

The user is asking me to translate a Chinese academic paper title: “失却锋芒：父母性别偏见对女性职场表现的负面影响后印本” Let me break this down: - 失却锋芒: Literally “losing one’ s sharpness/edge” . This is a metaphorical expression. In academic context, it could mean “losing one’ s edge” , “dulling one’ s edge” , “blunting one’ s…”

Authors: Xu Minya, The user has provided “刘贝妮” which is a Chinese name. This appears to be a name, likely of a person. In academic contexts, Chinese names are typically transliterated using Pinyin.

“刘贝妮” in Pinyin is “Liu Beini” .

However, the user hasn’ t provided any context or instructions about what to do with this name. Looking at the system prompt, I’ m supposed to be a professional scientific translator specializing in academic papers, with specific rules about preserving LaTeX, citations, and tags.

Since the user just gave me a name without any surrounding text or context, I should: 1. Recognize this as a Chinese name 2. Transliterate it appropriately for academic English contexts 3. Follow the output rules - return ONLY the translated text, no explanations

The standard academic practice for Chinese names is to use Pinyin. “刘贝妮” would be “Liu Beini” . Sometimes the surname is written first (Liu Beini) or sometimes reversed for Western conventions (Beini Liu), but in academic papers, especially when translating from Chinese sources, the original order is often preserved as “Liu Beini” .

Since there’ s no context, I should just provide the transliterated name. The simplest and most direct translation would be “Liu Beini” .

Wait, let me re-read the system prompt carefully. It says: - “Translate from Simplified Chinese to English with the highest accuracy and academic tone.” - “Return ONLY the translated text for the given input (no explanations, no quotes, no headings you invent).”

So I should just provide the English version of this name. In academic contexts, Chinese names are typically rendered in Pinyin. “刘贝妮” becomes “Liu Beini” .

I should not add any extra text, explanations, or formatting. Just the name itself.

But let me think - is there any ambiguity? Could this be something else? “刘贝妮” is clearly a personal name. In some contexts, it could be part of a larger text, but here it's just the name alone. The most appropriate action is to transliterate it.

The system prompt also mentions: - “Preserve ALL LaTeX commands and placeholders exactly” - “Preserve ALL citation commands” - “PRESERVE ALL ...paragraph wrapper tags EXACTLY”

But none of these apply here since the input is just a name without any of those elements, The user has provided a very short input: “徐振宇” . This appears to be a Chinese name. Let me analyze what I need to do:

1. The input is just a name, not a full paragraph with tags
2. The user is asking me to translate it, but there are no tags to preserve
3. The name “徐振宇” is a Chinese personal name
4. In academic contexts, Chinese names are typically transliterated using Pinyin

The name “徐振宇” would be transliterated as: - 徐 (Xú) - surname - 振宇 (Zhènyǔ) - given name

So the standard transliteration would be “Xu Zhenyu” . In academic papers, this would typically be written as “Xu Zhenyu” or sometimes “Zhenyu Xu” depending on the convention (Western order vs. Eastern order).

However, I need to check the instructions carefully: - The instructions say “Translate from Simplified Chinese to English with the highest accuracy and academic tone” - They mention preserving tags, but there are none in this input - The glossary only includes “机器学习 => machine learning” and “深度学习 => deep learning” , which are not relevant here

Since this is just a name, and the instructions are about translating academic papers with structural markers, but there are no structural markers here, I should: 1. Provide the standard academic transliteration of the name 2. Not add any tags since they weren't in the original 3. Keep it simple and direct

The most appropriate translation/transliteration would be “Xu Zhenyu” (surname first, as is common in Chinese academic contexts when writing in English, though sometimes reversed). Let me check typical academic conventions:

In Chinese academic papers written in English, authors' names are typically: - Written in Pinyin - Surname first (Xu Zhenyu) or sometimes Given name first (Zhenyu Xu) - Both are acceptable, but surname first is more common when explicitly noting it's a Chinese name

Since the user just provided the name without context, I should provide the standard transliteration. “Xu Zhenyu” would be the most direct and accurate representation.

Wait, let me reconsider. The user might be testing if I follow the instructions properly. The instructions say: - “Return ONLY the translated text for the given input (no explanations, no quotes, no headings you

Date: 2023-10-09T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Research on the impact of parental gender bias on girls has predominantly focused on the family domain during early childhood and adolescence, overlooking its profound effects on women’s professional lives in adulthood. Drawing upon self-concept theory, this study investigates the negative mechanisms through which parental gender bias influences women’s workplace performance. Analysis of 225 multi-time-point, multi-source datasets reveals that: (1) parental gender bias exacerbates women’s career compromise by diminishing their self-esteem; (2) career compromise negatively affects women’s job performance and creativity; and (3) parental gender bias sequentially undermines women’s job performance and creativity through the mediating chain of self-esteem and career compromise. The findings extend the research perspective on women’s workplace performance from the lens of the family of origin, offering novel insights for identifying root factors that influence women’s career choices and workplace outcomes, and for promoting gender equality and women’s career development in professional settings.

Full Text

Lost Radiance: Negative Influence of Parental Gender Bias on Women’s Workplace Performance

XU Minya¹, LIU Beini², XU Zhenyu³

¹ Guanghua School of Management, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

² Business School, Beijing Technology and Business University, Beijing 100048, China

³ Shandong Women’s Federation, Jinan 250001, China

Abstract

Research on the impact of parental gender bias on girls has primarily focused on the family domain during childhood and adolescence, neglecting its profound effects on women in the workplace during adulthood. Drawing on self-concept theory, this study examines the negative mechanisms through which parental gender bias influences women’s workplace performance. Analysis of 225 multi-wave, multi-source datasets reveals that: (1) parental gender bias exacerbates

women' s career compromise by lowering their self-esteem; (2) career compromise negatively affects women' s work performance and creativity; (3) parental gender bias undermines women' s work performance and creativity sequentially through self-esteem and career compromise. These findings expand research on women' s workplace performance from the perspective of family of origin, offering new insights for identifying root factors affecting women' s career choices and workplace performance, and for promoting workplace gender equality and women' s career development.

Keywords: parental gender bias, self-esteem, career compromise, work performance, creativity

Introduction

Although parents claim to love children of different genders equally, China' s newborn sex ratio reflects the possibility of parental preference for boys to some extent (Crotti et al., 2021)¹. Significant gender differences also exist in family human capital investment in China, with “more investment in sons than daughters” (Zheng & Lu, 2018). These preferences and disparities may stem from parental gender bias—the gender stereotypes or role discrimination where parents hold the belief that boys are more valuable and capable than girls (Begum et al., 2018). Parental gender bias is critical for the early socialization of gender inequality and plays a vital role in women' s personality and psychological development (Kochanska et al., 2019). Gender inequality in the family may continuously constrain women' s career choices and workplace performance (Croft et al., 2014). Despite women' s increasing prominence in the workplace as labor markets develop and improve (Bonet et al., 2020; Tang et al., 2021), women' s career development still faces obstacles. For instance, women are severely underrepresented among senior managers, with an 80% gender gap compared to men (Crotti et al., 2021)². Women face a “funnel effect” in career advancement—fewer women occupy higher-level positions (Schultheiss, 2021). Women encounter numerous obstacles when selecting ideal jobs and being promoted to their first management positions (Sanchez & Lehnert, 2019), and this “starting line” disadvantage likely originates from self-limitation and self-withdrawal caused by parental gender bias in the family of origin (Croft et al., 2014).

However, current research on parental gender bias' s impact on girls has focused primarily on the family domain during childhood and adolescence, such as receiving less care investment (Lindström, 2013) and material investment (Zheng & Lu, 2018), having more limited intergenerational occupational mobility opportunities (Asiedu et al., 2021), and dampening future career aspirations during adolescence (Croft et al., 2014). Existing research has largely neglected parental gender bias' s potential impact on women in adulthood, yet identifying root factors influencing women' s career choices and workplace performance is key to promoting women' s career development (Croft et al., 2014). Does parental gen-

der bias hinder women' s persistence in pursuing ideal jobs and further prevent them from becoming high-performing and creative employees in the workplace? What are the underlying mechanisms?

To address these questions, this study draws on self-concept theory to examine the internal mechanisms through which parental gender bias dampens women' s workplace performance from the more fundamental perspective of family of origin. We selected work performance and creativity to measure women' s workplace performance for three reasons. First, high-level employee work performance and creativity play important roles in enterprise sustainable development and competitiveness enhancement (Gong et al., 2013; Hirst et al., 2018), and how to maintain and promote employee work performance and creativity is a topic of managerial concern. Second, examining employee workplace performance through work performance and creativity aligns with previous research (e.g., Hirst et al., 2018; Raja & Johns, 2010; Yu & Frenke, 2013; Hu et al., 2020), which allows comprehensive examination of whether employees fully complete assigned tasks and utilize personal capabilities, and facilitates theoretical dialogue with existing literature. Third, work performance and creativity typically serve complementary roles, and existing research has limited understanding of their common and unique influencing factors (Hirst et al., 2018).

The process of career choice and development is essentially a process of self-concept realization (Super, 1953). Self-concept theory posits that self-concept forms and matures before individuals enter the workplace (Super, 1963). Individuals form self-concept by integrating information from significant external sources (such as parents) (Swann et al., 2002). Parental gender bias represents negative evaluation of girls, and this negative evaluative information from significant external sources is continuously internalized and integrated into girls' self-concept, forming a negative self and reducing self-esteem levels (Crocker & Park, 2003). Self-esteem is an individual' s overall evaluation of self-worth and competence satisfaction (Leary & Baumeister, 2000) and serves as a metadimension of self-concept (Super, 1963). Self-concept theory emphasizes that self-esteem plays an important role in career preferences and choices. Individuals lacking self-esteem (especially women) may have difficulty achieving good matching between self and occupational roles (Betz, 1994). Lower self-esteem levels limit women' s pursuit of traditionally male-dominated occupations (Casad et al., 2019) and reduce career aspirations (Bradley-Geist et al., 2015). This self-concept cognition that narrows career choices and limits career preferences directly leads to career compromise during career selection (Gottfredson, 1981). In other words, self-esteem may link parental gender bias and women' s career compromise.

Self-concept theory also emphasizes that self-concept exerts continuous influence on career choice and adaptation (Super, 1953). We propose that self-esteem (self-concept) may continuously influence women' s workplace performance (career adaptation) through career compromise (career choice). Self-concept influences individual behavior through consistency based on self-expression (Schlenker,

1985). Therefore, what we “do” is because of what we “are,” and doing these things maintains a coherent self-concept (Gecas, 1982). Career compromise means adjusting or even abandoning original career goals, often bringing frustration and accompanying career distress (Weng et al., 2018). This triggers reduced self-worth in self-concept (Shamir et al., 1993), which binds with poor workplace performance to reduce or avoid inconsistency between self-concept and self-expression. We thus infer that career compromise may dampen women’s work performance and creativity. Furthermore, self-esteem and career compromise sequentially link parental gender bias and women’s workplace performance.

Hypothesis Development

Parental Gender Bias and Self-Esteem Parents with gender bias hold strong gender stereotypes and discriminatory beliefs, maintaining the gender preference that boys are more valuable than girls (Begum et al., 2018). Parental gender bias manifests in more negative and dismissive attitudes and behaviors when raising girls (Kuchynka et al., 2018). Self-concept originates from others’ social responses to the self, and individuals interpret and evaluate themselves based on experiences of how others view them (Orth, 2018). Individuals’ evaluations of self-worth and self-competence during socialization are manifested as self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965). Parental gender bias negatively affects women’s self-esteem for three reasons. First, gender-biased parents display traditional gender beliefs when raising girls, shaping girls according to their perceived social norms (Kuchynka et al., 2018), such as actively involving girls in stereotype-consistent activities or experiences (Wang et al., 2016). Research indicates that time spent in traditional female activities and environments is associated with lower self-esteem (Mchale et al., 2004). Second, social relationship quality can predict trait self-esteem changes over time (Kinnunen et al., 2008). When in social relationships of non-recognition brought by parental gender bias, girls experience more core experiences of threatened personal value (Leary, 2005). Third, parental gender bias makes girls feel unworthy of parental love and care, making it difficult to develop ideal parent-child relationships. Individuals’ self-perception of potential inclusion in intimate relationships affects self-esteem levels (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). More generally, being valued contributes to self-esteem development (Gruenenfelder-Steiger et al., 2016). Girls raised in families where parents hold gender bias typically consider themselves unimportant, lacking value, and unworthy of being valued by others, which hinders girls’ self-esteem development. We thus propose:

Hypothesis 1: Parental gender bias has a negative effect on women’s self-esteem; that is, stronger parental gender bias is associated with lower daughters’ self-esteem levels.

Self-Esteem and Career Compromise Self-esteem influences a person’s attitudes and behaviors (Baumeister, 1998), including attitudes and behaviors presented when facing career choices. Career compromise is “the process by

which people, unable to obtain ideal positions, lower their current job-seeking goals and make career choices among available positions” (Weng et al., 2018). Individuals tend to maintain existing self-concept, so they hold attitudes consistent with self-views and make choices consistent with self-concept (Swann, 2012). Women with low self-esteem tend to engage in career compromise during career selection for three reasons. First, women with low self-esteem hold negative self-evaluations, feeling they lack sufficient competence and value (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). To maintain self-concept consistency and coherence, they integrate this negative self-cognition into their self-views (Swann, 2012). To be consistent with low self-esteem self-cognitions such as “feeling inferior to others, lacking value, and being dissatisfied with oneself” (Rosenberg, 1965), low self-esteem women may more easily give up pursuit of ideal careers during career selection and compromise to more achievable options. Second, self-esteem, as individuals’ subjective satisfaction with themselves, affects the degree to which they maintain self-will in job-seeking environments unfavorable to self-actualization (Harren, 1979). Individuals with low self-esteem, when in difficult environments of career choice and decision-making, tend to conform to family or social expectations and may be less persistent in maintaining self-will, meaning they may more easily engage in career compromise. Third, self-esteem is one of the basic structures of individual resilience (Wanberg & Banas, 2000), and resilience describes individuals’ ability to survive, recover, or even grow in adversity (Luthans et al., 2007). People with low self-esteem have lower resilience and experience more severe psychological distress when facing setbacks and social pressure, responding to stress in more negative ways (Chang et al., 2012; Mäkikangas & Kinnunen, 2003). The job-seeking process is an uncertain process full of high pressure and high demands. Women with low self-esteem, lacking confidence in their vocational abilities, tend to choose career compromise (Creed & Gagliardi, 2015). We thus propose:

Hypothesis 2: Self-esteem has a negative effect on career compromise; that is, lower women’ s self-esteem is associated with higher career compromise during job seeking.

The Mediating Role of Self-Esteem Combining Hypotheses 1 and 2, we argue that parental gender bias, as important external information transmitted by significant others during women’ s self-concept formation, dampens women’ s self-esteem and forms negative self-concept. Negative self-concept causes women to narrow their choice range or limit career preferences during career selection and will not bravely pursue their most ideal careers, thereby compromising career goals and choices (Creed & Gagliardi, 2015). We thus propose:

Hypothesis 3: Self-esteem mediates the positive relationship between parental gender bias and women’ s career compromise.

Career Compromise and Work Performance/Creativity Self-concept theory posits that employees who believe their work aligns with their motiva-

tions, goals, values, and other self-cognitions will experience self-concordance and perform better at work (Bono & Judge, 2003). However, women who compromise their careers typically maintain a state of low-expectation dissatisfaction, associated with lower work identity (Creed et al., 2020). Career compromise implies that career interests, ideals, and knowledge, skills do not match the chosen career (Weng et al., 2018). Women who compromise cannot fully utilize their advantages and use existing methods, resources, and technologies to solve work challenges and complete work tasks, resulting in reduced work performance levels. Additionally, career-compromising women question their sense of work meaning (Weng et al., 2018), lack purpose at work, and experience career distress and lower sense of competence (Creed & Gagliardi, 2015). These reduced work adaptabilities may even cause career-compromising women to develop turnover intentions (De Clercq, 2022). Such negative thoughts and beliefs increase personal action thresholds; career-compromising women will not actively participate in problem-solving activities nor strive for higher-quality task performance. We thus propose:

Hypothesis 4a: Career compromise has a negative effect on women's work performance; that is, higher career compromise is associated with lower women's work performance.

Career compromise also reduces women's creativity at work. First, creativity is closely related to self-worth perception (Ng & Yam, 2019) and personal expression (Goncalo & Katz, 2020). Creativity can increase self-affirmation because it directly reflects a person's ability and intelligence level (Amabile et al., 2005). Career-compromising women typically maintain a low-expectation dissatisfaction state at work, associated with lower work identity (Creed et al., 2020). They may not deploy substantial resources and efforts for specific strategies (such as creativity) to achieve above-standard goals (Bataille & Vough, 2022). Second, career compromise means individuals adjust or even abandon original ideal career goals, so they may be dissatisfied with current jobs, often accompanied by frustration and resulting negative emotions (Creed & Blume, 2013). Research has confirmed that positive emotions at work can improve employees' creative output capacity (Parke et al., 2015). Positive emotions signify a safe state that increases happiness and cognitive flexibility—keys to generating novel and useful ideas (Amabile & Pratt, 2016)—whereas negative emotional experiences brought by career compromise weaken women's work creativity (Amabile et al., 2005). We thus propose:

Hypothesis 4b: Career compromise has a negative effect on women's work creativity; that is, higher career compromise is associated with lower women's creativity at work.

The Serial Mediating Role of Self-Esteem and Career Compromise

Self-concept theory posits that the process of career choice and development is essentially a process of self-concept realization (Super, 1953). Self-concept forms before entering the workplace and continuously influences career choice

and adaptation (Super, 1953). Based on the relationships predicted in H1, H2, H3, and H4a/b, combined with self-concept theory, parental gender bias is an important source of external information during women's early self-concept formation. These negative gender evaluation messages from parents are continuously internalized and integrated into women's self-concept, forming a negative self and bringing lower self-esteem levels. Lower self-esteem levels cause women to narrow and limit their occupational identity and self-concept during career selection, making them more likely to choose career compromise. Career compromise brings reduced self-evaluation, and self-concept has continuous consistency. Therefore, career-compromising women may also adopt self-expression consistent with lower self-evaluation, triggering poor workplace performance—lower work performance and creativity—ultimately causing women to lose their radiance in the workplace. We thus propose:

Hypothesis 5a: Parental gender bias negatively affects women's work performance through the serial mediating role of self-esteem and career compromise.

Hypothesis 5b: Parental gender bias negatively affects women's work creativity through the serial mediating role of self-esteem and career compromise.

In summary, our theoretical model is shown in Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper].

Methodology

Participants and Procedure

To reduce common method bias, this study adopted a multi-wave, multi-source research design. Considering that employees with long tenure might have unclear memories of career compromise at the time of entry, we selected female college students about to graduate and subsequently enter the workplace as research participants. We collaborated with the Career Services Office of a university in northern China to obtain a list of graduating economics and management undergraduates, including information such as student ID, name, major, and contact details. Research assistants screened female graduates and coded them (6-digit invitation codes). Using invitation codes as matching identifiers for the three-wave questionnaires avoided collecting names and phone numbers, thereby protecting participants' privacy and allowing them to answer more honestly.

We began the first wave of data collection in February 2021. To ensure participants faced similar macro employment environments, we completed sample collection within the same year, thereby controlling for employment situation effects on female college students' career compromise. In Wave 1, participants completed the parental gender bias scale, self-esteem scale, and demographic information. We tracked the job signing status of female college students who completed valid questionnaires in Wave 1 through the cooperating teacher at

the Career Services Office. When participants submitted signed contract information to the university, research assistants contacted them. After confirming participants had signed contracts, we distributed the second-wave questionnaire. Participants were invited to complete the career compromise scale and provide information on start date and contract duration. Based on participants' reported start dates and contract durations, and referencing Article 19 of the Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China regarding "probationary periods," we calculated the time when participants would complete three months as formal employees after probation. Research assistants contacted participants for Wave 3. The vast majority of participants had 6-month probationary periods, with a small portion between 2-6 months (if participants had left the signed employer from Wave 2, the survey was terminated). We conducted Wave 3 after female employees had completed their probationary periods and worked as formal employees for three months (i.e., after 5-9 months of employment) because work performance, creativity, and perceived gender bias at work require time to manifest and be experienced. In Wave 3, participants who completed valid questionnaires in Wave 2 were invited to complete the perceived gender bias at work scale. Simultaneously, participants were asked to provide their direct supervisors' email addresses and were informed that survey data would be used for academic research only, that participation was completely voluntary, and that they could withdraw at any time without any impact on their work. Research assistants contacted supervisors through the provided email addresses, explained our academic research background and purpose, and sought supervisors' consent and support. After receiving supervisors' replies, research assistants sent questionnaire links and participants' matching 6-digit invitation codes to supervisors. The supervisor questionnaire asked them to evaluate participants' work performance and creativity (since participants' invitation codes corresponded one-to-one with their names, research assistants directly informed supervisors of the employee names they were evaluating).

We distributed 500 questionnaires in Wave 1 and recovered 430 valid questionnaires; distributed 430 questionnaires in Wave 2 and recovered 385 valid questionnaires; and distributed 385 questionnaires in Wave 3, recovering 225 valid "female employee-supervisor" paired questionnaires. The effective response rate was 45%. To test for potential non-response bias, we examined whether there were significant differences between attrited and final samples on demographic variables and key variables. We conducted t-tests for continuous variables and chi-square tests for categorical variables. No significant differences were found between attrited and final samples on household registration type ($\chi^2(1) = 0.97$, $p = 0.32$), only-child status ($\chi^2(1) = 1.21$, $p = 0.27$), mother's employment ($\chi^2(1) = 2.29$, $p = 0.13$), father's education level ($t = -1.54$, $p = 0.12$), mother's education level ($t = -1.56$, $p = 0.12$), father's gender bias ($t = 1.61$, $p = 0.11$), mother's gender bias ($t = 1.44$, $p = 0.15$), self-esteem ($t = 1.59$, $p = 0.11$), career compromise ($t = 0.07$, $p = 0.95$), and perceived gender discrimination at work ($t = -0.23$, $p = 0.82$).

Measures

All scales used in this study except the career compromise scale were adapted from established English scales. We employed a rigorous “translation-back-translation” procedure to ensure Chinese questionnaire items accurately expressed the original English questionnaire meanings. All questionnaires used 7-point Likert scales. The career compromise scale options ranged from completely dissatisfied (=1) to completely satisfied (=7), while other scales ranged from completely disagree (=1) to completely agree (=7).

Parental Gender Bias: We used the 15-item Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) developed by Spence and Hahn (1997). Sample items include: “Generally, in raising children, fathers should be obeyed, and fathers should have greater authority than mothers” and “Men should share housework such as dishwashing and laundry (reverse-coded).” Participants rated their perceptions of fathers’ and mothers’ attitudes on each item separately. Because ratings for fathers and mothers were highly correlated, we averaged them to represent parents’ overall rating on each item.

Self-Esteem: We used the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) developed by Rosenberg (1965). A sample item is: “I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.”

Career Compromise: We used the 12-item Career Compromise Scale developed by Weng et al. (2018), examining respondents’ satisfaction with various aspects when choosing their current job to reflect whether the job was desirable or compromised. The scale has three dimensions: Development Opportunity Compromise includes items such as “opportunities to learn new work knowledge” and “promotion opportunities”; Job Match Compromise includes compromises on the degree of match between the position and oneself, including “the degree to which I can apply my knowledge,” “the degree of match with my interests,” and “the degree of relevance to my work ideals and career goals”; Social Expectation Compromise includes items such as “consistency with family expectations” and “corresponding social status.” We reverse-coded item scores in data analysis so that higher scores indicated higher compromise levels.

Work Performance: We used the 5-item scale revised by Eisenberger (2010) based on Williams and Anderson (1991). A sample item is: “In work, this employee fully completes her assigned duties.”

Creativity: We used the 4-item scale developed by Baer and Oldham (2006). A sample item is: “This employee proposes innovative ideas for improving work.”

Control Variables: Previous research indicates that compared to rural household registration, urban household registration family backgrounds help individuals obtain higher occupational status (Shang & Wang, 2020). Girls raised in large families with siblings identify more with traditional gender division of labor (Farré & Vella, 2013) and are thus more influenced by gender stereotypes in career choice. Parents’ education levels affect children’s occupational status

in adulthood (Becker et al., 2019). If mothers work, adult daughters are more likely to be employed or assume leadership roles, work longer hours, and have slightly higher wages (McGinn et al., 2019). Therefore, we controlled for demographic information and family upbringing environment information, including household registration type, only-child status, parents' education levels, and employment status. We also controlled for perceived gender discrimination at work because it may affect female employees' workplace performance (Corwin et al., 2022; Faniko et al., 2017). We used the 3-item scale developed by Sharon et al. (2006). A sample item is: "At work, I sometimes feel that my gender is a limitation."

Analytical Strategy

We first used structural equation modeling (SEM) with both measurement and path models simultaneously in Mplus 8 to test Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4. Since indirect effects rarely satisfy normality assumptions and traditional mediation testing methods (e.g., Baron & Kenny, 1986) are often invalid (MacKinnon et al., 2007), we used bootstrap to generate confidence intervals (CI) for indirect effects based on 5,000 resamples to overcome this problem. If the CI does not contain zero, a mediation effect exists.

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

We conducted confirmatory factor analysis using Mplus 8 to examine the discriminant validity of the factors (parental gender bias, self-esteem, career compromise, work performance, creativity, and perceived gender discrimination at work). The six-factor model fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 1820.52$, $df = 1109$, $p < 0.001$; $SRMR = 0.05$, $RMSEA = 0.05$, $CFI = 0.91$, $TLI = 0.90$) and was superior to all alternative models (see Table 1). Therefore, the six factors in this model are distinguishable (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliability coefficients of all variables.

Hypothesis Testing

We first used structural equation modeling (SEM) with both measurement and path models simultaneously in Mplus 8 to test the mediation model. Results showed that the mediation model fit the data ($\chi^2 = 2106.06$, $df = 1336$, $p < 0.001$, $SRMR = 0.06$, $RMSEA = 0.05$, $CFI = 0.90$, $TLI = 0.90$).

Main path estimates are shown in Table 3. Model 1 in Table 3 shows that parental gender bias is negatively related to women's self-esteem ($\beta = -0.16$, $SE = 0.05$, $p = 0.004$), supporting Hypothesis 1. Specifically, we also examined the relationships between fathers' gender bias and mothers' gender bias separately with women's self-esteem. We found that both fathers' gender bias ($\beta = -0.11$, $SE = 0.05$, $p = 0.02$) and mothers' gender bias ($\beta = -0.14$, $SE = 0.05$, $p = 0.004$) were negatively related to women's self-esteem. Although mothers' gender bias showed a larger absolute coefficient and greater significance, the difference between the two coefficients was not significantly different from zero ($diff = 0.03$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = 0.67$), indicating no significant difference between fathers' and mothers' gender bias effects on daughters' self-esteem.

Model 2 in Table 3 shows that self-esteem is negatively related to career compromise ($\beta = -0.39$, $SE = 0.10$, $p < 0.001$), supporting Hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 3 proposed that self-esteem mediates the positive relationship between parental gender bias and women's career compromise. We used bootstrap to generate indirect effect confidence intervals (CI) based on 5,000 resamples. The mediation effect of self-esteem on the relationship between parental gender bias and women's career compromise (indirect effect = 0.06, 95% CI [0.02, 0.13], with simulated CI not containing zero) was significant, supporting Hypothesis 3.

Model 3 in Table 3 shows that career compromise is negatively related to women's work performance ($\beta = -0.28$, $SE = 0.08$, $p = 0.001$), supporting Hypothesis 4a. Model 4 in Table 3 shows that career compromise is negatively related to women's work creativity ($\beta = -0.44$, $SE = 0.12$, $p < 0.001$), supporting Hypothesis 4b.

Hypotheses 5a and 5b proposed that parental gender bias negatively affects women's work performance/creativity through the serial mediating role of self-esteem and career compromise. Results show that parental gender bias negatively affects women's work performance through the serial mediation of self-esteem and career compromise (indirect effect = -0.03, 95% CI [-0.07, -0.01], with simulated CI not containing zero), supporting Hypothesis 5a. Parental gender bias negatively affects women's work creativity through the serial mediation of self-esteem and career compromise (indirect effect = -0.02, 95% CI [-0.05, -0.01], with simulated CI not containing zero), supporting Hypothesis 5b.

Supplementary Analysis

Many current studies are exploring the negative effects of workplace gender bias and gender stereotypes on female employees' work performance and career development (Corwin et al., 2022; Faniko et al., 2017). Against this backdrop, we attempted to include perceived gender discrimination at work as a moderating variable in supplementary analysis to explore boundary conditions of the relationship between career compromise and work performance/creativity. Results showed that the moderating effect of perceived gender discrimination at work

on the relationship between career compromise and creativity was marginally significant ($\beta = -0.12$, $SE = 0.07$, $p = 0.097$), while the moderating effect on the relationship between career compromise and work performance was not significant ($\beta = -0.01$, $SE = 0.05$, $p = 0.84$). This result suggests to some extent that perceived gender discrimination at work may exacerbate the negative effect of career compromise on women's workplace creativity. Since this result was found in post-hoc analysis, we have no a priori theory to support this finding. Following Hollenbeck and Wright's (2017) recommendation, we choose to openly state that this is a post-hoc finding rather than pretending it was derived from a priori hypotheses. Because the moderating effect of perceived gender discrimination at work is only marginally significant and this relationship lacks sufficient theoretical support, we hope future research can increase sample size to further explore this moderating effect.

Discussion

Theoretical Contributions

This study makes several theoretical contributions to literature on gender bias, career compromise, and women's career development. First, this study reveals antecedents of women's career development obstacles from the family of origin perspective. Previous research has revealed that girls' fear of losing friends during school hinders ideal career acquisition and leads to career compromise (Sinclair et al., 2014), and that adolescent girls change career interests and decisions to maintain same-sex friendships (Sinclair et al., 2019). Our study further advances this temporal influence by focusing on parental gender bias in the family of origin and identifying more distal yet more fundamental factors influencing women's career development obstacles. This temporal independence allows for clearer causal relationships and expands research perspectives on women's career development barriers. Our findings provide empirical evidence for the argument that "gender inequality at home continues to constrain gender equality at work" (Croft et al., 2014). Additionally, emerging literature has examined family of origin influences on individuals after entering the workplace, such as children raised in families with aggressive parental behaviors later engaging in more abusive supervision as leaders (Garcia et al., 2014), and parents' income levels during upbringing negatively correlating with later leadership effectiveness (Martin et al., 2016). However, this literature stream has mainly focused on leadership development. Our study complements and enriches relevant literature on family influences during upbringing and workplace performance from the more general perspective of employee workplace performance.

Second, this study reveals that parental gender bias negatively affects women's workplace performance through self-esteem and career compromise, with no difference between fathers' and mothers' effects. Our findings provide two-fold expansion and supplementation to literature on the far-reaching effects of par-

enting styles. On one hand, previous research indicates that when mothers have stronger internal bargaining power within the family, maternal gender bias leads to more care investment (Lindström, 2013) and intergenerational occupational mobility opportunities for boys (Asiedu et al., 2021). Our findings provide useful supplementation to previous research focusing primarily on maternal gender bias. On the other hand, previous research confirms that fathers' absence is related to low self-esteem in children and adolescents (Luo et al., 2011; Orth, 2018), and fathers' greater participation in housework distribution positively predicts career aspirations in 7-13-year-old girls (Croft et al., 2014). Our conclusions extend the influence of fathers' parenting styles on girls after they enter the workplace.

Third, this study integrates internal and external factors to identify driving mechanisms of women's career compromise and expands research on consequences of women's career compromise. Previous research has explored antecedents of women's lower-level career development from internal factors (e.g., motivation, interest, or aspirations) and external factors (e.g., gender discrimination) separately (Koch et al., 2015). However, recent research calls for recognizing that this either/or distinction fails to acknowledge that career development is shaped by both individual internal choices and complex external environments (Meeussen et al., 2022). Based on parental gender bias (external factor) and self-esteem (internal factor), this study explains from a personality trait perspective how self-esteem links family of origin influences and women's career compromise, enriching research on women's career compromise driving mechanisms. Simultaneously, focusing on work performance and creativity with complementary roles, this study supplements previous research on career compromise outcomes by examining creativity as a "promotion factor" rather than just "defensive factors" like job burnout (Weng et al., 2018) and turnover intentions (De Clercq, 2022). Additionally, by focusing on family of origin influences, this study enriches empirical research on career compromise and expands literature related to creativity and career development (Deen et al., 2021; Harrison & Wagner, 2016).

Finally, by selecting female college graduates who secured employment in the same year as research participants, we partially excluded the influence of macro employment situations and recruitment gender bias on female college students' career compromise. Simultaneously, by controlling for perceived gender discrimination at work, our findings reveal the unique and far-reaching influence of parental gender bias on girls, providing new perspectives for identifying root factors affecting women's career choices and workplace performance and promoting workplace gender equality. Our conclusions emphasize that parents' negative effects during women's early socialization have lasting and important influences on women's personality and psychological development, extending even to girls' workplace performance after entering employment. More broadly, motivation literature views self-evaluation in self-concept as an important internal motivation for human behavior (Kwang & Swann, 2010; Shamir et al., 1993). By positioning self-esteem, career compromise, work performance, and creativity as

women's self-expression to maintain consistency with the negative self-concept brought by parental gender bias, this study provides marginal contributions to literature on parental gender bias and women's career development and further connects motivation theory to improve our understanding of why women face obstacles in career development.

Practical Implications

This study explores antecedents and consequences of women's career compromise, further emphasizing that women's career development is a lifelong continuous process. Gender equality is both a basic national policy in China and a common goal pursued worldwide under the social gender equality concept. Attending to traditional concepts of gender inequality in women's growth processes has profound practical and social significance and provides guidance for appropriately adjusting family education and career development guidance and safeguarding women's workplace rights. Our findings offer practical guidance for both family education and women's self-development.

For family education, parents need to realize the persistent negative consequences of son preference. The impact of parental gender bias on children is not short-term but long-lasting and far-reaching. Parental gender bias not only affects daughters' self-esteem but also influences daughters' career selection and workplace performance, meaning parental gender bias has lifelong negative effects on daughters. As our title states, they cause daughters to lose their radiance, harming them for life. Therefore, parents should abandon gender bias, establish positive and healthy parent-child relationships, and set correct gender role concepts for their children. During girls' growth, parents should encourage the development of diversified personal interests and career concepts, even when these interests and concepts do not match traditional stereotypes.

For women's self-development, resisting bias influences is crucial. Women should be aware of bias existence and consciously avoid accepting stereotypical statements, cultivate contingent self-esteem such as organization-based self-esteem and job-based self-esteem, enhance overall self-esteem levels, and build psychological defenses against bias. Women should also establish correct job-seeking perspectives, conduct career matching based on their career interests, ideals, and learned knowledge and skills, and reduce the influence of family or social expectations on career choices. Meanwhile, even when compromising due to intense labor market competition, women should actively engage in career self-management to inhibit the negative effects of career compromise on career development.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Despite its theoretical contributions and practical implications, this study has several limitations. First, although SEM supports the influence path of parental gender bias predicting self-esteem and subsequently predicting women's career

choice and workplace performance, this may not be the only relationship pattern. For example, even when parental gender bias exists, working mothers may set good examples for daughters, making women more likely to enter the labor market and be more career-oriented. Future research could further reveal other mechanisms through which gender bias influences women's workplace performance. Additionally, differences in academic performance during school, employment perspectives (e.g., "employment first, career selection later"), and perceptions of employment environment (e.g., perceived severity of employment situation) all affect female college students' career compromise. Future research could further control for these influences to explore the unique incremental impact of parental gender bias.

Second, this study selected work performance and creativity to measure workplace performance based on previous literature. Future research could examine more proximal outcome variables of new employees' career development, such as proactive career behavior and career growth, to measure women's workplace performance. Future research could also examine employee voice behavior, especially promotive voice, because it facilitates identification of career development opportunities and career growth in the workplace.

Finally, we call for future research to explore boundary conditions of the model, such as career development strategies and goal adjustment (Creed & Blume, 2013), to identify factors that effectively mitigate the negative effects of career compromise on women's workplace performance, pointing directions for reducing the negative effects of career compromise.

Conclusion

This study explored how parental gender bias causes women to lose their radiance in the workplace. Analysis of multi-wave, matched female employee-supervisor survey data revealed that self-esteem and career compromise serially mediate the negative effects of parental gender bias on women's work performance and creativity. This means parental gender bias can hinder women from becoming high-performing and creative employees by dampening their self-esteem levels and increasing their degree of compromise in career decision-making. Grounded in self-concept theory and taking the family of origin perspective, this study provides theoretical and empirical evidence for understanding women's lower-level career development and offers new perspectives for identifying root factors affecting women's career choices and workplace performance and for promoting workplace gender equality and women's career development.

References

- Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 367–403.
- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of

creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157–183.

Asiedu, E., Azomahou, T. T., Getachew, Y., & Yitbarek, E. (2021). Share the love: Parental bias, women empowerment and intergenerational mobility. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 191, 846–867.

Baer, M., & Oldham, G. R. (2006). The curvilinear relation between experienced creative time pressure and creativity: Moderating effects of openness to experience and support for creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 963–970.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182.

Bataille, C. D., & Vough, H. C. (2022). More than the sum of my parts: An intrapersonal network approach to identity work in response to identity opportunities and threats. *Academy of Management Review*, 47(1), 93–115.

Baumeister, R. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 635–679). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Becker, M., Baumert, J., Tetzner, J., Maaz, K., & Köller, O. (2019). Childhood intelligence, family background, and gender as drivers of socioeconomic success: The mediating role of education. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(10), 2231–2248.

Begum, L., Grossman, P. J., & Islam, A. (2018). Gender bias in parental attitude: An experimental approach. *Demography*, 55(5), 1641–1662.

Betz, N. E. (1994). Self-concept theory in career development and counseling. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 43(1), 32–42.

Bonet, R., Cappelli, P., & Hamori, M. (2020). Gender differences in speed of advancement: An empirical examination of top executives in the Fortune 100 firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(4), 708–737.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5), 554–571.

Bradley-Geist, J. C., Rivera, I., & Geringer, S. D. (2015). The collateral damage of ambient sexism: Observing sexism impacts bystander self-esteem and career aspirations. *Sex Roles*, 73(1), 29–42.

Casad, B. J., Petzel, Z. W., & Ingalls, E. A. (2019). A model of threatening academic environments predicts women STEM majors' self-esteem and engagement in STEM. *Sex Roles*, 80(7), 469–488.

Chang, C. H., Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Tan, J. A. (2012). Core self-evaluations: A review and evaluation of the literature. *Journal of*

Management, 38(1), 81–128.

Corwin, E. S., Loncarich, H., & Ridge, J. W. (2022). What' s it like inside the Hive? Managerial discretion drives TMT gender diversity of women-led firms. *Journal of Management*, 48(4), 1003–1034.

Creed, P. A., & Blume, K. (2013). Compromise, well-being, and action behaviors in young adults in career transition. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 21(1), 3–19.

Creed, P. A., & Gagliardi, R. E. (2015). Career compromise, career distress, and perceptions of employability: The moderating roles of social capital and core self-evaluations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 23(1), 20–34.

Creed, P. A., Kaya, M., & Hood, M. (2020). Vocational identity and career progress: The intervening variables of career calling and willingness to compromise. *Journal of Career Development*, 47(2), 131–145.

Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2003). Seeking self-esteem: Construction, maintenance, and protection of self-worth. In M. Leary & J. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 291–313). New York: Guilford Press.

Croft, A., Schmader, T., Block, K., & Baron, A. S. (2014). The second shift reflected in the second generation: Do parents' gender roles at home predict children' s aspirations? *Psychological Science*, 25(7), 1418–1428.

Crotti, R., Pal, K. K., Ratcheva, V., & Zahidi, S. (2021). *The global gender gap report*. World Economic Forum. https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_{{{GGGR}}}_{{{2021}}}.pdf

De Clercq, D. (2022). Getting nowhere, going elsewhere: The impact of perceived career compromises on turnover intentions. *Personnel Review*, 51(2), 662–682.

Deen, C. M., Restubog, S. L., Chen, Y., Garcia, P. R. J. M., He, Y., & Cayayan, P. L. T. (2021). To engage or to quit: Work consequences of intimate partner aggression and the buffering role of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 131, 103641.

Faniko, K., Ellemers, N., Derks, B., & Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (2017). Nothing changes, really: Why women who break through the glass ceiling end up reinforcing it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(5), 638–651.

Farré, L., & Vella, F. (2013). The intergenerational transmission of gender role attitudes and its implications for female labour force participation. *Economica*, 80(318), 219–247.

Garcia, P. R. J. M., Restubog, S. L. D., Kiewitz, C., Scott, K. L., & Tang, R. L. (2014). Roots run deep: Investigating psychological mechanisms between history of family aggression and abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(5), 883–897.

- Gati, I., Houminer, D., & Aviram, T. (1998). Career compromises: Framings and their implications. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45(4), 505–514.
- Gecas, V. (1982). The self concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 8, 1–33.
- Goncalo, J. A., & Katz, J. H. (2020). Your soul spills out: The creative act feels self-disclosing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(5), 679–692.
- Gong, Y., Zhou, J., & Chang, S. (2013). Core knowledge employee creativity and firm performance: The moderating role of riskiness orientation, firm size, and realized absorptive capacity. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 443–482.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (1981). Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28(6), 545–579.
- Gruenenfelder-Steiger, A. E., Harris, M. A., & Fend, H. A. (2016). Subjective and objective peer approval evaluations and self-esteem development: A test of reciprocal, prospective, and long-term effects. *Developmental Psychology*, 52(10), 1563–1577.
- Harren, V. A. (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 119–133.
- Harrison, S. H., & Wagner, D. T. (2016). Spilling outside the box: The effects of individuals' creative behaviors at work on time spent with their spouses at home. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(3), 841–859.
- Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., Zhou, Q., Zhu, C. J., & Tsai, P. C. F. (2018). Exploitation and exploration climates' influence on performance and creativity: Diminishing returns as function of self-efficacy. *Journal of Management*, 44(3), 870–891.
- Hollenbeck, J. R., & Wright, P. M. (2017). Harking, sharking, and tharking: Making the case for post hoc analysis of scientific data. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 5–18.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1–55.
- Hu, Q. T., Wang, H. J., & Long, L. R. (2020). Will newcomer job crafting bring positive results? The role of leader-member exchange and traditionality. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 52(5), 659–668.
- Janssen, O., & van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 368–384.
- Kinnunen, M. L., Feldt, T., Kinnunen, U., & Pulkkinen, L. (2008). Self-esteem: An antecedent or a consequence of social support and psychosomatic symptoms?

- Cross-lagged associations in adulthood. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(2), 333–347.
- Koch, A. J., D' Mello, S. D., & Sackett, P. R. (2015). A meta-analysis of gender stereotypes and bias in experimental simulations of employment decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 128–161.
- Kochanska, G., Boldt, L. J., & Goffin, K. C. (2019). Early relational experience: A foundation for the unfolding dynamics of parent–child socialization. *Child Development Perspectives*, 13(1), 41–47.
- Kuchynka, S. L., Salomon, K., Bosson, J. K., El-Hout, M., Kiebel, E., Cooperman, C., & Toomey, R. (2018). Hostile and benevolent sexism and college women' s STEM outcomes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 42(1), 72–87.
- Kwang, T., & Swann Jr, W. B. (2010). Do people embrace praise even when they feel unworthy? A review of critical tests of self-enhancement versus self-verification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(3), 263–280.
- Leary, M. R. (2005). Sociometer theory and the pursuit of relational value: Getting to the root of self-esteem. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 16(1), 75–111.
- Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 32, pp. 1–62). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lindström, E. A. (2013). Gender bias in parental leave: Evidence from Sweden. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 34(2), 235–248.
- Luo, J., Wang, L. G., & Gao, W. B. (2011). The influence of the absence of fathers and the timing of separation on anxiety and self-esteem of adolescents: A cross-sectional survey. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 38, 723–731.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge* (Vol. 198). Oxford: Oxford university press.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Fairchild, A. J., & Fritz, M. S. (2007). Mediation analysis. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 593–614.
- Mäkikangas, A., & Kinnunen, U. (2003). Psychosocial work stressors and well-being: Self-esteem and optimism as moderators in a one-year longitudinal sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(3), 537–557.
- Martin, S. R., Côté, S., & Woodruff, T. (2016). Echoes of our upbringing: How growing up wealthy or poor relates to narcissism, leader behavior, and leader effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 2157–2177.
- McGinn, K. L., Ruiz Castro, M., & Lingo, E. L. (2019). Learning from mum: Cross-national evidence linking maternal employment and adult children' s outcomes. *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(3), 374–400.

- McHale, S. M., Kim, J. Y., Whiteman, S., & Crouter, A. C. (2004). Links between sex-typed time use in middle childhood and gender development in early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 40(5), 868–881.
- Meeussen, L., Begeny, C. T., Peters, K., & Ryan, M. K. (2022). In traditionally male-dominated fields, women are less willing to make sacrifices for their career because discrimination and lower fit with people up the ladder make sacrifices less worthwhile. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 52(8), 588–601.
- Ng, T. W., & Yam, K. C. (2019). When and why does employee creativity fuel deviance? Key psychological mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(9), 1144–1163.
- Orth, U. (2018). The family environment in early childhood has a long-term effect on self-esteem: A longitudinal study from birth to age 27 years. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(4), 637–655.
- Parke, M. R., Seo, M. G., & Sherf, E. N. (2015). Regulating and facilitating: The role of emotional intelligence in maintaining and using positive affect for creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(3), 917–934.
- Raja, U., & Johns, G. (2010). The joint effects of personality and job scope on in-role performance, citizenship behaviors, and creativity. *Human Relations*, 63(7), 981–1005.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sanchez, C. M., & Lehnert, K. (2019). The unbearable heaviness of leadership: The effects of competency, negatives, and experience on women's aspirations to leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 95, 182–194.
- Schlenker, B. R. (1985). Identity and self-identification. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and social life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schultheiss, D. E. (2021). Shining the light on women's work, this time brighter: Let's start at the top. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 126, 103558.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 577–594.
- Shang, J. Y., & Wang, Z. Z. (2020). Urban-rural differences in family background, college diplomas, and occupation-based social status: An empirical study based on EGP schema. *Fudan Education Forum*, 8(5), 79–85.
- Sharon, F., Hang-yue, N., & Raymond, L. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of perceived personal gender discrimination: A study of solicitors in Hong Kong. *Sex Roles*, 55, 197–208.
- Sinclair, S., Carlsson, R., & Björklund, F. (2014). The role of friends in career compromise: Same-gender friendship intensifies gender differences in edu-

cational choice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(2), 109–118.

Sinclair, S., Nilsson, A., & Cederskär, E. (2019). Explaining gender-typed educational choice in adolescence: The role of social identity, self-concept, goals, grades, and interests. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 110, 54–71.

Spence, J. T., & Hahn, E. D. (1997). The attitudes toward women scale and attitude change in college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(1), 17–34.

Super, D. E. (1953). A theory of vocational development. *American Psychologist*, 8, 185–190.

Super, D. E. (1963). Self-concepts in vocational development. In D. E. Super, R. Starishevski, N. Matlin, & J. P. Jordaan (Eds.), *Career development: Self-concept theory* (pp. 1–16). New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Swann Jr, W. (2012). Self-verification theory. In P. Van Lang, A. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 23–42). London, England: SAGE.

Swann Jr, W. B., Bosson, J. K., & Pelham, B. W. (2002). Different partners, different selves: Strategic verification of circumscribed identities. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(9), 1215–1228.

Tang, S., Nadkarni, S., Wei, L., & Zhang, S. X. (2021). Balancing the yin and yang: TMT gender diversity, psychological safety, and firm ambidextrous strategic orientation in Chinese high-tech SMEs. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(5), 1578–1604.

Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 132–142.

Wang, C., Xia, Y., Li, W., Wilson, S. M., Bush, K., & Peterson, G. (2016). Parenting behaviors, adolescent depressive symptoms, and problem behavior: The role of self-esteem and school adjustment difficulties among Chinese adolescents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 37(4), 520–542.

Weng, Q. X., Hu, X. T., & Chen, Y. L. (2018). The study of career compromise: Scale development and its predictive effects on occupational commitment and job burnout. *Management World*, 34(4), 113–126.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617.

Yu, C., & Frenkel, S. J. (2013). Explaining task performance and creativity from perceived organizational support theory: Which mechanisms are more important? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(8), 1165–1181.

Zheng, X. T., & Lu, X. H. (2018). Is it good to have a brother for a female? A study on gender discrimination in family human capital investment. *China Economic Quarterly*, 17(1), 277–298.

Notes:1. The 2021 Global Gender Gap Report shows China' s newborn sex ratio at 1:0.88. The report states that this severely skewed sex ratio, deviating from natural conditions, ranks China last globally on the “health and survival” indicator of the Gender Equality Index, with an overall ranking of 107/156. These data indicate that China still has a certain degree of gender preference and opportunity inequality.

2. The 2021 Global Gender Gap Report shows that only 11.4% of board members and 16.7% of senior managers in China are women.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv –Machine translation. Verify with original.