CHAPTER 2

CHAPTER OBJECTIVES

After completing this chapter, readers should have a greater understanding of the meaning of "minority" groups, the processes surrounding people's thinking about and treatment of those who are dissimilar to them, and what organizational processes can help to foster diversity, equality, and inclusion. Specifically, they should be able to:

- discuss the meaning of the terms minority group and non-dominant group.
- explain characteristics used to identify non-dominant groups and be able to use these characteristics to identify the non-dominant groups in one's particular environment.
- discuss thought processes related to stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination and theories related to diversity in organizations.
- examine in-group favoritism and out-group bias.
- explain what organizations can do to promote diversity and inclusion, given knowledge about reasons for differential treatment, experiences, and outcomes for different demographic groups.
- have a foundation for synthesizing the material in the remaining chapters.

KEY FACTS

Characteristics of minority or non-dominant groups often include identifiability, differential power, discrimination, and group awareness.

Minority, or non-dominant, groups are not necessarily fewer in number than majority, or dominant, groups.

Categorization and stereotyping are often unconscious processes. People tend to attribute positive characteristics to members of their in-groups and negative characteristics to members of groups to which they do not belong.

In-group favoritism and out-group bias disadvantage non-dominant groups and impede diversity.

Structured interviews and control and monitoring of managerial decisions can reduce similarity effects and other biases in organizations.

Theories and Thinking about Diversity

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

In this chapter, we consider some of the many theories and research studies related to psychological processes affecting diversity in organizations. What are prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination and how do they work to impede diversity? What factors are associated with people's preferences for similar others and hostility and discrimination toward dissimilar others? What can organizations do to address these effects? Knowledge of these factors will provide a foundation for understanding the material in the remaining chapters of the book and for fostering diversity in organizations.

We begin with a discussion of the characteristics associated with minority groups. What defines minority groups? Aside from counting, how does one tell who is the "majority" and who is the "minority" in a society? We examine some of the many theories and concepts related to diversity and investigate how new forms of racism and sexism (and other "isms") affect individuals' behavior toward others. We conclude with suggestions for individuals and organizations to reduce stereotyping and discrimination and to increase fairness in employment decisions and treatment of others at work.

WHAT IS A "MINORITY"?[1]

Although the term *minority* is generally understood to mean "fewer in number," it does not always refer to groups that are numerically fewer than majority group members. What, then, *is* a minority?[2] Minority or non-dominant[3] groups are those subordinated to majority or dominant group members in terms of power, prestige, and privilege.[4] In South Africa, Whites are the dominant group, although they are outnumbered by people of color. In the United States, women outnumber men, but men are the dominant group. *Non-dominant*, then, is a more accurate term than *minority*, although both are used in this book.

In many of the topics we cover, there are clear dominant and non-dominant groups; in others, the distinction is ambiguous. Of the U.S. racial and ethnic groups discussed in this book, Blacks, Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and multiracial group members represent non-dominant groups, and Whites are the dominant group. Throughout the world, men are the dominant sex, although women often outnumber men. Heterosexual is the dominant sexual orientation and people without disabilities are dominant compared to people with disabilities. Attractive people are dominant with respect to people deemed unattractive; and, perceptions of attractiveness are shaped by dominant groups. Thinner people are dominant with

respect to overweight people—although overweight people outnumber thinner people in the United States and increasingly in other nations. Whether younger or older workers are the dominant group is not clear, making research and generalizations about age diversity somewhat complicated. Although older workers occupy considerably more of the high-status, high-paid organizational positions than younger workers, stereotypes and misperceptions pervade the workplace experiences, opportunities, and outcomes of many older workers. At times, younger workers are clearly preferred to older workers, but at other times younger people are viewed as irresponsible, self-centered, and lacking in organizational commitment. The answer to the question of whether people with or without families are dominant is even less clear. For men, researchers have found that being married (to a woman) and having children contribute to being viewed positively in organizations, to higher wages, and to greater advancement. For women, as we discuss in Chapters 9 and 10, having a husband and children contributes to perceptions of divided loyalties and, as a result, to lower wages and fewer promotions. Yet because even unmarried women without children suffer from discrimination and inequality, it is not only having families that affect women.

In considering what is a minority or non-dominant group, social scientists propose that non-dominant group members have distinguishing characteristics across societies and time. Drawing from the seminal work of a group of noted social scientists, Anthony and Rosalind Dworkin propose that minority group members have four common characteristics: identifiability, differential power, the experience of discrimination,[5] and group awareness. Using similar ideas, Edward Sampson offers the following relationships among identifiability, power, and discrimination:

> *Which types of differences are emphasized and which are ignored is usually a choice made by the social groups that occupy positions of dominance within a society. These are the groups that have the power to make their definitions of who is one of them and who is different stick. Dominant groups not only select the qualities of difference that will be emphasized but also develop the rationale to explain why those differences mean one group should be treated differently from another (p. 22).*[6]

Some examples of dominant groups' decisions about which differences matter that will be discussed in later chapters include such things as citizenship, immigration, marriage, property, and voting rights; residential, school, and job segregation; and rights to freedom. In diverse nations around the globe, dominant groups decide on these and other basic rights, controlling the lives and life chances of non-dominant groups. The ways in which identifiability, power, discrimination, and group awareness create subordinating systems are considered in more detail in the following sections.

Identifiability

For subordinating systems to work, minority and majority group members must possess distinguishing physical or cultural traits that make it possible to single them out for differential treatment. If members of non-dominant groups were not identifiable, differential treatment would be difficult or impossible. Historical records suggest that dominant groups devise means to identify non-dominant groups if the members have no distinguishing features. As an example, in Nazi Germany, Jews were required to wear yellow armbands to distinguish them from non-Jews.[7]

In the United States, women, Blacks, Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans are generally fairly easy to identify. In the United Kingdom, the term "black and minority ethnic" is used, while in Canada, members of certain groups are referred to as "visible minorities."[8] Ease of identifiability facilitates singling people out for differential treatment. In the past, as in the present, however, many individual

members of non-dominant racial groups have been difficult to identify, including those who self-identify as members of a minority group but are attributed to another group by independent observers. If a person's heritage is clearly visible, differential treatment from prejudiced employers, businesses, and even the police (racial profiling) is a potential consequence. But it is also true, as we discuss in later chapters, that non-dominant group members who cannot be clearly identified may experience some problems as well. The group identities of gay men and lesbians, some multiracial people, and people with some types of disabilities are invisible, and these group members may experience stress and guilt associated with this invisibility and, at times, fear of disclosure.

A related concept to identifiability is **stigma**, which is widely associated with Erving Goffman's 1963 book, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, in which he describes how stigma affects people's lives Also referred to as "marks" or deviations from the desired norm or typical individual in a particular context, certain stigma can be "evident on the spot," according to Goffman, including

a. "various physical deformities,"
b. "blemishes of individual character," which (if not clearly visible), may be inferred from such things as a "known record" of addiction, alcoholism, homosexuality, mental illness, unemployment, or other areas; and,
c. "tribal stigma of race, nation, and religion, which can be transmitted through lineages and equally contaminate all members of a family." Low class status has also been included in tribal stigma.[9]

While Goffman's specific terminology (marks, blemishes, deformities) is no longer widely used, the idea of being "evident on the spot" and deviant from the desired normal worker or customer in physical ability, race, nation, religion, or being an out sexual minority, like the concept of identifiability, allows people to be singled out for differential treatment.

Differential Power

Dworkin and Dworkin define *power* as the "actual use of resources to influence and control others."[10] Differential power allows those who have more power to control those who have less power. Although power is associated with numerical dominance, those who are members of groups that are larger in number are not always the most powerful. As examples, native people in what would become the United States were originally greater in number, but they were less powerful than the European newcomers and thus were subject to domination; there are more women than men in many countries, but women as a group are less powerful than men. Through their control of resources, powerful groups also control access to education, employment, food, health care, income, voting rights, and other things that affect the life chances and futures of those with less power. Thus, power is used to help the dominant remain dominant.

Discrimination

Dworkin and Dworkin include the experience of discrimination as a defining characteristic of minorities. **Discrimination** has been broadly defined as differential and pejorative actions that serve to limit the social, political, or economic opportunities of members of particular groups.[11] Various types of discrimination have limiting effects on their targets. As described in Chapter 1, **Employment discrimination** or **labor market discrimination** occurs when personal characteristics of applicants or workers that are unrelated to productivity are valued in the labor market. Labor market discrimination based on sex, a personal characteristic, limits the social, political, and

economic opportunities of women. Through access discrimination, the social, political, and economic opportunities of Blacks are limited. For targets of discrimination, according to Dworkin and Dworkin, the experience of being discriminated against leads to group awareness and can become the focus of protests and activism.[12]

Group Awareness

Group awareness, the final characteristic of minority groups proposed by Dworkin and Dworkin, is one consequence of their subordination by the majority and its discriminatory practices. The unfair treatment minority groups experience leads them to realize that they are subjected to differential treatment simply because of their group membership and that this treatment is a result of the majority's definitions and evaluations rather than due to intrinsic qualities or actions of their group. They may also realize that they can achieve certain goals (e.g., housing, jobs, and voting rights) through cooperative resistance (such as protests, boycotts, and participation in the political process). The Civil Rights, women's rights, and gay rights movements are examples of ways in which group awareness produced activism and attainment of some goals.

Analysis of the Characteristics

Although these characteristics—identifiability, differential power, discrimination, and group awareness—do in many cases help clarify which groups are minority groups, they are by no means definitive. At times, they do not apply to some non-dominant groups or are otherwise insufficient, as for those with invisible identities and for individuals with power who are also non-dominant group members (e.g., a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) who is a woman of color). In other situations, there are disconnects between the group to which a person appears to belong and his or her self-identity. Taylor Cox labels these situations as incongruence of phenotype (visible identity) and culture identities,[13] such as a Mexican American with Caucasian physical features identifying with the Mexican American culture. This creates cognitive dissonance for observers that may cause discomfort or even negative reactions. In the chapters that discuss individual groups, we will analyze further the applicability of these four criteria to those groups.

CATEGORIZATION AND IDENTITY

As discussed in the previous section, Dworkin and Dworkin's first defining criterion for minority groups is identifiability. Once identified, what factors make groups single out others for discrimination? What factors make otherwise rational people prone to believe stereotypes? What organizational constraints can prevent prejudicial attitudes from resulting in discrimination?

Although prejudice and discrimination are sometimes viewed as synonymous, they are not. **Prejudice** is "irrationally based, negative attitudes" about certain groups and their members.[14] Prejudice is an attitude, whereas discrimination is behavior—differential and pejorative actions that serve to limit the social, political, or economic opportunities of members of particular groups—based on the attitude. Given the power to act and the absence of sanctions for doing so, discriminatory behavior may result from prejudice. For example, employers may have negative attitudes about overweight people, and these attitudes may result in refusal to hire them (employment discrimination), which is not currently illegal in most parts of the United States.

Stereotypes are the overgeneralization of characteristics to large human groups and are often the basis for prejudice and discrimination. **Prescriptive stereotyping** refers

to perceptions about how people should behave, based on their group memberships (e.g., women should wear makeup, as discussed in the Ann Hopkins case in Chapter 9), while **descriptive stereotyping** refers to ideas about how people do or will behave, based on their group memberships (e.g., women are caring and are therefore appropriate as nurses and elementary school teachers).[15] Fairly common job-related stereotypes about the groups we consider in the following chapters can be easily called to mind even by those who do not believe them or who are themselves members of the targeted groups.[16] Some stereotypes reflect interactions among multiple groups, such as race, ethnicity, gender, and parental status. In a job-related context, stereotyping can prevent individuals who would be capable, committed workers from being hired, promoted, or trained. Negative organizational outcomes follow from the negative individual outcomes, as noted in Chapter 1.

Although common stereotypes can easily be identified, when prompted to think of someone from each group who *does not* fit the stereotype, many people can do so. Despite being able to identify people who do not fit them, people often attend to evidence that supports stereotypes they hold and ignore evidence that disconfirms stereotypes. Further, stereotypes can lead to prejudice, which in turn can lead to discrimination, given the right circumstances.

Social Categorization and Stereotyping

Social cognitive theory suggests that people use categorization to simplify and cope with the large volumes of information to which they are continually exposed. Categories allow us to quickly and easily compartmentalize data. Consistent with Dworkin and Dworkin's proposals that minority group members must be identifiable, people often use visible characteristics, such as race, sex, and age, to categorize others. Thus, when one sees a person of a particular race, automatic processing occurs and beliefs about this particular race are activated. When the person is not visible but his or her name is known (perhaps on a résumé), this provides information about the person's sex, which allows categorization: male or female. Mental models of a person suited to a particular job (e.g., bank teller, truck driver) are often associated with sex, and sorting of candidates by sex occurs as a result of such models. A name may also provide evidence of a person's race or ethnic background, which could also allow categorization and discrimination (see Chapter 4). People's propensity to categorize, coupled with the need to then *evaluate* the person categorized, leads to stereotyping.[17]

Along with the tendency to categorize, people have a tendency to perceive themselves and others as belonging to particular groups. This part of categorization, referred to as *social categorization*, involves ordering one's social environment by groupings of persons.[18] Social categorization helps create and define one's place in society. Groups define one's place by separating people: where we belong or do not belong and where others belong and do not belong. A person's in-group is the group to which he or she belongs, while out-groups are groups to which he or she does not belong. Recall from Chapter 1 that **identity groups** are the collectivities that people use to categorize themselves and others. Depending on the situation, and what factor is salient, or distinctive, a person's in-group may be based on his or her race, sex, age, or other identity factor of importance.[19] Salient characteristics are important to an individual at a particular time, or at all times, depending on how critical the characteristic is to the individual's experiences and life. For example, in a department with three women and ten men, the in-group for the women would be women and the out-group would be men. If the department had two Blacks (one man and one woman) and eleven White men and women, in-groups and out-groups could instead be determined using racial categories. Which category would be salient would depend on the situation (e.g., if the men were all sitting together on one

side of the room, or if the conversation were about racial profiling) and the extent to which people *identified* themselves by their race or sex. For a Black person in the United States, race may be salient in an organization in which there are few Blacks or in an organization in which everyone is Black (if being in such an organization is unusual). Beverly Daniel Tatum's book *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?* explains that the clustering of Blacks in the cafeterias of predominantly White educational institutions is obvious and disturbing to some observers.[20] The similar clustering of groups of Whites is typically less obvious or disturbing.

Social identity refers to the part of an individual's self-concept that derives from his or her membership in a particular social group and the value and emotional significance attached to that group membership.[21] Using race as an example, social identity describes how much a person identifies as a member of a certain race and how strongly and passionately he or she feels about belonging to that race. Is being Black integral to one's life, experiences, and being? For sex as a characteristic, social identity describes how much a person identifies as a man or woman and how strongly and passionately he or she feels about being a man or woman. Is being deaf central to one's life, experiences, and being? Social identity is in some ways similar to Dworkin and Dworkin's conceptualization of the development of group awareness for non-dominant group members. Those who see that they belong to a particular group and that the group receives pejorative treatment by others (out-groups) become aware of their group membership as a collective body able to take resistive action.

Consequences of Social Categorization and Social Identity

As noted earlier, when we first come into contact with others, we categorize them as belonging to an in-group or an out-group. These tendencies to categorize can affect job satisfaction and the relationships among supervisors, subordinates, and peers.[22] We tend to see members of our in-group as being heterogeneous, with different attitudes, behaviors, and characteristics, and out-group members as being homogeneous—having similar attitudes, behaviors, and characteristics (i.e., fitting stereotypes). Researchers propose that these perspectives may occur because of the breadth of interactions we have with people from our in-group as compared with those from out-groups, with whom we may have little substantive personal interaction. When biased depictions of out-groups permeate the media, these depictions may be the basis of the only "knowledge" one may have of out-group members and may strongly influence unfounded negative attitudes and biases.[23] Influence of media on biases is discussed further in Feature 2.1.

In-Group Favoritism and Out-Group Biases

There is often strong in-group favoritism and, at times, derogation of out-group members. Favoritism and viewing members of one's group positively bolster one's self-esteem, as does viewing other groups negatively. Alone, favoritism for one's particular group is not necessarily negative. When coupled with power, however, favoritism is associated with advantages for the in-group and negative opportunities and outcomes for the (lower status, less powerful) out-group.

A likely result of in-group favoritism in a work setting is the hiring, promoting, rewarding, and retention by those in power of members of their in-group. Even if no overt derogation of out-group members is involved, the non-dominant out-group is disadvantaged when the dominant in-group is favored. Because women and minorities are typically non-dominant in organizations, social categorization and in-group favoritism work against them, negatively affecting their chances for employment, high-status positions, promotion, and other opportunities when compared with Whites and men. Women and people of color often have relatively little

FEATURE 2.1

The Media and the Promulgation of Stereotypes

News reports, television, movies, and commercials communicate stereotypes about perpetrators and victims of crime, gender roles, age groups, and numerous other diversity issues.[24] People tend to believe what they see on television and read on news sites, implicitly trusting writers and reporters to be objective conveyors of what is actually occurring. Yet those who write and choose stories are not unbiased. Instead, they are products of a society in which racial, ethnic, gender, and other stereotypes exist; and can contribute to perpetuation of stereotypes.[25] For example, minorities are disproportionately portrayed as perpetrators of crime in the news. One study found that over fourteen weeks, minorities were shown to be crime perpetrators in 20% more cases than would be predicted based on FBI statistics.[26] Although Whites comprise a greater proportion of arrests for drug-related crimes (67%), Blacks (31%)[27] are more likely to be shown on television being arrested for such crimes. News reports are also more likely to portray Black on White crime, although most crime is intra-racial (e.g., Black on Black or White on White).[28] The term "Black on Black" crime is well known, but "White on White" crime is not.

> **Misperception:** *Blacks and Latinos commit more crimes than Whites.*
>
> **Reality:** *Blacks and Latinos are more likely to be (profiled and) arrested and convicted than Whites.*

Chapter 4 describes research in which college-educated Black applicants without a criminal record received fewer positive responses from employers than college-educated White applicants with a record. In some cases, the Black applicant was asked in advance whether he had a record, reflecting beliefs likely in some part fueled by media representations. Divisive and erroneous stereotypes about Black men contribute to their higher unemployment when compared with comparably educated White men, lower participation rates (see Chapter 4), and a host of other individual, organizational, and societal problems. Researchers have documented relationships between television viewing and stereotyping of women and racial and ethnic minorities. For minorities, less actual contact with a group exacerbates the relationships between media viewing and stereotyping.[29]

Questions to Consider

1. In addition to racial, ethnic, and gender stereotyping, what other kinds of stereotypes have you seen in the media? How do frequent portrayals of such stereotypes affect people's perceptions of their veracity?
2. Choose one week night and one weekend night to watch television news during prime time. Describe the race, sex, approximate age, and other notable factors of people featured in the news. What diversity-related factors do you observe?
3. One commercial that has attempted to change what was a stereotypical statement is the revised Jif® peanut butter commercial. Previous commercials said, "Choosy Moms choose Jif®"; the newer one says, "Choosy Moms … and Dads choose Jif®." What other stereotype-resistant commercials have you observed? What stereotype-supportive commercials have you observed? What messages are being conveyed?
4. Investigate the circumstances surrounding the 2010 Shirley Sherrod/USDA media-driven disaster. What could have prevented the disaster from spreading with such fervor?

organizational power; thus any favoritism they may feel toward women and people of color is less likely to disadvantage men and Whites. The documented existence of the **similarity effect**, a bias in which people are more likely to select or hire demographically similar others, is also a manifestation of in-group favoritism. The similarity effect has even been documented in professional sports. In the National Basketball Association, researchers found that "more personal fouls are awarded against players when they are officiated by an opposite-race officiating crew than

when they are officiated by an own-race refereeing crew. These biases are sufficiently large so that they affect the outcome of an appreciable number of games."[30] In Major League Baseball, when not monitored, umpires are more likely to call strikes when the umpire and the pitcher are the same race/ethnicity. This propensity affects pitchers' performance, batters' behavior, and the outcome of games.[31] The researchers speculated that when having umpires' decisions evaluated by others or technology, similarity preferences might no longer manifest themselves.[32] Although most people do not play professional sports, similarity biases can and do affect those in more common jobs. As discussed in Research Summary 2.1, researchers have found that using structured interviews can negate similarity biases and in-group favoritism in selection.[33]

In addition to favoring the in-group and derogating the out-group, similar behaviors exhibited by members of the in-group and the out-group are judged differently.[35] A man who exhibits a "take-charge" attitude is viewed as assertive (a positive attribute), but a woman who does so is "bossy" (a negative attribute; see also the Ann Hopkins case in Chapter 9). Again, because men are in positions of power, their propensity is to see the same behaviors as positive if exhibited by men but negative if exhibited by women, which disadvantages women and advantages men. As discussed in Chapter 9, these perceptions are the result of gender roles that men and women are expected to play and are penalized for violating.

Attribution Errors

Attribution errors are the tendency to underestimate the influence of external factors (e.g., situations or circumstances) and overestimate the influence of internal factors (e.g., personal qualities) when evaluating the behavior of others, also occurs during in-group and out-group evaluations. Thus, when in-group members behave positively or are successful, this behavior is attributed to the character or personal attributes of in-group members. When they behave negatively (such as screaming at a subordinate), this behavior is attributed to the circumstances (e.g., being upset because the computer system crashed and records were lost). When out-group members exhibit desirable behaviors, this behavior is attributed to luck or chance rather than to their character. When they behave negatively (such as screaming at a subordinate), this behavior is attributed to the character of the out-group member (e.g., rude or inconsiderate). The entire out-group is also then viewed as being rude, rather than as having one member who behaved rudely at a particular point in time. Future interactions with out-group members will then continue to be shaped by perceptions that they are rude. Ironically, expecting that someone will be rude may lead to treating that person rudely, to which they may respond rudely, confirming the expectation that they (and people like them) are rude.

In research summarizing findings from nineteen studies about attribution errors, Hewstone found some support for three general findings:

1. More internal attribution for positive acts and less internal attribution for negative acts by in-group than out-group members;
2. More attribution of out-group than in-group failure to lack of ability, and 'explaining away' out-group success to good luck, high effort or an easy task;
3. A preference for in-group serving than out-group serving attributions for group differences.[36]

When confronted with information about an out-group member that is contradictory to stereotypes, people tend to see this as "unique" ("not like the rest of them"[37]) rather than use it to question and discard their beliefs. When confronted with behavior that confirms a stereotype about an out-group member, people attend to such information and hold to relevant stereotypes. From a diversity perspective, let us consider the stereotype that Asians lack communication skills and thus prefer to work in technical

RESEARCH SUMMARY 2.1

No More "Tell Me about Yourself" Interviews: Using Structured Interviews to Reduce Bias in Selection

Many researchers have investigated the influence of demographic similarity on interview outcomes. Research results have been mixed, with some researchers finding that interviewers favored those who were similar in race or sex while others finding no similarity effects. Julie McCarthy and her colleagues proposed that these mixed results were due to different research settings, different samples, and different types of interviews. Unstructured interviews, in which the interviewer asks different questions of different candidates are fraught with bias and do little to help managers choose the most qualified candidates. In contrast, **structured interviews** have certain key characteristics that increase the validity of the selection process.[34] In structured interviews, all candidates are asked the same set of questions that are based on a job analysis—what tasks the person will be required to do, and what knowledge, skills, and abilities she or he will need.

McCarthy et al. used the key elements of successful structured interviews (including behaviorally anchored rating scales and interviewer training) with a sample of nearly 20,000 people who had applied for professional positions with the U.S. government. Demographically, 59% of applicants were men, 34% were women, and 7% declined to provide their sex. Whites, Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks were 79%, 7%, 5%, and 4% of applicants, respectively. Five percent did not report their race or ethnicity. Of 207 interviewers, 58% were men, 37% were women, and 5% did not identify their sex; Whites, Blacks, Asians, and Hispanics comprised 63%, 19%, 4%, and 3% of the interviewers, respectively, with 11% not providing their race or ethnicity.

Each candidate had experience-based, situational, and behavioral interviews. In the experience-based interview, applicants answered questions about their qualifications. In the situational interview, applicants responded to hypothetical questions that they might experience at work. In the behavioral interview, applicants described their behavior in past situations that was relevant to the job for which they were being interviewed. Interviewers were extensively trained on how to conduct and score the interview, on the importance of taking notes during the interview, and on rater errors, and two interviewers evaluated each candidate.

Findings were clear: Applicants' race and sex were not related to their ratings by the interviewers nor was applicant/interviewer similarity related to applicants' ratings. Because the research involved a very large field sample that included significant proportions of Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians as applicants and interviewers, the results of no sex and race effects and no similarity effects in applicant ratings have strong implications for selection decisions. The researchers noted that organizations that adopt carefully structured and administered interviews can minimize concerns about discrimination on the basis of race and sex. The use of highly structured interviews will help facilitate the selection of a diverse workforce and increase the effectiveness of interviews in identifying candidates most suited for positions. Through requiring structured interviews, and monitoring results of human resources activities for fairness, organizational leaders can also reduce the effects of individual prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination, and bias in human resources (HR) systems (see Figure 1.1).

Questions to Consider

1. Aside from the diversity-related benefits, what are some other benefits of structured job interviews?
2. For your current job or for your most recent previous job, was your interview a structured interview? What were the race and sex of the last three people with whom you interviewed for a job? Were they similar to or different from you? Do you think the similarity or difference played a role in whether you were hired?

SOURCE: McCarthy, J. M., Van Iddeking, C. H., & Campion, M. A. (2010). "Are Highly Structured Job Interviews Resistant to Demographic Similarity Effects?" *Personnel Psychology*, 63: 325–359.

jobs rather than managerial jobs. Let us assume that a decision maker who is making promotion and succession plans holds this stereotype about Asians. If this person knows an Asian American individual who was born and reared in the United States (and who speaks English as well or as poorly as any other American), he or she is still likely to think Asians as a group do not speak English well and will not make good managers. Rather than use the knowledge that this known Asian man or woman has good communication skills as a reason to question and discard the stereotype, the decision maker is likely to discard the information as unique to this particular person. Were that decision maker to encounter an Asian man or woman who preferred the technical promotion track over the managerial path, the manager might attribute this preference to the person's lack of communication skills (rather than to a genuine personal strength or interest), confirming an existing stereotype.

Taking women as another example, if a decision maker holds the stereotype that women do not have the requisite managerial skills, a woman who expresses interest in advancing in an organization and is highly successful in assessment center exercises would still be disadvantaged by that stereotypical perception. A successful woman would be viewed as an anomaly, and her success would be attributed to external factors (the organization's desire to increase representation of women in management, affirmative action, or physical attractiveness), rather than to her personal strengths and motivation. Were she to enter management and fail, this confirmatory failure would be attributed to her (and women) not having the skills requisite to manage. In actuality, her failure may be related to the failure of management to provide training, mentoring, and encouragement due to holding stereotypes about women managers.[38]

Again turning to how these attribution errors disadvantage non-dominant groups, imagine that those in positions of power—the dominant group—attribute their own failures to circumstances but their successes to personal strengths and character. Imagine also that they see the failures of non-dominant groups as a result of lack of strength and moral character and the successes of those groups as due to luck, accident, or chance. A likely consequence, then, is the tendency to hire, promote, and reward the in-groups because they are meritorious, and to not hire, promote, and reward out-groups because they clearly are not meritorious.

Chapter 4 examines how the legacy of slavery and continued discrimination has contributed to wealth disparities between Whites and Blacks. Chapter 7 considers how privileges enjoyed by Whites as "normal" aspects of everyday life contribute to the "myth of meritocracy." For example, when Whites believe that Blacks do not have as much wealth as Whites have because of failing to invest, save, become entrepreneurs, or work hard and that Whites have greater wealth because of doing so, this is an example of attribution errors. Such errors do not allow Whites to see how their personal, unearned advantages also disadvantage non-dominant group members. These unearned advantages include such things as being perceived as trustworthy because of being White, being given the benefit of the doubt when credentials are ambiguous, legacy admissions to universities that were previously segregated, and inheritance from ancestors who profited from things denied to Blacks (e.g., union membership and resulting high wages, homes in neighborhoods reserved for Whites that appreciated in value).

Multiple Group Memberships

As mentioned in Chapter 1, each person has multiple group memberships, including racial, ethnic, age, and other groups. Multiple group memberships make relationships among in-groups and out-groups and social identities quite complex. A White male has a racial identity and a sex or gender identity. Depending on the circumstances and particular stereotypes, he may perceive Whites or men as the in-group and non-Whites and women as the out-groups, as appropriate. In some cases, Whiteness may be the most salient identity, and he may display favoritism toward White women. In other cases, his maleness may be more salient, and he may favor a Black man.

When stereotyping is included in his decision-making, he may make different decisions. If Blacks are perceived as not reliable, for example, the White male manager may prefer to hire a White woman. If he views women as likely to quit work to stay at home with children or miss work because of children, he may favor a man of color.

Add religion, sexual orientation, and disability to that White male's social identities and the situation becomes even more complex. Imagine that the White man is also Jewish and gay and has a disability. In some circumstances, being Jewish or having a disability may be salient. In other circumstances, his White maleness may be overshadowed by his having a disability or being gay. These factors would reduce his power and the perception that he is a member of the in-group of heterosexual, nondisabled White males. Being gay or having a disability could also affect his perceptions of and actions toward (other) non-dominant group members. If his identity as a member of a non-dominant group is salient, this may increase the likelihood he will see other non-dominant group members less negatively as well. The experience of heterosexism, for example, may cause him to see women as individuals with a variety of characteristics rather than as a monolithic group. Being Jewish may make him view Blacks as experiencing unfair discrimination and to be supportive of Blacks' pursuit of equality. As is evident by these examples, multiple group memberships that include some non-dominant groups add complexity to the social identity equation and highlight the need to avoid painting people with broad strokes.

Non-dominant Groups as the In-Group

When non-dominant groups are the in-group, the results of the social categorization of people into in-groups and out-groups are different. Women, for example, may view other women as having positive attributes and prefer them to men. They may attribute positive behaviors to the characteristics of women and negative behaviors to circumstances in which women find themselves. They may attribute negative behaviors to the characteristics of men and positive behaviors to circumstances. Similarly, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans may attribute positive characteristics to themselves and negative characteristics to Whites. As discussed earlier, a key difference for women, racial and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, and other non-dominant group members as in-groups is their generally lower access to power. Because non-dominant group members are less likely to be in positions of power, despite what they might believe about dominant group members, non-dominant group members are less likely to be able to discriminate against men, Whites, people without disabilities, and other dominant group members.[39]

It is also possible that non-dominant group members may hold stereotypes about members of their own groups. Instead of favoring members of their own in-groups, they may stereotype them and view the dominant group as more likely to have positive attributes. In research conducted using real teams (rather than those formed in the laboratory), Jennifer Boldry and Deborah Kashy found that the status of the group affected perceptions of the homogeneity of out-groups and the heterogeneity of in-groups.[40] Lower-status groups viewed themselves and high-status groups (their out-groups) as having variation in member characteristics. High-status group members saw themselves and their group as having heterogeneous characteristics but saw the out-group members as having homogenous characteristics. Interestingly, the lower-status group rated the high-status group more favorably in terms of leadership, motivation, and character than the high-status group members rated themselves. Boldry and Kashy's sample included undergraduate freshmen and juniors participating in a campus corps of cadets, a legitimate group for research purposes but composed of 90% males. The race and ethnicity of the sample were not reported, but it is to be expected that more diversity in status characteristics (e.g., race, ethnicity, or sex) would result in different perceptions of the qualities of in- and out-groups. In addition, the out-group members were striving to become official in-group members

as they moved up the status hierarchy (i.e., become senior members of the Corps), which is not likely for those who would differ by race, ethnicity, or sex.

It is possible, however, that non-dominant group members (e.g., Blacks, Latinos) to a certain extent may "buy in" to the negative stereotypes about their group and also prefer members of the dominant group, reflecting internalized racism.[41] **Internalized racism** occurs when members of devalued races consciously or unconsciously accept or believe negative messages about their own abilities and intrinsic worth and those of others of the same race.[42] Kenneth and Mamie Clark's "doll studies," which continue to be replicated decades later, and Jane Elliott's "blue eyes/brown eyes" experiments in the documentary "A Class Divided" have been offered as evidence of the power of racism and continued messages that one's group is of low value.[43] For example, the stereotype that Blacks are lazy and have a poor work ethic is sometimes held by Blacks and other minorities as well as by Whites.[44] Pyke has studied internalized racism among Asians, noting one Asian man's parents had told him to stay away from Asians, resulting in him feeling "uneasy" when around Asians, and feeling he "can't stand Vietnamese people or just Asians in general."[45] **Internalized sexism** occurs when women accept and believe negative messages about their own abilities and intrinsic worth and those of other women. While many non-dominant group members resist such negative messages and have pride in their group memberships,[46] those who succumb to internalized racism or sexism may suffer a host of negative individual consequences (e.g., depression, hopelessness, and health problems) that affect organizations and society as well. Along with internalized sexism and racism, internalized ableism, ageism, and homophobia and associated negative consequences can also occur. Although these –isms may occur, it is also possible that any in-group favoritism by powerful non-dominant members might be noticed and scrutinized more than in-group favoritism by dominant group members. This may serve to limit in-group favoritism by non-dominant group members.

Stereotype threat is related to the effects of negative messages about one's group, and occurs when one is concerned about being judged by a negative stereotype about one's group. Stereotype threat has deleterious effects on performance in a variety of situations.[47] Multiple studies have shown that priming of one's group membership influences performance on relevant tasks, including women's math performance, Blacks', Latinos', and poor people's standardized test performance, and White men's athletic performance, among others.[48] In addition to performing more poorly, stereotype threat has been shown to reduce women's learning and retention of math skills, which has long-term individual and societal consequences.[49]

Along with internalizing or having their performance (and sometimes learning) impeded by negative beliefs, there are many other negative individual, organizational, and societal consequences of stereotyping and discrimination. As we discuss in later chapters, name-based discrimination, job steering based on who is thought to be suited to certain jobs (e.g., by sex, race, physical appearance), discrimination in layoffs and terminations, and consumer racial profiling are just a few of these negative consequences that researchers have documented. As mentioned in Chapter 1, **consumer racial profiling** is differential treatment of consumers in the marketplace based on race/ethnicity that constitutes denial of or degradation in the products and/or services that are offered to the consumer.[50] Organizational Feature 2.1 provides an example of how consumer racial profiling can result in lost business both from customers who are profiled and from other customers who are displeased by others' mistreatment.

Individuals, such as Mr. Pitts, clearly suffer from consumer racial profiling, but organizations experience negative consequences as well, from lost business, but also from shrinkage due to stereotyping and consumer racial profiling as a means to control theft. For example, a common fear is that young people, particularly minorities, are likely shoplifters. In a large study in an Atlanta store, however, unobtrusive observers documented who was stealing by race, sex, and age category. They

ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURE 2.1

Negative Consequences of Bad Check Accusation

Appearing to make decisions on the basis of stereotypical beliefs generated considerable negative publicity for Walmart when Reginald Pitts, a Black man and human resources manager at GAF Materials, went to a Florida Walmart to purchase 510 gift cards for company employees and was assumed to be using a bad check.[51] GAF, the biggest roofing systems maker in the United States with $1.6 billion in revenues the year prior to the incident, had been purchasing gift cards at Walmart for years. The cards were typically picked up by a White female administrator, but because she was on vacation, Pitts decided to get the cards himself. He phoned in the order and went to Walmart with a $13,000 company check, his driver's license, and his GAF business card. When called, a GAF accounting supervisor assured store managers that the check was good, but store managers still told Pitts they were having trouble verifying the check. While he waited about two hours at the customer service desk, two Black Walmart employees told Pitts that similar transactions by other customers had been processed without delay and suggested he was being closely scrutinized because he was Black.

Pitts repeatedly asked for the check to be returned so he could buy the cards elsewhere, but store managers refused to return the check and continued stalling. They had called law enforcement to report a felony. When the deputies arrived, one grabbed Pitts, telling him they needed to talk with him about the "forged check." Pitts said he thought he was going to jail. After reviewing the "evidence," the deputies concluded there were no grounds for a criminal charge and returned the check to Pitts. Pitts said that the Walmart store manager told him he "did what he had to do" and "have a great day, sir." "I keep going over and over the incident in my mind. I cannot come up with any possible reason why I was treated like this except that I am Black," said Pitts.

GAF and Pitts lodged complaints with Walmart, which opened its own investigation. Walmart conceded the situation was "handled very poorly" but said that Walmart does not tolerate racial profiling or discrimination. The store manager was fired, and another was disciplined for not following company policies. Four Walmart officials called Pitts to apologize for the incident, including Lawrence Jackson, Walmart's executive VP of Human Resources. Jackson "said that he was apologizing as one HR manager to another and as one African-American to another."

After Mr. Pitts' experience, which he described as being "totally humiliating," GAF purchased the gift cards at Target instead. In addition to that lost business, after significant media coverage, including local and national news coverage, other incensed customers also took their business elsewhere. Samantha Devine, an office manager at a medical clinic, had planned to go to Walmart to buy gift cards for coworkers. When she heard what happened to Pitts, Devine said, "It made me so angry I haven't set foot in a Walmart since."

Questions to Consider

1. What assumptions might have been made about Mr. Pitts?
2. Given the risk of retaliation from management if found out, what factors may have motivated the Black store employees to tell Mr. Pitts that other customers had processed large checks without hassle?
3. Walmart apparently had policies regarding checks that could not be verified that were not followed, suggesting policies alone are insufficient to address certain stereotypes and fears. What additional safeguards might be implemented so that consumer racial profiling does not occur?

found that shoppers aged 35–54 were most likely to steal and that non-Whites and Whites were equally likely to steal. People who exhibited certain *behaviors* were most likely to be shoplifters: leaving the store without making a purchase, scanning the premises looking for surveillance cameras, and tampering with products.[52] Ironically, consumer racial profiling may increase crime by those *not* targeted, but who are aware of the targeting of other groups.[53] In a controlled experiment, Amy

Hackney and Jack Glaser found a "reverse deterrent" effect on Whites who were not profiled for cheating on a difficult task. When Black confederates in the study were singled out for cheating, White participants cheated more than when Whites were profiled and more than when there was no profiling of either group. Blacks' cheating behavior was similar across experimental conditions, thus, the additional cheating by Whites when Blacks were profiled led to a net increase in cheating. This net increase led the researchers to suggest that profiling may be counterproductive—having a reverse deterrent effect. If retailers focused training on avoiding stereotypes and paying attention to behaviors, shrinkage due to shoplifting and lost business due to consumer racial profiling might be significantly reduced. Similar observations can be made for other forms of racial profiling.

AVERSIVE RACISM, AMBIVALENT SEXISM, AND OTHER NEW – ISMS

Overt demonstrations of intentional discrimination are considerably less likely in the twenty-first century than they have been in the past. However, researchers have identified contemporary, different forms of racism, including aversive, symbolic, and new racism. **Aversive racism** occurs when those who ostensibly adhere to egalitarian values and believe themselves to be unprejudiced still possess negative feelings and beliefs about racial issues and minority group members. A person with **egalitarian** values believes in human equality, particularly regarding social, political, and economic rights and privileges. Unlike those who practice traditional, overt racist behavior, those who hold aversive racist beliefs do not openly discriminate, but when their actions can be justified by some other factor (e.g., lack of "fit" or some other factor other than race), they are likely to exhibit aversive racist behaviors. Multiple studies have documented the existence of this form of racism across times and settings, and it could be considered more troublesome than traditional racism. People who hold traditional racist beliefs might state them openly, but aversive racists say they espouse egalitarian beliefs, which makes efforts to identify and change their true beliefs more difficult. In one study, John Dovidio and Samuel Gaertner documented the change in White participants' expression of prejudiced beliefs over a ten year period, finding significantly fewer instances in the later period.[54] Even so, the researchers did find that, when making selection decisions, participants who expressed prejudicial beliefs (i.e., traditional racism) at both points were less likely to select Blacks, regardless of the qualifications of the Black candidates. Those who did not express prejudicial beliefs showed no differences in rates of recommendation when qualifications for either Blacks or Whites were particularly high. When qualifications were ambiguous—neither particularly strong, nor particularly weak—Whites were more frequently recommended than similarly qualified Blacks. Thus, when qualifications were strong and discrimination could be easily identified, aversive racists made similar recommendations for Blacks and Whites. When qualifications were ambiguous and decisions could be attributed to factors other than discrimination (e.g., "fit" or "personality"), aversive racists made fewer selection recommendations for Blacks. Dovidio and Gaertner suggested that this behavior may be based in part on the fundamental attribution error (discussed earlier) and reflective of Whites' tendency to give the benefit of the doubt to ambiguously qualified in-group members but not to out-group members. As we discuss in Chapter 4, Blacks and Latinos with similar financial qualifications have been steered to higher mortgage rates than Whites, which may also indicate in-group favoritism and out-group bias, and which had devastating consequences for some of the affected families. Differences in relationships between qualifications and hiring or mortgage rates can be monitored and measured and disparities addressed by knowledgeable leaders committed to equality and to their bottom line.

"New" Racism

Similar to aversive racism, **new racism** includes beliefs that racism is a thing of the past and that Blacks have attained excessive, unfair gains through programs such

as affirmative action. New racists do not display overt racism, but when provided with a rationale, they will use business justifications as excuses to deny employment to Blacks. In a laboratory study, Art Brief and his colleagues investigated whether explicit instructions from "company officials" to discriminate against Blacks would be followed.[55] The business justifications provided were that the company president believed it was important to (1) continue the good relationships built by the previous (White) job incumbent, (2) keep the marketing teams as homogeneous as possible, or (3) match the newly hired employee to the race of the majority of clients in the assigned territory base. Study participants who had high scores on the new racism scale were likely to avoid hiring qualified Blacks when provided with this "business justification." In nearly 40% of the cases, those participants chose an *unqualified White* instead of a *qualified Black*, a finding consistent with a case discussed in Chapter 3, in which a Coca-Cola bottler was found to have passed over Blacks and Latinos for less qualified Whites.

In another study assessing purported changes in racial attitudes, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva and Tyrone Forman hypothesized that recent changes overstate the amount of positive change in racial attitudes.[56] Using qualitative and quantitative data drawn from 732 university students (who are believed to be less prejudiced than those with less education), Eduardo Bonilla-Silva and Tyrone Forman found that students avoided the appearance of holding discriminatory beliefs in surveys, but interview data presented a different picture. "I'm not a racist ... but ..." preceded statements expressing hostile attitudes toward racial minorities; beliefs that minorities, rather than systematic discrimination, were responsible for their own situations; and belief in the existence of reverse discrimination, among other things. The researchers urged caution in concluding that racial attitudes were improving, suggesting that "colorblind racism" was replacing the expression of traditionally racist attitudes that are no longer widely acceptable.

Ambivalent sexism is the simultaneous holding of both hostile ("women are incompetent at work") and "benevolent" ("women must be protected") sexist beliefs about women.[57] **Hostile sexism** is an antipathy toward women based on faulty and inflexible generalization (e.g., negative stereotypes). **Benevolent sexism** is defined as a set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist (stereotypical) and at the same time perceived as positive by the attitude holder (e.g., helping and attraction).[58]

Benevolent sexism might be manifested by comments to a female coworker on her appearance, which could undermine her being taken seriously at work,[59] or by finishing her sentences, which could make her appear timid and unassertive. Although benevolent sexism is viewed less negatively than hostile sexism, it is still detrimental to women.[60]

Neosexism is similar to aversive racism; it occurs when people's reported egalitarian values conflict with their negative attitudes toward women.[61] The existence of neosexism has been documented in studies conducted in the United States, Slovenia, and Croatia, among other areas.[62] It could be argued that similar aversive attitudes exist toward other non-dominant groups. Reporting egalitarian attitudes toward gay men and lesbians but resisting equitable work-related benefits for them or reporting egalitarian attitudes toward people with disabilities but resisting accommodations for them as expensive or unfair to people without disabilities are possible examples.

"DIVERSITY" AND NON-DOMINANT GROUPS IN DIFFERENT CONTEXTS

Although most of the research in this chapter was conducted in American settings, many of the theoretical ideas, constructions, and relationships discussed have widespread relevance. As discussed in Chapter 1, what is most important to the study of

diversity in different countries depends on national context, culture, political and socioeconomic structures, and history.[63] To determine critical areas of difference in a particular context, considering differences based on power or dominance relations stemming from historical disparities and perpetuated by continued differential and pejorative treatment of certain groups, can be helpful. Identifiability, whether through physical features, religion, name, or other factor is also important. In most areas around the world, females are the non-dominant group, regardless of their proportion of the population. For other non-dominant groups, one might assess which groups are more likely to be un- or under-employed, residentially segregated, receive less education or poorer returns on education, have higher unemployment and incarceration rates, and poorer health. Key markers of "minority" or non-dominance are often consistent across cultures. Looking at groups targeted by anti-discrimination legislation might also be useful; the need for legislation often suggests the existence of differential and pejorative actions. Looking at areas prohibited from discussion or tracking (such as race in France or Germany) might also indicate problem areas.[64] Refusal to talk about something does not make it invisible or negate disparities associated with it.

Although the groups relevant to "diversity" in the United States are not transferrable to other countries, the ideas about dominance, power, in-groups and out-groups, social categorization, stereotyping, inequality, and other concepts are indeed relevant. As noted by Özbilgin and his colleagues in their research on global diversity management, "Diversity is here to stay on a global scale. We can celebrate it or hate it, but we cannot neglect it or postpone it."[65]

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Efforts to combat stereotypes must be purposeful. As we have discussed, when confronted with information that is contradictory to their stereotypes, people tend to see the situation as "unique" rather than using it to question and begin discarding their beliefs. When faced with behavior that confirms stereotypes, people attend to such information instead of recognizing that there is variation among members of all groups. Indeed, it is likely that every stereotype will apply to individuals from many different groups. With concerted effort, motivated people can in some cases deactivate stereotyping and stop automatic categorization and discriminatory actions.

Kerry Kawakami and colleagues have empirically investigated the effects of training on stereotype reduction. They found that practice in negating stereotypes results in reduced activation of stereotypes.[66] Adam Galinsky and Gordon Moskowitz have also found that perspective taking helps to reduce stereotyping and some of its negative consequences.[67] Even without formal training, we can and should work consciously, as individuals, to resist stereotyping, in-group favoritism, and out-group biases. Awareness of these processes is an important step, as is organizational support of equity. We should question ourselves and our beliefs, attitudes, and behavior toward dissimilar others.

Because aversive racists are unaware that they hold prejudiced attitudes and genuinely think they are unbiased, efforts to change their prejudices are necessarily different from attempts to change those who openly acknowledge and express overt prejudice. Dovidio and Gaertner suggest several strategies that may be employed to help people reduce their propensities to stereotype and the in-group–out-group categorizations that people seem to make automatically.[68] Their analyses indicate the following measures may be effective:

- Lead aversive racists to see the inconsistencies in their behaviors and their stated values, thereby developing cognitive dissonance and the desire to reduce it. Active efforts to reduce dissonance will help aversive racists reduce and ultimately eliminate automatic activation of stereotypes in interactions with out-group members.

- Engage group members in activities to achieve common, superordinate goals. Doing so will reduce perceptions of competition between in-groups and out-groups while increasing perceptions of cooperation.
- Encourage groups to perceive themselves as members of a single, superordinate group, rather than as two separate groups. Doing so will help create a common identity and result in in-group favoritism that includes both groups.

In an organizational setting, group members who view themselves as part of the organization working for the same employer, pursuing the organization's vision and mission, and competing against others in the industry will be more likely to see their diverse group as the in-group working toward the same goal. Although some researchers have questioned the efficacy of prejudice reduction programs,[69] what is certain is that organizational leadership, zero tolerance for discrimination, accountability, and control and monitoring can and do affect behaviors at work. In organizations in which diversity is embraced and valued and discrimination and exclusion are not tolerated, those who would exclude and limit based on characteristics such as race, sex, age, religion, sexual orientation, ability, and other irrelevant factors at work should be viewed as undesirable out-groups working against the important goal of diversity, equality, and inclusion.

In addition to working to reduce discrimination based on stereotyping and social categorization processes, organizational monitoring and control measures should be implemented. In her work on sex and race inequality at work, Reskin notes that the discretion involved in human resources decisions "invites stereotyping, evaluation bias, and attribution error by decision-makers, and these almost certainly maintain inequality."[70] In their study in which Blacks and Hispanics were more likely to be laid off than Whites and Asians who had similar qualifications and performance, Elvira and Zatzick suggested that managerial discretion and lack of monitoring of managerial decisions allowed managers to act upon conscious or unconscious cognitive biases, perhaps "due to similarity-attraction or stereotypes," to influence layoff decisions about who would be laid off.[71]

Contemporary forms of racism (aversive, new, and modern racism) reflect people's decreasing willingness to express overtly racist beliefs; however, people may still behave in discriminatory ways when provided a rationale or justification for doing so.[72] Supportive organizational climates for diversity can reduce individuals' discriminatory actions.[73] Holding managers and supervisors accountable for their decisions helps reduce overt and covert displays of bias.[74] Diverse recruitment and selection teams, supervisors and managers, and legitimate selection criteria may be helpful at organizational entry. Interviews should be highly structured, and interviewers should be trained in proper procedures and about errors and biases. Salary decisions should be made based on job requirements, as should training, development, promotion, and termination decisions; all should be monitored regularly by the human resources staff. Organizational leaders must be willing to implement policies and monitoring and control measures that are supportive of diversity throughout their organizations.

Diversity and human resources practitioners should analyze and assess data on progress and trends in their organizations by identity groups (e.g., race, ethnicity, sex, age, and so on). Which groups comprise new hires, promotions, transfers, and exits? Researchers have found that even when controlling for possible contributors (absence, social class, economic sector, and industry), Black men at high and low levels were more likely to be dismissed than White men.[75] Which groups are consistently not represented in certain departments or represented only at certain levels, despite qualifications and backgrounds similar to those of others? Do certain groups comprise all or nearly all of certain departments? Managers and supervisors should be evaluated on their diversity results, including their employees' perceptions of fairness. Long-standing attitudes and perceptions about different groups, coupled with longstanding organizational practices (such as unstructured interviews or

recruitment solely at certain universities) and characteristics may impede diversity and may not be useful for a considerably more diverse population. Consistent attention to diversity and inclusion are needed to ensure continued progress.[76]

SUMMARY

In this chapter, we have considered factors that characterize minority, or non-dominant, groups and have provided a rationale for determining "What is a minority?" yet we have acknowledged that identifiability, power, discrimination, and group awareness vary among non-dominant groups. We have incorporated research from social psychology to help understand prejudice, stereotyping, and social categorization. These social processes were linked to behaviors that support or hinder diversity in organizations and to some specific examples that will be discussed in subsequent chapters. When made on the basis of stereotyping and social categorization, job-related decisions (hiring, firing, compensation, promotion and advancement, training, job placement, and so on) are often illegal and are always problematic, regardless of whether they are illegal. We presented measures to reduce stereotyping, aversive racism, and other aversions.

Although it is impossible to consider every theory and psychological process related to diversity, readers should now be aware that along with the deliberate, overt categorization of different others, underlying, unconscious processes are also involved. Both overt and unconscious discrimination often result from people's propensity to stereotype and see members of certain groups as more or less appropriate for certain jobs (e.g., women as secretaries versus truck drivers—see Chapter 9). It is these unconscious propensities that are most insidious and difficult to eradicate. As some lawsuits show, some employers verbalize their stereotypical perceptions, but many simply act on them, so the individual affected has little or no concrete evidence of discrimination. Unchecked prejudicial attitudes can lead to discrimination, but external factors such as control and monitoring can prevent them from doing so.

For individuals, willingness to listen, think, understand, and grow in learning about diversity issues will be helpful in improving positive outcomes. Because discrimination, exclusion, diversity, and inclusion are consequences of more than individual actions, however, concerted organizational and societal measures to bring about change are also required.

KEY TERMS

Ambivalent sexism – the simultaneous holding of both hostile and "benevolent" sexist beliefs about women; for example, "women are incompetent at work" and "women must be protected."

Attribution errors – the tendency to underestimate the influence of external factors (e.g., situations or circumstances) and overestimate the influence of internal factors (e.g., personal qualities) when evaluating the behavior of others.

Aversive racism – the holding of egalitarian values and beliefs that one is unprejudiced but still possessing negative feelings and beliefs about racial issues and minority group members.

Benevolent sexism – a set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist while they are perceived as positive by the attitude holder.

Consumer racial profiling – differential treatment of consumers in the marketplace based on race/ethnicity that constitutes denial of or degradation in the products and/or services that are offered to the consumer.

Descriptive stereotyping – perceptions about how people do or will behave, based on their group memberships.

Discrimination – differential and pejorative actions that serve to limit the social, political, or economic opportunities of members of particular groups.

Egalitarian – one who believes in human equality, particularly regarding social, political, and economic rights and privileges.

Employment discrimination – the valuation in the labor market of personal characteristics of applicants and workers that are unrelated to productivity.

Hostile sexism – antipathy toward women based on faulty and inflexible generalizations (negative stereotypes).

Internalized racism – the acceptance of and belief by members of devalued races in negative messages about their own abilities and intrinsic worth and those of others of the same race.

Internalized sexism – acceptance and belief by women of negative messages about their own abilities and intrinsic worth and those of other women.

Labor market discrimination – the valuation in the labor market of personal characteristics of applicants and workers that are unrelated to productivity.

Neosexism – the conflict between people's reported egalitarian values and their negative attitudes toward women.

New racism – the belief that racism is a thing of the past and that Blacks have attained excessive, unfair gains through programs such as affirmative action.

Prejudice – irrational, negative evaluations of a group.

Prescriptive stereotyping – perceptions about how people should behave based on their group memberships.

Similarity effect – a bias in which people are more likely to select or hire demographically similar others.

Social identity – the part of an individual's self-concept that derives from his or her membership in a social group and the value and emotional significance attached to that group membership.

Stereotype threat – when one is concerned about being judged by a negative stereotype about one's group.

Stereotypes – overgeneralizations of characteristics to large human groups.

Stigma – deviations from the desired norm in a certain context.

Structured interviews – a series of job-related questions with pre-determined answers that are consistently applied across all interviews for a particular job.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

1. This chapter discusses many identities and multiple group memberships that people have. If you were to describe the important parts of your identity, what would be on your list? Make a list, and then rank order the most-to-least important aspects of your identity. Which are immediately apparent to others? What effect does each identity have on your life?
2. As a powerful group, elected officials affect the life chances of the populace. How are elected officials in the area in which you live similar to or different demographically from the population in that area?
3. Researchers have found that people are less willing to express "traditionally" prejudiced beliefs than in the past, but their behavior does not agree with

espoused beliefs. How can such disparities in expressed beliefs and actions undermine diversity in organizations? What organizational measures can be implemented to investigate whether there are inconsistencies in expressed beliefs, behaviors, and outcomes related to diversity in organizations?

4. Choose an aspect of your identity in which you are a member of the dominant racial, ethnic, sex, or religious group. Have you experienced being the minority in a situation (e.g., White among many Blacks, Asians, or Latinos; Christian in the United States among many Jews)? If you are a racial minority, have you experienced being a minority among others of color (e.g., Asian among many Blacks; Latino among many Asians) rather than among Whites? If you are a man, have you experienced being the minority in a meeting at work or at school in a class? If you are a woman, have you experienced being the minority in a meeting at work or at school in a class? What were these experiences of being a "minority" like?

ACTIONS AND EXERCISES

1. Discuss stereotypes with a trusted friend or family member. What kinds of job-related stereotypes is he or she aware of? (Note that awareness of stereotypes does not mean belief in the veracity of the stereotype.) Discuss how these stereotypes can negatively affect individuals' job opportunities and advancement. Can you think of a person who is *not* a member of the stereotyped group who fits the stereotypical characteristic? Can you think of a person who is a member of the stereotyped group who doesn't fit the stereotype?
2. Using a local newspaper (*San Francisco Chronicle*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Dallas Morning News*, and so on), a campus or university newspaper, and a community or city newspaper, locate stories that include photos of people in the story. Make a table of the type of story (human interest, business news, crime, etc.), race, ethnicity, sex, and estimated age of the subject. What diversity-related observations can be made from the table?
3. Locate a newspaper that has an executive or business section that includes "promotions," "executive changes," or other career moves. If there are photos of the people involved, list their race, ethnicity, and sex. If names only are provided, determine the sex of the person, where possible. What observations can you make from your list?

NOTES

1. Dworkin, A. G., & Dworkin, R. J. (1999). *The Minority Report*, 3rd ed. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Publishers, pp. 11–27.
2. Ibid.
3. Price, J. & Wolfers, J. (2010). Racial discrimination among NBA referees. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125: 1859–1887; quote, p. 1859.
4. Schaefer, R. T. (1989). *Racial and Ethnic Groups*, 4th ed. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
5. Dworkin & Dworkin used the term *differential and pejorative treatment* as well as *discrimination*.
6. Sampson, E. E. (1999). *Dealing with Differences*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Publishers.
7. Dworkin & Dworkin (1999).
8. Ng, E. S. W., (2014),"Relative deprivation, Self-interest and Social Justice: Why I Do Research On Inequality," *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 33 (5): 429–441.

9. Goffman, E. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. (1963). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
10. Dworkin & Dworkin, 1999, p. 19.
11. Ibid., p. 98; Frederickson, G. M., & Knobel, D. T. (1980). "A History of Discrimination." In T. F. Pettigrew, G. M. Fredrickson, D. T. Knobel, N. Glazer, & R. Ueda (Eds.), *Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, pp. 30–37.
12. Dworkin & Dworkin (1999).
13. Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research, and Practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
14. Pettigrew, T. (1980). "Prejudice." In T. F. Pettigrew, G. M. Fredrickson, D. T. Knobel, N. Glazer, & R. Ueda (Eds.), *Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, pp. 1–29.
15. Goldman, B. M., Gutek, B. A., Stein, J. H., & Lewis, K. (2006). "Employment Discrimination in Organizations: Antecedents and Consequences." *Journal of Management*, 32(6): 786–831.
16. See Cox (1993), p. 91, for a detailed list of common stereotypes about various groups.
17. Nelson, T. (2002). *The Psychology of Prejudice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
18. Tajfel, H. (1978). "Social Categorization, Social Identity and Social Comparison." In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation Between Social Groups*. London: Academic Press, pp. 61–76.
19. McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. (1978). "Salience of Ethnicity in the Spontaneous Self-Concept as a Function of One's Ethnic Distinctiveness in the Social Environment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(5): 511–520.
20. Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?* New York: Basic Books.
21. Ibid., p. 63; see also Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel and W. Austin (Eds.). *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.
22. Shen, J., Chanda, A., D'Netto, B., & Monga, M. (2009). "Managing Diversity Through Human Resource Management: An International Perspective and Conceptual Framework." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(2): 235–251.
23. Ghandnoosh, N. (2014). "Race and Punishment: Racial Perceptions of Crime and Support for Punitive Policies." *The Sentencing Project*, Washington, DC. Nelson (2002). See also Anastasio, P. A., Rose, K. C., & Chapman, K. C. (1999). "Can the Media Create Public Opinion? A Social- Identity Approach." *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(5): 152–155.
24. Nelson (2002). See also Anastasio, P. A., Rose, K. C., & Chapman, K. C. (1999). "Can the Media Create Public Opinion? A Social- Identity Approach." *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(5): 152–155; Gerbner, G. (1998). "Cultivation analysis: An overview." *Mass Communication and Society*, 1(3–4): 175–194.
25. Lee, M. J., Bichard, S. L., Irey, M. S., Walt, H. M., & Carlson, A. J. (2009). "Television viewing and ethnic stereotypes: Do college students form stereotypical perceptions of ethnic groups as a result of heavy television consumption?" *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 20(1), 95–110.
26. Romer, D., Jamieson, K. H., & deCouteau, N. J. (1998). "The Treatment of Persons of Color in Local Television News: Ethnic Blame Discourse or Realistic Group Conflict?" *Communication Research*, 25(3): 286–305, cited in Nelson (2002).
27. U.S. Department of Justice, Uniform Crime Reports, Arrests by Race, Table 43A. http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2012/crime-in-the-u.s.-2012/tables/43tabledatadecoverviewpdf, accessed September 13, 2014.
28. For a discussion of intraracial crime compared with interracial crime, see Gross, S. R., Jacoby, K., Matheson, D., Montgomery, N., & Patil, S. (2005). "Exonerations in the United States: 1989 Through 2003." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 95: 524–560.
29. Behm-Morawitz, E., & Mastro, D. E. (2008). Mean girls? The influence of gender portrayals in teen movies on emerging adults' gender-based attitudes and beliefs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(1), 131–146; Fujioka, Y. (1999). Television portrayals and African-American stereotypes: Examination of television effects when direct contact is lacking. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*,

76(1), 52–75; Lee, M. J., Bichard, S. L., Irey, M. S., Walt, H. M., & Carlson, A. J. (2009). Television viewing and ethnic stereotypes: Do college students form stereotypical perceptions of ethnic groups as a result of heavy television consumption? *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 20(1), 95–110; Mastro, D., Behm-Morawitz, E., & Ortiz, M. (2007). The cultivation of social perceptions of Latinos: A mental models approach. *Media Psychology*, 9(2), 347–365.

30. Price, J. & Wolfers, J. (2010). Racial discrimination among NBA referees. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125: 1859–1887; quote, p. 1859.
31. Parsons C. A., Sulaeman J., Yates M.C., & Hamermesh D.S. (2011). "Strike three: discrimination, incentives, and evaluation." *American Economic Review* 101(4): 1410–1436.
32. Ibid., p. 1434.
33. McCarthy, J. M., Van Iddeking, C. H., & Campion, M. A. (2010). "Are Highly Structured Job Interviews Resistant to Demographic Similarity Effects?" *Personnel Psychology*, 63: 325–359.
34. Pursell, E. D., Campion, M. A., & Gaylord, S. R. (1980). "Structured interviewing: Avoiding selection problems." *Personnel Journal*, 59(11): 907–912.
35. Dworkin & Dworkin (1999).
36. Hewstone, M. (1990), "The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution." *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 20: 311–335.
37. Padilla, L. M. (2001). "But *You're* Not a Dirty Mexican: Internalized Oppression, Latinos, and the Law." *Texas Hispanic Journal of Law and Policy*, 7(1): 58–113.
38. A featured case in describes a case in which a woman driver was used as a test to see how women drivers would fare—expectations for her success were low, however. The woman's failure as a delivery driver resulted in the company's decision to not hire any more women drivers, because it was clear that they would not work out.
39. See Goldman et al. (2006).
40. Boldry, J. G., & Kashy, D. A. (1999). "Intergroup Perception in Naturally Occurring Groups of Differential Status: A Social Relations Perspective." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6): 1200–1212.
41. It is also possible that minorities and women who exhibit in-group favoritism are more closely scrutinized (and penalized) than Whites and men are for favoring members of their in-group. See Hekman, D.R. & Foo, M. D. (2014). "Does valuing diversity result in worse performance ratings for minority and female leaders?" Paper presented at 2014 Academy of Management Conference, Philadelphia, PA.
42. p. 32, Nuru-Jeter, A., et al. (2009). "'It's the Skin You're In:' African-American Women Talk About Their Experiences of Racism: An Exploratory Study to Develop Measures of Racism for Birth Outcome Studies." *Maternal Child Health Journal* 13: 29–39; Jones, C. P. (2000). "Levels of Racism: A Theoretic Framework and a Gardener's Tale." *American Journal of Public Health*, 90(8): 1212–1215; Lipsky, S. (1987). *Internalized Racism.* Seattle, WA: Rational Island Publishers; Padilla, (2001); Pyke, K., & Dang, T. (2003). "'FOB' and 'Whitewashed': Identity and Internalized Racism Among Second Generation Asian Americans." *Qualitative Sociology*, 26(2): 147–172; Speight, S. (2007). "Internalized Racism: One More Piece of the Puzzle." *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35: 126–135.
43. Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1950). "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children." *The Journal of Negro Education*, 19(3): 341–350; Peters, W. (1987). *A Class Divided: Then and Now.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
44. Banks, T.L. (1998), "Both edges of the margin: Blacks and Asians in Mississippi Masala, barriers to coalition building," *Asian Law Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 7–40; Feagin, J.R. (2010), Racist America, Taylor Francis, New York, NY; Hernández, T.K. (2007), "Latino inter-ethnic employment discrimination and the 'diversity' defense," Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 259–316.
45. Pyke, K. D. (2010). "What is Internalized Racial Oppression and Why Don't We Study It? Acknowledging Racism's Hidden Injuries." *Sociological Perspectives*, 53(4): 551–572; Pyke, K. D. (2010). "An Intersectional Approach to Resistance and Complicity: The Case of Racialized Desire among Asian American Women." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 31(1): 81–94.
46. See Chapter 4 for a discussion of how racial socialization may help build self-esteem and pride among minority children.

47. Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). "Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans." *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 69(5), 797–811.
48. Croizet, J. C., & Claire, T. (1998). "Extending the concept of stereotype threat to social class: The intellectual underperformance of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(6), 588–594; Rodriguez, B. (2014). "The Threat of Living Up to Expectations: Analyzing the Performance of Hispanic Students on Standardized Exams." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 13 (3): 191–205; Silverman, A. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2014). Stereotypes as Stumbling-Blocks How Coping With Stereotype Threat Affects Life Outcomes for People With Physical Disabilities. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(10): 1330–1340; Spencer, S. J., Steele, C. M., & Quinn, D. M. (1999). "Stereotype threat and women's math performance." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(1), 4–28. Steele & Aronson, (1995); Stone, J. (2002). Battling Doubt by Avoiding Practice: The Effects of Stereotype Threat on Self-handicapping in White Athletes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(12), 1667–1678.
49. Rydell, R. J., Rydell, M. T., & Boucher, K. L. (2010). The Effect of Negative Performance Stereotypes on Learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(6), 883–896.
50. Harris, A-M. G., Henderson, G. R., & Williams, J. D. (2005). "Courting customers: Assessing consumer racial profiling and other marketplace discrimination." *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 24(1): 163–171.
51. Albright, M. (2005, December 2). "Racial Profiling Feared at Walmart." *St. Petersburg Times*. http://www.sptimes.com/2005/12/02/Tampabay/Racial_profiling_fear.shtml, accessed October 9, 2014; Albright, M. (2005, December 10). "Ugly Walmart Tale Resonates." *St. Petersburg Times*. Albright, M. (2005, December 12), "Walmart Fires Managers in Alleged Discrimination," http://www.sptimes.com/2005/12/12/Business/Wal_Mart_fires_manage.shtml, accessed October 9, 2014. http://www.sptimes.com/2005/12/10/Business/Ugly_Wal_Mart_tale_re.shtml, accessed November 17, 2014; "Walmart Apologizes to Man for Bad Check Accusation." http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2005-12-02-walmart-check_x.htm, accessed October 9, 2014.
52. Dabney, D. A., Hollinger, R. C., & Dugan, L. (2004). "Who Actually Steals? A Study of Covertly Observed Shoplifters." *Justice Quarterly*, 21: 693–728.
53. Hackney, A. A. & Glaser, J. (2013). "Reverse Deterrence in Racial Profiling: Increased Transgressions by Nonprofiled Whites." *Law and Human Behavior*, 37(5): 348–353.
54. Brief, A. P., Buttram, R. T., Reizenstein, R. M., Pugh, S. D., Callahan, J. D., McCline, R. L., & Vaslow, J. B. (1997). "Beyond Good Intentions: The Next Step Toward Racial Equality in the American Workplace." *Academy of Management Executive*, 11(4): 59–72.
55. 63 OFCCP news release: Release Number 10-1368-ATL, http://www.dol.gov/opa/media/press/ofccp/ofccp20101368.htm, accessed October 5, 2014.
56. Bonilla-Silva, E., & Forman, T. (2000). "'I'm Not a Racist, But …' 76.: Mapping White College Students' Racial Ideology in the USA." *Discourse and Society*, 11: 50–85. See also Pager, D., & Quillian, L. (2005). "Walking the Talk? What Employers Say Versus What They Do." *American Sociological Review*, 70: 355–380.
57. Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3): 491–512.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid.
60. Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2005). "The Burden of Benevolent Sexism: How It Contributes to the Maintenance of Gender Inequalities." *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35(5): 633–642.
61. Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). "Neosexism: Plus Ça Change, Plus C'est Pareil." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(8): 842–849.
62. Frieze, I. H., Ferligoj, A., Kogovsek, J., Rener, T., Hovat, J., & Sarlija, N. (2003). "Gender-Role Attitudes in University Students in the United States, Slovenia, and Croatia." *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27: 256–261.
63. Syed, J., & Özbilgin, M. (2009). "A Relational Framework for International Transfer of Diversity Management Practices." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(12): 2435–2453.

64. Özbilgin, M., Jonsen, K., Tatli, A., Vassilopoulou, V. & Sürgevil, O. (2013). "Global Diversity Management," pp. 419–441. In Roberson, Q. (Ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity and Work.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
65. Özbilgin, et al., 2013.
66. Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., Moll, J., Hermsen, S., & Russin, A. (2000). "Just Say No (to Stereo- typing): Effects of Training in the Negation of Stereotypic Association on Stereotype Activation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(5): 871–888.
67. Galinsky, A., & Moskowitz, G. (2000). "Perspective Taking: Decreasing Stereotype Expression, Stereotype Accessibility, and In-Group Favoritism." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4): 708–724.
68. Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1999). "Reducing Prejudice: Combating Intergroup Biases." *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8(4): 101–105.
69. Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). "Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60: 339–367.
70. Reskin, B. F. (2000). Getting it right: Sex and race inequality in work organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*: 707–709.
71. Elvira, M. M., & Zatzick, C. D. (2002). Who's displaced first? The role of race in layoff decisions. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 41(2), 329–361, p. 352.
72. See Chapter 4 for a discussion of research by Art Brief and his colleagues on new racism and recommendations for hiring.
73. Brief, A. P., & Barsky, A. (2001). Establishing a climate for diversity: The inhibition of prejudiced reactions in the workplace. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 19: 91–129.
74. Castilla, E. (2008). "Gender, race, and meritocracy in organizational careers." *American Journal of Sociology*, 113: 1479–526; Lerner, J. S. & Tetlock, P.E. (1999). "Accounting for the effects of accountability." *Psychological Bulletin*, 125: 255–275; Elvira & Zatzick, (2002).
75. Fairlie, R., and Kletzer, L. (1998), "Jobs Lost, Jobs Regained: An Analysis of Black/White Differences in Job Displacement in the 1980s," *Industrial Relations*, 37(4): 460–475; Wilson, G. (2005), "Race and Job Dismissal: African American/White Differences in their Sources During the Early Work Career," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48:1182–1199. Wilson, G., and McBrier, D. B. (2005), "Race and Loss of Privilege: African American/White differences in the determinants of job layoffs from upper-tier occupations," *Sociological Forum*, 20(2): 301–321.
76. R. R. Thomas, Jr. (2011). "The Management of Workforce Diversity: A Continuing Evolution." *Employment Relations Today*, Fall: 1–9.