unrestricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.
What: This award provides each recipient with a scholarship of $5,000.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational goals and how you would benefit from an Andrews Scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Dorsey Scholarship (Unrestricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.
What: This award provides each recipient with a scholarship of $2,500.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational goals and how you would benefit from a Dorsey Scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Dorsey Scholarship (Restricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to women who are freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.
What: This award provides each recipient with a scholarship of $2,500.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational goals and how you would benefit from a Dorsey Scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Scholarship Descriptions, Study 3

Scholarship F (Unrestricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.
What: Four students will be selected to receive this award, which provides each recipient with a scholarship of $5,000.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need. Last year about 400 students applied.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational goals and how you would benefit from this scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Scholarship J (Unrestricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.
What: Four students will be selected to receive this award, which provides each recipient with a scholarship of $2,500.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need. Last year about 400 students applied.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational goals and how you would benefit from this scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Scholarship J (Restricted)
Who: This scholarship is available to women who are freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.
What: Four students will be selected to receive this award, which provides each recipient with a scholarship of $2,500.
How: Recipients are selected on the basis of scholastic achievement, leadership activities, community service and financial need. Last year about 400 students applied.
To Apply: With your application you will need to submit a 500-word essay in which you describe your educational goals and how you would benefit from this scholarship. Applicants are also encouraged to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

Appendix B

Study 1 Omitted Questions

- How similar do you think you are to other applicants for Scholarship __?
- Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: Scholarship __ is for people like me.

Study 2 Omitted Questions

- How similar do you think you are to other applicants for the ___ Scholarship?
- Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: The ____ Scholarship is for people like me.

Study 3 Omitted Questions

- How similar do you think you are to other applicants for Scholarship __?
- Please rate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statement: Scholarship __ is for people like me.
- How much do you think your gender would be seen as a positive by the Scholarship __ selection committee?
- How much do you think your experiences as a woman would set you apart from other applicants for Scholarship __?
- How much do you think your gender would give you a competitive advantage in applying for Scholarship __?
- How much do you think your gender would be a disadvantage in applying for Scholarship __?
- I worry that the Scholarship __ selection committee would draw conclusions about my gender group based on my application.

Appendix C

Study 1 results for all participants, including those who failed the manipulation checks, are reported below.

Dependent Variables

Applying and winning. Fewer participants chose the $5,000 scholarship when the smaller scholarship was restricted to minorities (60%) than when neither scholarship was targeted (85%), χ^2 (1, N = 195) = 16.35, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .29$. Fewer participants felt they had a better chance of getting the $5,000 scholarship when the smaller scholarship was restricted to minorities (24%) than when neither scholarship was targeted (40%), χ^2 (1, N = 195) = 5.61, $p = .02$, $\varphi = .17$. Participants in both conditions were equally likely to say they would apply for both scholarships, $t(1, 193) = 0.85$, $p > .05$. Choice of scholarship was moderately positively correlated with believing one had a better chance of receiving that scholarship in both conditions ($2,500 unrestricted: $r = .34$, $p < .01$; $2,500 restricted: $r = .46$, $p > .01$).

To examine whether participants' likelihood of applying for the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. Participants were more likely to say they would apply for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.93, SD = 1.53) than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 5.52, SD = 1.72) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 193) = 9.04$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 193) = 0.14$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction between scholarships amount and condition, $F(1, 193) = 0.01$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether participants' perceived likelihood of getting the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating their likelihood of getting the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 4.64, SD = 1.69) higher than their likelihood of getting the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 4.13, SD = 1.87) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 193) = 24.43$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 193) = 0.32$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 193) = 1.25$, $p > .05$.

Prestige and competitiveness. To examine whether the scholarships differed in prestige, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.09, SD = 1.52) as more prestigious than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 4.50, SD = 1.51) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 193) = 44.37$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 193) = 1.42$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 193) = 1.34$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in competitiveness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 6.28, SD = 1.17) as more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 5.32, SD = 1.50), $F(1, 193) = 78.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .29$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 193) = 1.75$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 193) = 6.94$, $p = .009$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. As expected, participants rated the $5,000 scholarship as equally competitive regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: M = 6.33, SD = 1.16; $2,500 not restricted: M = 6.24, SD = 1.19), $F(1, 193) =$

0.24, $p > .05$. However, participants rated the $2,500 scholarship as *less* competitive when it was restricted to minorities ($M = 5.05$, $SD = 1.48$) than was it was not restricted ($M = 5.55$, $SD = 1.49$), $F(1, 193) = 5.51$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. The $5,000 scholarships was rated as significantly more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship in both conditions (both ps <.001).

Potential Moderators

Importance of race/ethnicity to identity. The importance of participants' racial or ethnic group membership was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (both rs <.10, ps > .05). Further, among participants in the restricted condition, importance to identity was not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for the restricted scholarship ($r = .13$, $p = .21$). Participants whose racial or ethnic group membership was more important to their identity did rate themselves as more likely to get the smaller scholarship when it was restricted ($r = .29$, $p = .005$).

Appendix D

Study 2 results for all participants, including those who failed the manipulation checks, are reported below.

Dependent Variables

Applying and winning. Fewer participants chose the $5,000 scholarship when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women (33.3%) than when neither scholarship was restricted (71.4%), χ^2 (1, N = 100) = 14.53, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .38$. The percentage of participants who felt they had a better chance of getting the smaller scholarship did not differ between conditions, χ^2 (1, N = 100) = 1.70, $p > .05$. Participants in both conditions were equally likely to say they would apply for both scholarships, $t(1, 98) = 1.53$, $p > .05$. Choice of scholarship was strongly positively correlated with believing one had a better chance of receiving that scholarship in the restricted condition, $r = .41$, $p = .003$, but these items were not correlated in the unrestricted condition, $r = .16$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether participants' likelihood of applying for the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was no main effect of scholarship amount, $F(1, 98) = 0.57$, $p > .05$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 2.16$, $p > .05$. However, there was a significant interaction between scholarships amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 4.00$, $p = .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. When both scholarships were unrestricted, participants were equally likely to apply for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.92$) and for the $2,500 one ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 1.78$), $F(1, 98) = 0.76$, $p > .05$. But when the $2,500 scholarship was restricted to women, participants were marginally more likely to apply for it ($M = 5.22$, $SD = 1.64$) than for the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 1.73$), $F(1, 98) = 3.87$, $p = .052$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Participants in both conditions were equally likely to say they would apply for the $5,000 scholarship ($2,500 restricted: $M = 4.76$, $SD = 1.73$; $2,500 not restricted: $M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.91$), $F(1, 98) = 0.13$, $p > .05$. However, participants were more likely to apply for the $2,500 scholarship when it was restricted to women ($M = 5.22$, $SD = 1.64$) than was it was not restricted ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 1.78$), $F(1, 98) = 5.29$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$.

To examine whether participants' perceived likelihood of getting the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating their likelihood of getting the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.36$) higher than their likelihood of getting the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.24$) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 98) = 16.70$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .15$. There was a marginal main effect of condition, with participants more likely to think they would get both scholarships when one was restricted to women ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 1.59$) than when neither was restricted ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.55$), $F(1, 98) = 9.35$, $p = .054$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. There was no interaction, $F(1, 98) = 0.69$, $p > .05$.

Prestige and competitiveness. To examine whether the scholarships differed in prestige, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.16$, $SD = 1.34$) as more prestigious than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.25$) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was

restricted, $F(1, 98) = 41.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.01$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 98) = 0.60$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in competitiveness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M = 5.97$, $SD = 1.29$) as more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship ($M = 5.29$, $SD = 1.43$), $F(1, 98) = 20.82$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.01$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 98) = 1.67$, $p > .05$.

Appendix E

Study 3 results for all participants, including those who failed the manipulation checks, are reported below.

Dependent Variables

Applying and winning. Fewer women chose the $5,000 scholarship when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women (32%) than when neither scholarship was restricted (74%), χ^2 (1, N = 100) = 17.70, $p < .001$, $\varphi = .42$. The percentage of participants who felt they had a better chance of getting the smaller scholarship did not differ between conditions, χ^2 (1, N = 100) = 0.00, $p > .05$. Participants in both conditions were equally likely to say they would apply for both scholarships, $t(1, 98) = 0.94$, $p > .05$. Choice of scholarship was strongly positively correlated with believing one had a better chance of receiving that scholarship in the restricted condition, $r = .86$, $p = .001$, but these items were not correlated in the unrestricted condition, $r = .14$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether participants' likelihood of applying for the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. The main effect of scholarship amount was non-significant, $F(1, 98) = 1.61$, $p > .05$, as was the main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 2.95$, $p > .05$. However, there were an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 15.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .14$. As expected, participants were equally likely to say they would apply for the $5,000 scholarship regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: M = 4.86, SD = 1.85; $2,500 not restricted: M = 4.86, SD = 1.67), $F(1, 98) = 0.00$, $p > .05$. However, participants were more likely to say they would apply for the $2,500 scholarship when it was restricted to women (M = 5.56, SD = 1.22) than was it was not restricted (M = 4.50, SD = 1.91), $F(1, 98) = 10.98$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$. Furthermore, participants were equally likely to say they would apply for the two scholarships when neither was restricted ($5,000: M = 4.86, SD = 1.67; $2,500: M = 4.50, SD = 1.91), $F(1, 98) = 3.61$, $p > .05$. But, when the smaller scholarship was restricted, they were more likely to say they would apply for it (M = 5.56, SD = 1.22) than the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 4.86, SD = 1.85), $F(1, 98) = 13.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$.

To examine whether participants' perceived likelihood of getting the two scholarships differed, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating their likelihood of getting the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 3.38, SD = 1.48) higher than their likelihood of getting the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 3.00, SD = 1.36), $F(1, 97) = 11.87$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .11$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 97) = 0.13$, $p > .05$, and there was no interaction, $F(1, 97) = 0.05$, $p > .05$.

Prestige and competitiveness. To examine whether the scholarships differed in prestige, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.14, SD = 1.36) as more prestigious than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 4.67, SD = 1.26) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 98) = 25.62$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .21$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.13$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 9.75$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. In the control condition, participants rated the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.24, SD = 1.41) as more prestigious than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 4.48, SD = 1.30), $F(1, 98) = 33.49$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .26$. However, when the

$2,500 scholarship was restricted to women (M = 4.86, SD = 1.21), it did not differ in prestige from the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.04, SD = 1.32), $F(1, 98) = 1.88$, $p > .05$. As expected, participants rated the $5,000 scholarship as equally prestigious regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: M = 5.04, SD = 1.32; $2,500 not restricted: M = 5.24, SD = 1.41), $F(1, 98) = 0.54$, $p > .05$. Unexpectedly, the $2,500 scholarship was rated as equally prestigious regardless of whether it was restricted to women (M = 4.86, SD = 1.21) or not (M = 4.48, SD = 1.30), $F(1, 98) = 2.29$, $p > .05$.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in competitiveness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 6.25, SD = 0.85) as more competitive than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 5.78, SD = 0.95), $F(1, 98) = 25.89$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .21$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.72$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 6.20$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. In the control condition, participants rated the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 5.60, SD = 0.99) as significantly less competitive than the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 6.30, SD = 0.74), $F(1, 98) = 28.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .23$. When the $2,500 scholarship was restricted to women (M = 5.96, SD = 0.88), it was rated as only marginally less competitive than the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 6.20, SD = 0.95), $F(1, 98) = 3.38$, $p = .07$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. As expected, participants rated the $5,000 scholarship as equally competitive regardless of condition ($2,500 restricted: M = 6.20, SD = 0.95; $2,500 not restricted: M = 6.30, SD = 0.74), $F(1, 98) = 0.35$, $p > .05$. However, the $2,500 scholarship was rated as marginally more competitive when it was restricted to women (M = 5.96, SD = 0.88) than when it was not restricted (M = 5.60, SD = 0.99), $F(1, 98) = 3.70$, $p = .06$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$.

Potential Mediators

Quality of other applicants. To examine whether the other applicants for the restricted scholarships were seen as lower in quality than applicants for the unrestricted scholarships, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants rating applicants for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 5.74, SD = 0.93) as higher quality than applicants for the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 5.46, SD = 0.94) regardless of whether the smaller scholarship was restricted, $F(1, 98) = 20.71$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .17$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.07$, $p > .05$, and no interaction between condition and scholarship amount, $F(1, 98) = 1.43$, $p > .05$.

We also conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA to examine whether applicants for the restricted scholarship were perceived to have lower grades than applicants for the unrestricted scholarships. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants estimating the average GPA of applicants for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 3.68, SD = 0.20) to be higher than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 3.58, SD = 0.25), $F(1, 98) = 44.29$ $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .31$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.01$, $p > .05$. The main effect of scholarship was qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 9.85$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. However, examination of simple effects revealed that, although applicants for the $5,000 scholarship were estimated to have a slightly higher average GPA in the $2,500 restricted condition and this pattern was reversed for the $2,500 scholarship, neither of these differences were significant (both Fs < 2.00, ps > .05).

Finally, we also conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA to examine whether applicants for the restricted scholarship were perceived to have lower SAT scores than applicants for the unrestricted scholarships. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants estimating the average SAT score of applicants for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 1348.91, SD = 137.93) to be higher than the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 1309.18, SD = 143.85), $F(1, 97) = 22.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 97) = 0.91$, $p > .05$. However, there were an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 97) = 9.74$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. When neither scholarship was restricted, applicants for the more lucrative scholarship were estimated to have higher SAT scores (M = 1375.29, SD = 116.59) than applicants for the smaller scholarship (M = 1308.80, SD = 121.84), $F(1, 97) = 30.36$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .24$. But when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women, applicants for it (M = 1309.56, SD = 163.84) were not estimated to have lower SAT scores than applicants for the more lucrative, unrestricted scholarship (M = 1323.06, SD = 152.83), $F(1, 97) = 0.26$, $p > .05$.

Concern about bias. To examine whether participants' concerns about encountering bias in the selection process were greater for the unrestricted scholarships, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants expressing lower concern about encountering bias in the selection process of the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 2.15, SD = 1.42) than the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 2.46, SD = 1.47), $F(1, 98) = 4.50$, $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. There was no main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.15$, $p > .05$. However, there were an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 6.94$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. Applicants' concerns about encountering bias did not differ between the two scholarships when both scholarships were unrestricted ($2,500: M = 2.29, SD = 1.45; $5,000: M = 2.22, SD = 1.41), $F(1, 98) = 0.13$, $p > .05$. But, in line with our hypotheses, when the smaller scholarship was restricted to women, applicants' concerns about encountering bias were lower for the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 2.01, SD = 1.39) than for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 2.69, SD = 1.50), $F(1, 98) = 11.30$, $p = .001$.

However, contrary to our hypothesis, concerns about encountering bias in the selection process for the more lucrative scholarship were not correlated with choice of scholarship or the likelihood of applying for either scholarship in either condition (all rs <.25, ps > .01). Similarly, concerns about encountering bias were not correlated with perceived likelihood of receiving either scholarship (all rs <.25, ps > .01).

Concerns about stereotype threat. To examine whether participants' concerns about encountering stereotype threat were greater for the unrestricted scholarships, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, with participants expressing lower concern about encountering stereotype threat for the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 2.21, SD = 1.40) than the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 2.54, SD = 1.45), $F(1, 98) = 4.34$, $p = .04$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$.There was also a marginal main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 4.11$, $p = .045$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Participants who read about a restricted scholarship were less concerned about stereotype threat (M = 2.61, SD = 1.02) than participants who did not read about a restricted scholarship, (M = 2.14, SD = 1.28). These main effects were qualified by a marginal interaction, $F(1, 98) = 3.35$, $p = .07$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. In the control condition, concerns about stereotype threat did not differ between scholarships ($2,500: M = 2.12, SD = 1.32; $5,000: M = 2.16, SD = 1.38), $F(1, 98) = 0.03$, $p > .05$. However, when the smaller scholarship was restricted, participants felt less concern about

stereotype threat in the selection process for it (M = 2.30, SD = 1.47) than for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 2.92, SD = 1.44), $F(1, 98) = 7.67$, $p = .007$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. Moreover, concerns about stereotype threat in the selection process for the $5,000 award were higher when the other scholarship was restricted (M = 2.92, SD = 1.44) than when the $2,500 scholarship was not restricted (M = 2.16, SD = 1.38), $F(1, 98) = 7.28$, $p = .008$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. Concerns about stereotype threat in the selection process for the $2,500 scholarship did not differ between conditions ($2,500 unrestricted: M = 2.12, SD = 1.32; $2,500 restricted: M = 2.30, SD = 1.47), $F(1, 98) = 0.41$, $p > .05$.

Contrary to our hypotheses, greater concern about stereotype threat in the selection process for either of the scholarships was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (all rs <.20, ps > .01). Further, concerns about being judged based on gender by either committee were not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for the either scholarship (all rs <.32, ps > .01).

Fairness. The distribution of participants who said the scholarships were equally fair or that one was fairer than the other differed by condition, $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 9.30$, $p = .04$, $\varphi = .31$. The proportion of participants who said the selection process for the $5,000 scholarship would be more fair did not differ by condition ($2,500 unrestricted: 10.0%, $2,500 restricted: 22.0%), $p > .05$. However, the proportion who said the selection process for the $2,500 scholarship would be more fair was higher when it was restricted (34.0%) than when it was not restricted (16.0%), and fewer participants said the selection process for the two scholarships would be equally fair when the $2,500 scholarship was restricted (44.0%) than when neither scholarship was restricted (74.0%), both ps < .05.

To examine whether the scholarships differed in perceived fairness, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. Unexpectedly, there was no main effect of scholarship, $F(1, 98) = 0.82$, $p > .05$. However, there was a main effect of condition, with participants who read about the restricted $2,500 scholarship estimating that the selection process for both awards would be less fair (M = 4.70, SD = 0.98) than participants who did not read about a restricted scholarship, (M = 5.11, SD = 0.99), $F(1, 98) = 4.28$, $p = .04$. There was no interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 0.31$, $p > .05$.

Contrary to our hypothesis, perceptions of fairness were not correlated with scholarship choice (all rs < .30, ps > .01) or with the likelihood of applying for either scholarship in either condition (all rs < .15, ps > .01). Similarly, perceptions of fairness were not correlated with perceived likelihood of receiving either scholarship (all rs < .20, ps > .01).

Valuing identity. To examine whether participants felt their identity would be valued more by the selection committee of the restricted scholarship, we conducted a 2 (Scholarship amount: $2,500 or $5,000) x 2 (Condition: $2,500 restricted or $2,500 not restricted) mixed-model ANOVA. There was a main effect of scholarship, such that participants felt their identity would be valued more by the selection committee for the $2,500 scholarship ($M$ = 4.49, SD = 1.03) than by the selection committee for the $5,000 scholarship ($M$ = 4.14, SD = 0.97), $F(1, 98) = 23.32$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$. There was also a marginal main effect of condition, $F(1, 98) = 3.87$, $p = .052$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Participants who read about a restricted scholarship felt their identity would be valued more (M = 4.49, SD = 0.85) than participants who did not read about a restricted scholarship, (M = 4.14, SD = 0.96). These main effects were qualified by an interaction between scholarship amount and condition, $F(1, 98) = 29.80$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .23$. In the control condition, participants felt their identity would be valued equally by both selection committees ($2,500: M

= 4.12, *SD* = 0.98; $5,000: *M* = 4.16, *SD* = 1.03), $F(1, 98) = 0.20$, $p > .05$. However, as hypothesized, when the smaller scholarship was restricted, participants felt their identity would be valued more by the selection committee for the $2,500 scholarship (*M* = 4.86, *SD* = 0.94) than the selection committee for the $5,000 scholarship (*M* = 4.13, *SD* = 0.92), $F(1, 98) = 52.93$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .35$.

Although participants felt the selection committee for the restricted $2,500 scholarship would value their identity more, contrary to our hypothesis, feeling that a selection committee valued one's identity was not correlated with choosing that scholarship or with the likelihood of applying for that scholarship (all *r*s < .35, $p > .01$). When the $2,500 scholarship was restricted, participants who felt a selection committee valued their identity *did* see themselves as more likely to get that scholarship ($5,000 scholarship: $r = .40$, $p = .004$; $2,500 scholarship: $r = .60$, $p < .001$), but this was not the case when both scholarships were unrestricted (both *r*s < .30, $p > .01$).

Potential Moderators

Importance of gender to identity. Contrary to our hypothesis, the importance of participants' gender to their identity was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (both *r*s < .15, *p*s > .01). Further, among participants in the restricted condition, importance to identity was not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for the restricted scholarship ($r = -.04$, $p > .01$). Unlike in Study 1, participants whose gender identity was more important to them also did not rate themselves as more likely to get the smaller scholarship, (both *r*s < .06, *p*s > .01). None of the In-Group Identification subscales correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition or with likelihood of applying for the smaller scholarship when it was restricted (all *r*s < .35, *p*s > .01).

Gender based rejection sensitivity. Contrary to our hypothesis, gender based rejection sensitivity was not correlated with choice of scholarship in either condition (both *r*s < .25, *p*s > .01). Further, among participants in the restricted condition, it was not significantly correlated with the likelihood of applying for the restricted scholarship ($r = .12$, $p > .01$). Women higher in gender based rejection sensitivity also did not rate themselves as any less likely to get either of the unrestricted scholarships (all *r*s < .20, *p*s > .01).