

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270507772>

Racial discrimination in organizations

Chapter · January 2017

DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199363643.013.8

CITATIONS

5

READS

1,434

3 authors:



Derek Avery

Wake Forest University

106 PUBLICATIONS 3,331 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Sabrina D Volpone

University of Colorado Boulder

43 PUBLICATIONS 525 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Oscar Holmes IV

Rutgers School of Business-Camden

20 PUBLICATIONS 207 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



The Impact of Ethical Leadership on Employee Well-Being [View project](#)

Oxford Handbooks Online

Racial Discrimination in Organizations

Derek R. Avery, Sabrina D. Volpone, and Oscar Holmes IV

The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination (*Forthcoming*)

Edited by Adrienne J. Colella and Eden B. King

Subject: Psychology, Organizational Psychology, Personality and Social Psychology

Online Publication Date: Apr 2015

DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199363643.013.8

Abstract and Keywords

This chapter provides a current comprehensive understanding of racial discrimination in organizations. It begins by reviewing relevant theory that explains why racial discrimination occurs and how it is manifested through prejudice, stereotyping, and aversive racism. This includes macro (e.g., sociological) and micro (e.g., social psychological) perspectives that have helped guide the existent and continuing research on the topic. This discussion is followed by a review of research on the various targets of racial discrimination (i.e., Blacks, Asians, American Indians, Native Hawaiians, Whites, and Hispanics). Subsequently, the chapter considers types of racial discrimination by comparing overt, traditional forms of racial discrimination (i.e., formal) with covert, current forms (i.e., interpersonal).

Keywords: racial, discrimination, racism, overt, subtle, theory, manifestation, prejudice, stereotype

Noted scholar W. E. B. Du Bois famously proclaimed, “the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line” (Du Bois, 1903). A lot has changed in the United States since this famous decree was made. For example, legislation has extended voting rights to members of all racial groups and barred discrimination in the workplace. Black, Hispanic, and Asian American executives have led *Fortune* 500 companies. Now, the United States even has a Black (or at least half-Black) president in Barack Obama. Despite such sweeping changes and other unnamed markers of indelible progress, it is not unthinkable that the problem of the twentieth century could remain the problem of the twenty-first, as many racial desegregation trends are reversing and evidence continues to accumulate demonstrating the continued presence and impact of racial employment discrimination (e.g., K. P. Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2013).

The purpose of this chapter is to provide readers with a resource covering the cutting-edge scholarship on racial discrimination in the workplace. Our goal is to inspire future research and policy aimed at further enhancing our understanding of this topic and, ultimately, curtailing its negative impact in workplace decisions. Toward this end, the rest of this chapter proceeds as follows: We begin by reviewing many of the theoretical foundations that lend insight into why we (as people) discriminate on the basis of race. This includes macro (e.g., sociological) and micro (e.g., social psychological) perspectives that have helped guide the existent and continuing research on the topic. Next, we review the literature describing the various racial groups that serve as targets for discriminatory treatment. Our point in doing so is not to argue that any one group is more or less subject to bias but to illustrate the pervasiveness of the phenomenon across all racial groups. Finally, we describe two dominant types of discrimination found in the literature (i.e., formal and interpersonal).

Racial Discrimination Theory

There are few social topics that are as emotionally charged or controversial to discuss as racism. Although this

chapter focuses on racism mainly from a US perspective, racism is a global phenomenon with a long history (Nishii & Ozbilgin, 2007). Early accounts of racism can be found in religious texts such as the Bible and the widespread European colonization of vast lands around the world made racism *de jure* for hundreds of years in the modern era. In the United States, Myrdal (1944), like Du Bois, spoke of racism as an “American dilemma.” The term “American dilemma” was coined to represent the irony of the United States acting as a moral authority around the world with respect to the American creed (e.g., equality, liberty, and justice for all) while simultaneously upholding government-sanctioned racism and discrimination against some of its own citizens. This dilemma, frequently highlighted by civil rights activists, forced Americans to face the fact that the United States was not enacting the American creed at home and thus any efforts to serve as a moral authority throughout the world would be negated. Ironically, during World War II, many Black Americans who were forced to fight in segregated battalions in the armed forces to liberate Europeans from oppression returned to the United States only to continue to endure the trials of racism and discrimination that maintained second-class citizenship for an entire race of people. Myrdal believed that the paradox of promoting espoused values that were conspicuously not enacted and the resulting cognitive dissonance from it would compel White Americans to end racist and discriminatory practices. As DiTomaso (2013) pointed out, however, though overt government-sanctioned racism and discriminatory practices have diminished, it is not because White Americans had a moral awakening, nor did racism and discrimination as a practice truly cease.

Using Wellman’s (1977) definition as a starting point, Beverly Tatum (1999) defined racism as “a system of advantages that is based on race. That race in America is White” (p. 7). She asserts that racism should be understood as more than individual prejudice, that is, through a macro perspective that recognizes the systemic privileges afforded to White Americans and relatively withheld from non-White Americans or minorities. In the United States, racism does not solely rely on one’s skin color, however one’s skin color can determine the level of privileges that may be afforded to or withheld from an individual (e.g., Harrison & Thomas, 2009). This racism-generated phenomenon, known as *colorism*, made it possible for some non-Whites whose skin color was light enough to *pass* as White and receive the privileges associated with White skin in America (Gates, 1997). This system that grants advantages and privileges based on skin color has engendered what is known as *internalized* racism, wherein some non-White individuals overvalue aesthetics and characteristics associated with the White race and devalue those associated with their own race (Golden, 2005). In the following sections, we describe some of the theories scholars have used in various disciplines to explain race discrimination. First, we review theories that explain how racial animus and stereotypes may result in racist and discriminatory behaviors. Second, we review more recent theories that scholars have developed to take into account the complexity of racism and how it has transformed over time. Finally, we review theories that examine racism and discrimination from a legal perspective. In this regard, these theories did more than just explain why racism and discrimination may occur, but also presented a mechanism through which racism and discrimination can be legally challenged and provided some guidelines to develop standard operating procedures to either mitigate or eliminate racism.

Theories of Prejudice and Stereotypes

Although Tatum (1999) reminded us that race discrimination, or racism, is more than simply individual bias, theories of prejudice serve as an important foundation and starting point in explaining racist behavior. In relation to racism, prejudice is an unfavorable attitude that one has for a group of people based on race (Allport, 1954). These attitudes often consist of the idea that one race, most often White in the United States, is superior to the other racial groups and can lead to behavioral outcomes that often result in discrimination against an individual who is a member of the race(s) deemed inferior (Duckitt, 1992a; Ehrlich, 1973; J. M. Jones, 1997). It is important to note, however, that research has uncovered that White Americans who are racist do not distribute their prejudice equally among non-White persons. For example, Kaiser and Pratt-Hyatt (2009) found that Whites held harsher attitudes toward Blacks who strongly identified with their racial identity versus those Blacks who weakly identified with their racial identity. These findings highlight the shifting and complex nature of prejudicial attitudes and how race can be enacted in ways that either magnify or mitigate its saliency and experienced outcomes.

Subsequent research has sought to explain why people have different levels of prejudice (Reynolds, Turner, Haslam, & Ryan, 2001). This line of research generally identifies personality variables or group membership as the culprit (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003). In regard to the former, right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992), social dominance orientation (SDO; Sidanius, Pratto, Martin, & Stallworth, 1991), and the Big

Five personality factors (Heaven & Bucci, 2001; Reynolds et al., 2001; Van Hiel, Kossowska, & Mervielde, 2000) are the most heavily studied personality variables used to explain the different levels of prejudice. In regard to the latter, social identity and social categorization theories are most commonly evoked (Oakes & Turner, 1980; Tajfel, 1974; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) to explain the different levels of prejudice. We begin the next section by first examining the personality variables and how they are related to racism.

First, RWA describes both authoritarian submission and aggression as well as religious conventionalism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, 2004). Individuals higher in RWA generally submit to authority more easily and hold more hostile attitudes toward out-group members or those whom they perceive as wrongdoers (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). In fact, RWA seems to be universally present, as it has been linked to prejudicial attitudes toward racial and other minority group members (e.g., GLBT individuals) across several continents (Altemeyer, 1998; Duckitt, 1992b; McFarland, Ageyev, & Abalakina, 1993). For example, RWA is significantly correlated with religious beliefs ($r = .48$) and prejudice ($r = .41$; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Similarly, religious fundamentalism is a construct related to RWA that also relates significantly to prejudice ($r = .25$; McFarland, 1989). Overall, this research provides theoretical explanations as to why racist systems such as chattel slavery received widespread support among religious individuals and were steeped in religious dogma. More specifically, this research highlights an ironic connection between strongly held religious beliefs and increased racial animus.

Second, SDO refers to the individual motive to sustain group-level hierarchies that result in the differential allocation of valuable resources (Sidanius et al., 1991). Social dominance orientation suggests that hegemonic groups subordinate other groups in part to maintain or augment the group's positive identity and social standing in society (Sidanius & Pratto, 2001). While self-serving for the dominant group members, it is notable that subordinate group members also sometimes come to see the existing hierarchical system as legitimate (Sidanius et al., 1991), thereby accepting the social inequality and internalizing the racism (Bell, Marquardt, & Berry, 2014; Jost, Pelham, & Carvallo, 2002). Recent research suggests that in the United States, White Americans are perceived to occupy the highest level in this social hierarchical system, followed by Asians and Hispanics in the middle and Blacks at the lowest level (Bell et al., 2014). According to an SDO perspective, the control over resources and maintenance of racial identities of various valence (e.g., White = positive valence vs. non-White = negative valence) necessitate the continuation of group-based hierarchy perpetuating the dominant group's prejudice of the subordinate group (Bell et al., 2014; Jost et al., 2002; Sidanius & Pratto, 2001; Sidanius et al., 1991). Accordingly, SDO and anti-Black attitudes tend to exhibit correlations ranging from .42 to .65 and SDO has been related to racism against other racial and ethnic groups within and outside of the United States (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).

Third, the Big Five personality traits consist of openness to experience, conscientiousness, extroversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (McCrae & Costa, 1992). Of the five traits, Heaven and Bucci (2001) found that RWA was correlated positively with conscientiousness ($r = .19$) and negatively with openness to experience ($r = -.39$). Further, SDO correlates negatively with openness to experience ($r = -.23$) and agreeableness ($r = -.39$; Heaven & Bucci, 2001). Due to the relatedness of some of the Big Five traits with RWA and SDO, scholars sought to determine whether any of the Big Five traits were independently related to prejudice (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003). Indeed, Ekehammar and Akrami (2003) found that, in two independent samples, openness to experience and agreeableness were significantly and negatively related to generalized prejudice: openness to experience; $r = -.45$ (Sample 1) and $-.44$ (Sample 2); agreeableness: $r = -.45$ (Sample 1) and $-.45$ (Sample 2), respectively. This research led scholars to question which of these personality traits was most related to prejudice (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003; Ekehammar, Akrami, & Gylje, 2004). The answer appears to be RWA, as it predicts generalized prejudice both directly and indirectly related to it through SDO (Ekehammar et al., 2004). Conversely, SDO did have a direct effect on generalized prejudice, but it was smaller than that of RWA. In regard to the Big Five factors, interestingly, Ekehammar et al. found that openness to experience (through RWA) and agreeableness (through SDO) were only indirectly related to generalized prejudice and, unsurprisingly, had a much smaller total effect on generalized prejudice than either RWA or SDO. This line of research suggested two main findings. First, despite there being specific facets of prejudice (e.g., racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc.), the different types of prejudice all seem to form one general prejudice factor (Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003). Second, and most enlightening in regard to racism, it appears that prejudice does derive at least in part from personality traits (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003; Ekehammar et al., 2004).

The next group of theories, and perhaps the most well known, that have been used to explain racism are rooted in social psychology. Social identity and social categorization theories (Oakes & Turner, 1980; Tajfel, 1974; Tajfel &

Turner, 1979) posit that individuals have distinct identities that place them in distinguishable groups. The awareness of these groups creates categories that allow individuals to be placed in either in-groups or out-groups (Tajfel, 1974). The classification of people into these categories can lead to bias and discrimination against out-group members, as in-group members (1) have an inherent preference for other in-group members, (2) derive validation and self-esteem from their membership in their in-groups, and (3) seek to maintain a positive self-concept of their specific in-group social identity (Oakes & Turner, 1980). Race is often a salient social identity that allows individuals to quickly categorize others into in-groups and out-groups. Although in-group/out-group bias may occur, research has established that this bias is not inevitable and is most likely to occur when group identity is threatened (van Ginkel & van Knippenberg, 2009; van Knippenberg, Haslam, & Platow, 2007; van Knippenberg & van Ginkel, 2010). Additionally, discrimination and bias are dependent on the status and power of the in-group and out-group members. From this perspective, racial minorities experience racism in the United States because they are perceived as out-group members who occupy less powerful and lower status social identities (Brief, Dietz, Cohen, Pugh, & Vaslow, 2000; Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner, 1996; Talaska, Fiske, & Chaiken, 2008).

Similar to the interrelatedness of the prejudice via personality theories previously discussed in this chapter, theories using a stereotyping approach are interrelated with social identity and social categorization theories. Stereotypes are categorical schemas based on a social identity group that individuals employ to instantly categorize and form associations about people (Fiske & Lee, 2008). Stereotypes serve as cognitive heuristics that make it possible for individuals to catalog immense amounts of information more easily (Allport, 1954). They can be quickly activated (e.g., cognitively primed), but stereotype application does not automatically follow unless a person behaves, makes a decision, or interacts with someone in accordance with the activated stereotype (Gilbert & Hixon, 1991). Although individuals can self-correct before applying stereotypes to others, stereotype activation can still be detected using implicit measures (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Further, because unconscious thoughts can affect human behavior without awareness, individuals can unknowingly perpetuate racism (Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009). Nonetheless, racism is most often perpetuated consciously, as stereotypes become internalized, adopted as prototypical behavior of a group, and applied to members of those groups in a prejudicial manner (Allport, 1954; Gilbert & Hixon, 1991; Kunda & Spencer, 2003). Although individuals may not endorse or act on them, research suggests that people are aware of the stereotypes commonly assigned to different racial groups (Devine, 1989; Lepore & Brown, 1997). Despite the fact that stereotypes can be positive or negative, research surrounding racism using this perspective generally focuses on the negative outcomes of stereotype application as it applies to historically oppressed racial groups (Devine, 1989; Kunda & Spencer, 2003). The next group of theories that scholars have used to explain racism builds on theories of prejudice and stereotypes but also takes into account the complex and changing nature of how racism is enacted specifically in the United States.

Theories of Modern, Aversive, and Symbolic Racism

The manifestation of racism has changed dramatically over time. The next group of theories we discuss attempt to explain racism while taking into account civil rights advances, citizens' attitudinal changes, and the official rejection of government-enforced racism and discrimination. Despite their different names and scholar-group origins, theories of modern, aversive, and symbolic (henceforth referred to as MAS) racism are based on similar tenets and make similar predictions (Henry & Sears, 2002). These MAS racism theories suggest that traditional forms of racism (e.g., overt racist attitudes, government-enforced racism, hate crimes, etc.) have been supplanted by a newer, more current form, of racism (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; McConahay, 1986; McConahay & Hough, 1976). Accordingly, MAS racism relies on more covert expressions that are enacted in more subtle displays of racial inequality and animus (Brief et al., 2000; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; McConahay, 1983; McConahay, Hardee, & Batts, 1981). Modern, aversive, and symbolic racism takes into account that public displays of racism generally violate current cultural norms and the racial antipathy of Blacks is based on (1) Whites' shifting cognitive beliefs about Blacks, (2) the idea that Blacks violate "traditional" American values, and (3) perceptions that Black culture is inferior to and exists outside of "traditional" American culture (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Henry & Sears, 2002; McConahay, 1986; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). A key component of MAS racism theories is that White Americans who exhibit these contemporary racist attitudes see themselves as egalitarians and will refrain from discriminating when doing so would jeopardize their self-concept of being nonracist (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; McConahay, 1986; McConahay & Hough, 1976).

Contrary to previous time periods, many White Americans currently labor intently not to appear or behave in a racist manner (Plant & Devine, 1998) and if they do, they generally try to correct their behavior to appear nonracist (Tetlock, Kristel, Elson, Green, & Lerner, 2000).

Although MAS racism consists of behaviors that are not legally sanctioned (e.g., racial incivility, racial avoidance, etc.), it can be seen as inconsequential and less severe than old-fashioned racism. Nonetheless, MAS racism still has deleterious effects (we discuss this point later in greater detail) and can be much harder to prove, challenge, and resolve (Brief et al., 2000; Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta, & Magley, 2013; McConahay et al., 1981). Interestingly, RWA is also positively related to MAS racism and old-fashioned racism whereas SDO is only significantly related to the latter (Hiel & Mervielde, 2005). As such, RWA does a better job than SDO in distinguishing between the different forms of racism (Hiel & Mervielde, 2005). Similar to the personality variables, MAS racism predicts discriminatory outcomes toward Blacks as well as support of more conservative political candidates and anti-Black policies (e.g., banning affirmative action, etc.; Awad, Cokley, & Ravitch, 2005; Brief et al., 2000; Dovidio & Gaertner, 2000; Nail, Harton, & Decker, 2003; Tarman & Sears, 2005). Although MAS racism theories originated in the United States and focused on Black-White race relations, the theories have been used to explain racism on other continents (e.g., Europe) as well as with racial sentiments among other non-White Americans (Nail et al., 2003; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). The next group of theories we explore examines racism from a legal perspective. These theories have become important in providing legal remedies for the effects of racism and discrimination in organizations.

Theories of Disparate Treatment and Adverse Impact

As civil rights advances were formally recognized within the law, the US government took legal steps to redress the harm caused by government-sanctioned racism and discrimination (Estreicher & Harper, 2008). Various Titles (e.g., VI, VII, IX, etc.) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made it possible for employees to sue employers if they believed they were discriminated against based on their race, color, gender, religion, or national origin. This legislation gave employees the right to file a lawsuit whether the employer intentionally or unintentionally discriminated against the employee based on a protected identity class (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 2012). Whereas intentional discrimination based on race is analogous to occurrences of what racial minorities experienced with traditional forms of racism, unintentional discrimination could occur when employers use certain employment practices (e.g. selection tests, job requirements, etc.) that may appear neutral but have a differential effect along a protected category (Outtz, 2002; Ployhart & Holtz, 2008). Theories of disparate treatment and adverse impact were originated to legally address this differential treatment and historical racism (Estreicher & Harper, 2008).

In an employment context, disparate treatment results when different standards are required for different social identity groups (Gatewood & Field, 2001). Adverse impact results when groups of individuals receive scores on an assessment used in employment or other high-stakes situations that systematically disadvantages a protected social identity group (Sackett & Lievens, 2008). For example, an employer requiring drug tests only of its racial minority job applicants as a condition of employment is disparate treatment. Then, an employer using a cognitive ability test that racial minorities systematically score lower on than majority group members is an example of adverse impact. To determine the legally defensible cutoff rate of various selection assessments, the US federal government adopted the four-fifths rule (i.e., 80% test) that defined adverse impact as “a selection rate for one group that is less than four-fifths of the selection rate for another group” (Sackett & Lievens, 2008, p. 424). The use of cognitive ability tests in employment selection and other high-stakes situations has received heightened legal scrutiny and the greatest attention because (1) intellectual inferiority historically was used as a justification for racism and (2) these tests produce the highest occurrences of adverse impact (Allport, 1954; Ployhart & Holtz, 2008; Sackett & Lievens, 2008; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). In the first case argued before the US Supreme Court dealing with adverse impact (i.e., *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, 1971), the Court ruled that employment requirements also must be reasonably related to specific jobs to be considered bona fide occupational qualifications (Estreicher & Harper, 2008). It is important to note that an assessment resulting in adverse impact does not necessarily signify that the assessment lack criterion-related validity. Consequently, scholars have suggested additional indicators of adverse impact such as adverse impact ratios, significance testing, and minimum score qualifications (Landy, 2005; Morris & Lobsenz, 2000; Roth, Bobko, & Switzer, 2006; Sackett & Lievens, 2008). In addition to the two legal theories discussed above, further legislative and executive remedies such as affirmative action policies have also

been adopted to legally address the detrimental consequences of racism (Kravitz, 2008).

In the previous sections, we examined different theories that scholars have used to understand, explain, and empirically examine racism, mainly in an American context. Despite the ubiquitous and insidious effects of racism, governmental remedies and solutions to combat racism remain controversial and are still resisted by segments of the population (Thomas, 2008). For example, there have been several Supreme Court cases (e.g., *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, *Grutter v. Bollinger*, *Gratz v. Bollinger*, etc.) that have challenged the legality and succeeded in reducing the remediation of affirmative action policies (Estreicher & Harper, 2008; National Conference of State Legislatures, 2013). Scholars have also pointed out other instances where racial gains have encountered backlash resulting in challenges in organizational settings in the form of workplace incivility and public protest of specific workplace programs established to assist racial minorities (Cortina, 2008; Cortina et al., 2013; Thomas, 2008). These examples highlight an interminable *American dilemma* where solutions to racism have remained elusive. Theories of prejudice and stereotypes, disparate treatment and adverse impact, and MAS racism go far to explain the persistence of racism and the difficulties we experience to ending it.

Targets of Race Discrimination

Whereas the prior section focused on explanations for how and why discrimination is manifested, we now turn our attention to whom it impacts. For our purposes here, race discrimination is defined as treating someone unfavorably because they belong to a certain racial group, or associate with people of a certain race (EEOC, 2014a). Though some research finds that many American workers think view racial discrimination is historical artifact (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1996), government statistics tell a different story. For example, the latest information reported by the EEOC shows that 35% of the discrimination charges received by the EEOC in 2013 were race-related (EEOC, 2014a). Specifically, over 33,000 race-related charges were filled in 2013 (EEOC, 2014a). These numbers are consistent, as race-related discrimination charges have represented anywhere from 33% to 37% of discrimination-related charges received by the EEOC over the last 15 years (EEOC, 2014a).

In addition to these government statistics, research also supports the notion that race discrimination continues and is even prevalent in the workplace (for a comprehensive review of current discrimination research, see Goldman, Gutek, Stein, & Lewis, 2006). Often, this research is extended to Hispanic groups, as well, inspiring the use of our term “racioethnicity” throughout this section of the chapter. Relations between discrimination and several important workplace outcomes have been reported, including decreased commitment and citizenship behavior directed toward the organization (e.g., Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Donaldson, 2001; Triana, Garcia, & Colella, 2010). Additionally, racioethnic discrimination relates to increased levels of workers’ turnover intentions (Dipboye & Colella, 2005; Foley, Kidder, & Powell, 2002), withdrawal behavior (Volpone & Avery, 2013), and job dissatisfaction (Dipboye & Colella, 2005; Hughes & Dodge, 1997). At the organization level, racioethnic discrimination also exhibits considerable costs, as it is related to increased litigation costs (King & Spruell, 2001) and diminished organizational reputation (Rindova, Williamson, Petkova, & Sever, 2005; Singh & Point, 2004).

Moreover, racioethnic discrimination affects workers psychologically and physically. On the one hand, research shows that racioethnic discrimination is related to a number of psychological outcomes such as lower levels of mental health (e.g., Gee, Spencer, Chen, & Takeuchi, 2007; Noh, Kaspar, & Wickrama, 2007; Paradies, 2006; D. R. Williams, Costa, & Leavell, 2010), increased levels of depression (Crouter, Davis, Updegraff, Delgado, & Fortner, 2006), and decreased levels of positive affect, self-esteem, and quality of life (Lim & Cortina, 2005; Noh et al., 2007). On the other hand, research demonstrates that racioethnic discrimination is related to a number of physical outcomes as well, such as high blood pressure, heart disease (Gyull, Matthews, & Bromberger, 2001), and physical aggression (e.g., Brody et al., 2006). In sum, the evidence indicates that racioethnic discrimination is related to a number of negative psychological and physical outcomes that have a large presence for employees and organizations.

Comparing the Targets

Though the research on racioethnic discrimination is quite informative, diversity scholars have recently suggested that when examining discrimination issues, it would be best to consider each racial or ethnic group individually (e.g., Ruggs et al., 2013). Many of the existing findings in management and psychology examine discrimination as

a Black-White issue or by comparing Whites to non-Whites (i.e., grouping all minority groups together). However, discrimination experiences may be unique for different racial/ethnic groups. As such, we discuss racioethnic discrimination for each racial (i.e., White, Black or African American, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race) and ethnic (Hispanic origin) group identified by the US Census Bureau (Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011). Importantly, each of these seven racioethnic groups (even Whites) can be a target for racioethnic discrimination.

Blacks and African Americans

According to the US Census Bureau (Humes et al., 2011), the term “Black” or “African American” includes individuals whose origin can be traced back to Africa. In the United States, 12.6% of the population (or 38,929,319 people) are considered Black or African American (Humes et al., 2011). This number has remained somewhat consistent since 2000, when this racial group represented roughly 12.3% of the US population (Humes et al., 2011).

Research supports the idea that Blacks are discriminated against in American society. For example, findings show that Blacks experience racial profiling, where they are treated differently than Whites or other minority groups, based on their race (Dabney, Dugan, Topalli, & Hollinger, 2006; Harris, Henderson, & Williams, 2005). Phenomena like “driving while Black” or “shopping while Black” illustrate common discriminatory Blacks experiences in the United States (Gabbidon, 2003; J. D. Williams, Henderson, & Harris, 2001). The former suggests Black drivers are pulled over by law enforcement at a higher rate than other racial or ethnic groups (Lundman & Kaufman, 2003). The latter describes how Black shoppers tend to be followed or watched in stores, or treated like shoplifters, more so than consumers of other racioethnicities (Gabbidon, 2003; Harris et al., 2005; Schreer, Smith, & Thomas, 2009).

Blacks are also discriminated against in the workplace. To illustrate this, research has found that Blacks are treated differently than their coworkers in the service industry. In dining situations, Black servers are tipped less than White servers when comparable service is provided (Lynn et al., 2008). Similarly, Black taxicab drivers are tipped less than their White coworkers as well (Ayres, Vars, & Zakariya, 2005). Surprisingly, both Black and White consumers of these services engage in this discriminatory behavior. Further, across a number of industries, the job performance of Blacks is often rated as subpar as compared with Whites (e.g., Kraiger & Ford, 1985; we discuss this in greater detail in the section “Formal Discrimination”).

When Blacks are able to overcome some forms of racial discrimination in the workplace and gain access to management positions, other forms of discrimination are apparent. Once in management positions, they report problems advancing and low levels of acceptance as managers or leaders. Not surprisingly, Black leaders report feelings of dissatisfaction and frustration at work more so than their White counterparts (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). On a related note, Black leaders are viewed less favorably as compared with White leaders (Rosette, Leonardelli, & Phillips, 2008). As such, research shows that racioethnic discrimination affects Blacks at all organizational job levels.

A number of recent legal cases highlight the racial discrimination that Blacks face in the workplace. In 2008, Lockheed Martin paid 2.5 million dollars to a Black employee who was terminated after complaining about the harassment he encountered at work. In addition to being exposed to racial threats about slavery and lynching, this employee also experienced racial jokes and slurs in his work environment (*EEOC v. Lockheed Martin*; EEOC, 2014b). This judgment was the largest monetary amount that the EEOC won for a single employee in a discrimination lawsuit. Additional lawsuits describe that Blacks often encounter White power messages (i.e., references to the KKK and Confederate flags; *EEOC v. Rock-Tenn Services Co.*), use of “the N word,” or threats (physical or symbolic) involving a noose (*EEOC v. AA Foundries Inc.*; EEOC, 2014b). In addition to negative work environments, lawsuits also show that Blacks are sometimes subjected to different treatment at work such as harsher forms of discipline than other employees are (*EEOC v. Yellow Transp. Inc.*; EEOC, 2014b).

In our discussion of discrimination against Blacks, it is important to note that most of what we know about racioethnic discrimination comes from research on Blacks (Ruggs et al., 2013). However, much of this research only examines Black-White differences. This is evident through the research referenced in this section, as most of it compares Blacks with Whites. An avenue for future research on racioethnic discrimination would be to conduct research that compares Blacks’ experiences with discrimination with other minority groups’ experiences, both inside and outside of the workplace.

Further, it is also important to note that some individuals believe that racioethnic discrimination against Blacks may be more exaggerated than described here. Specifically, some claim that Blacks attribute social interactions as racial discrimination when they are in fact only ambiguous and not truly racist (Ford, 2008). However, examining the numerous government statistics and research accounts available on this topic, it is apparent that racioethnic discrimination does affect Blacks in the United States, even in the workplace.

Asians

The term “Asian” includes individuals whose origin can be traced to the Far East (e.g., Japan), Southeast Asia (e.g., Vietnam, Thailand), or the Indian subcontinent (e.g., India; Humes et al., 2011). In the United States, 4.8% of the population (or 14,674,252 people) are considered Asian (Humes et al., 2011). This number has increased since 2000, when this racial group represented 3.6% of the US population. In fact, Asians as a group grew faster than any other racial category during the period 2000–2010 (Humes et al., 2011).

Research speaks to the racioethnic discrimination that Asians experience in the United States (e.g., Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2006; Sue, Bucci, Lin, Nadal, & Torino, 2007). For example, in a study of 152 Asians, 78% of respondents reported experiencing some form of discrimination over the two weeks that the study occurred (Ong, Burrow, Fuller-Rowell, Ja, & Sue, 2013). Studies on racioethnic discrimination toward Asians are not as abundant as those that examine discrimination toward Blacks (Cheng & Thatchenkery, 1997). Nevertheless, much of the available research is consistent in showing that multiple negative stereotypes exist about Asians (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Lin, Kwan, Cheung, & Fiske, 2005) and these stereotypes are associated with discrimination.

To elaborate, the myth of Asians as the model minority (Qin, Way, & Mukherjee, 2008; Sue & Sue, 2013) is a stereotype that hinders the progress of Asians as a group. This stereotype is misleading because it depicts Asians in a positive light that implies they do not encounter discrimination (e.g., Gee et al., 2007). Asians are considered the model minority because of their successful adjustment to the majority (i.e., White) culture. In some ways, Asian American achievement has surpassed White accomplishments. For example, on average, Asians have a higher level of education than do Whites in the United States (Kao & Thompson, 2003; Yu & Goyette, 2004). Though these accomplishments are admirable, they can be misleading because they are not representative of all Asians. Some Asian subgroups (e.g., Chinese, Indian) are overrepresented in fields that require advanced degrees, but other subgroups (e.g., Cambodians, Laotians), on average, do not obtain high-school diplomas (Kao & Thompson, 2003).

The racioethnic discrimination Asians experience corresponds to a number of notable outcomes. For instance, discrimination is related to Asians’ mental (e.g., psychological distress, antisocial behaviors) and physical health outcomes (e.g., Gee, Ro, Shariff-Marco, & Chae, 2009; Huynh, Devos, & Goldberg, 2013; Park, Schwartz, Lee, Kim, & Rodriguez, 2013). Moreover, Asians also experience discrimination at work, as they are underrepresented in management and leadership jobs (Ruttimann, 2009). In fact, it is often the case that Asians are congregated in low-level jobs (Shinagawa & Kim, 2008). Recent legal cases highlight the racial discrimination that Asians face in the workplace. In 2007, the EEOC won a lawsuit on behalf of an employee who was repeatedly referred to as “dot-head” and “Osama bin Laden” by his coworkers (*EEOC v. MBNA-America*; EEOC, 2014b). Next, in 2007, a famous chef was ordered to pay \$80,000 dollars to Asian employees from Bangladesh. In this case, Asian employees who worked for the chef were hired for low-level positions (e.g., busboy, dishwasher) and were not promoted to more prestigious positions (e.g., server) even when they had more experience than those hired for those positions (*EEOC v. Restaurant Daniel*; EEOC, 2014b).

American Indian or Alaskan Natives

American Indians include those with an origin traced back to original peoples in North, Central, and South America; an affiliation with the original tribe must be maintained (Humes et al., 2011). In the United States, 0.9% of the population (or almost 3 million people) are considered American Indian or Alaskan Native (Humes et al., 2011). This number has remained consistent at 0.9% of the population since 2000 (Humes et al., 2011). American Indians are the second-smallest minority group in America.

American Indians face racial discrimination at work, as evidenced by a number of recent legal cases. In 2004, a company in New York was found guilty of having a hostile work environment when Native American employees complained to both their supervisors and the company’s Human Resources Department that other employees

referred to them as alcohol abusers and referenced other racially stereotypical subjects such as scalping and living in teepees (*EEOC v. Dielectric Labs, Inc.*; EEOC, 2014b). Another recent case shows that Native Americans can experience racioethnic discrimination from customers and their organizations can be held accountable should they permit such mistreatment to continue. The details of this case were that a customer harassed a Native American employee from the Cherokee Nation by calling this employee a dumb Indian (*Hern v. Department of Agriculture*; EEOC, 2014b).

As one of the smallest racial groups in the United States, Native Americans are not well represented in research on discrimination in the workplace. Though we were unable to find any studies that directly linked Native Americans to discrimination in the workplace, the research that is available for this racial group shows that Native Americans are often stereotyped according to images found in popular media (e.g., the Disney movie *Pocahontas*, Indians as warriors in sports mascots; Kim-Prieto, Goldstein, Okazaki, & Kirschner, 2010) and that these negative stereotypes are related to lower levels of self-esteem (Fryberg, 2003; Kim-Prieto et al., 2010) and negative health outcomes (Chae & Walters, 2009; Whitbeck, Walls, & Welch, 2012) for Native Americans.

It is interesting to note that though Native Americans are undeniably discriminated against in US workplaces (though research demonstrating this is scarce), this racial group actually has more legal rights than any other racial group in America. Specifically, through their tribal membership, Native Americans have certain rights that those in other racial groups do not (Kieval, 2009). Unfortunately, these additional legal rights have led to conflict between the US government and tribes concerning land, casinos, and law enforcement (Kieval, 2009).

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders include those with origins linked to original peoples in Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands (Humes et al., 2011). In the United States, 0.2% of the population (or almost half a million people) is considered Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (Humes et al., 2011). This number has grown by over 100,000 in the last decade (Humes et al., 2011). However, this group remains the smallest minority group in America.

A few recent legal cases highlight the racial discrimination that Native Hawaiians face in the workplace. In 2006, an employee identifying as a Pacific Islander was granted compensation and back pay when he was not selected for a position even though he was highly recommended for the job (*Paras v. SSA*; EEOC, 2014b). To our knowledge, research has yet to examine the racioethnic discrimination of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders.

White

The term “White” is used to refer to people with an origin that can be traced back to Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa (Humes et al., 2011). In the United States, Whites are the majority racial group, representing 72.4% of the population (or almost 300 million people; Humes et al., 2011). Over the last decade, this number has declined slightly (5.7% decline), as Whites represented 75.1% of the population in 2000 (Humes et al., 2011).

It is possible for Whites to experience racioethnic discrimination as other races do. For example, a recent Supreme Court case showed that White firefighters were discriminated against when their Black coworkers were promoted despite the fact that the White employees had higher test scores (*Ricci v. DeStefano*, 2009). Though discrimination toward Whites occurs, scholars argue that Whites are not as susceptible to discrimination as minority racioethnic groups are (Unzueta, Everly, & Gutierrez, 2014). Often, when Whites are discriminated against, the term “reverse discrimination” is used. Scholars note that this term is not an appropriate one, as it implies that there is a racial hierarchy, rather than racial and ethnic groups in society that can all be discriminated against (Unzueta et al., 2014).

Though Whites are the majority racioethnic group in the United States, Whites also face racioethnic discrimination, as evidenced by a number of recent legal cases. For example, Burger King was held responsible in 2005 when a White manager was fired for not following a customer’s request that a White boy not prepare her food (*EEOC v. Star City LLC Burger King*; EEOC, 2014b). Then, in 2009, Jack in the Box settled a lawsuit for not responding efficiently when a White employee informed management that her coworkers were harassing her with racial insults (*EEOC v. Jack in the Box*; EEOC, 2014b).

Other Race

The term “Other Race” is used by the US Census Bureau to categorize responses not belonging to one of the previous six racial categories. Examples of responses included in this category are multiracial, mixed, or interracial (Humes et al., 2011). In 2010, 6.2% of the population was categorized in this racial group (Humes et al., 2011). No research that we are aware of examines discrimination of Other Race individuals.

Two or More Races

Though multiple races is not an official racial or ethnic category according to the US Census Bureau, it should be noted that the US Census Bureau now allows people to report more than one race while filling out the US Census. However, a small number of people use this option; 97% of respondents reported only one race (approximately 9 million people; Humes et al., 2011). Over the last decade, the number of people reporting more than one race has increased by 32%, as only 2.4% of the population reported more than one race in the 2000 US Census (Humes et al., 2011). Of those who claim two races, most identify as White and Black, White and Some Other Race, White and Asian, or White and American Indian/Alaskan Native (Humes et al., 2011). Almost 92% of the respondents in this category identified two races (Humes et al., 2011). Of the respondents in this category, 7.5% chose three races and less than 1% identified with four, five, or six races (Humes et al., 2011).

Hispanic or Latino

According to the US Census Bureau (Humes et al., 2011), the term “Hispanic or Latino” includes individuals whose origin is Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or Spanish culture. In the United States, 16.3% of the population (or 50,477,594 people) is considered Hispanic or Latino (Humes et al., 2011). With these numbers, this population is the largest minority group in the United States (Tomkiewicz, Bass, & Vaicys, 2005). This number has increased since 2000, when this ethnic group represented 12.5% of the US population (Humes et al., 2011). Further, a 60% increase in the Hispanic population was projected by 2020 (Mallol, Holtom, & Lee, 2007).

Several scholars have noted that Hispanics are largely underinvestigated in business literature (DelCampo & Blancero, 2008; Stone, Johnson, Stone-Romero, & Hartman, 2006). Research on discrimination in this ethnic group shows that many Latinos report experiencing discrimination every day (Perez, Fortuna, & Alegria, 2008). Research shows that ethnic discrimination is related to a number of negative outcomes, such as alcohol and drug abuse (Verissimo, Gee, Ford, & Iguchi, 2014).

Recent legal cases demonstrate the ethnic discrimination that Hispanics face in the workplace. In 2012, Hampton Inn was found guilty of hiring Hispanics over other races for certain positions (e.g., maids; *EEOC v. Century Shree Corp. & Century Rama Inc.*, *EEOC v. New Indianapolis Hotels, Inc.*; EEOC, 2014b). Though on the surface this preference for hiring Hispanics seems like a positive situation, it actually enforces negative stereotypes about this ethnicity that keep them in low-level positions (e.g., maids). Other lawsuits have shown that Hispanics are subjected to ethnic slurs in the workplace, slurs such as being called lazy and ignorant, as was the case in a lawsuit involving the retail store Nordstrom (*EEOC v. Nordstrom*; EEOC, 2014b).

Types of Racial Discrimination

Despite the outlawing of workplace racial discrimination in the United States in the mid-twentieth century, recent empirical evidence suggests the perverse practice of making organizational decisions based on an individual's racial identity remains prevalent. Overall, nearly 5% of Americans believe they have suffered racial discrimination at work in the past year, and the odds of perceived victimization are roughly four times higher for minority than for White employees (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2008). In this section, we consider two different types of this behavior. First, we examine formal discrimination, or the overt, illegal use of one's racial group membership when making human resource management determinations. For instance, an interviewer opting to hire an Asian American applicant over a White employee on the basis of race has engaged in formal discrimination. Second, we examine interpersonal discrimination, which encompasses more covert and, often legally questionable, race-based behavior. For example, being impolite to a coworker because she is Black is not illegal, but such treatment is clearly discriminatory and can have negative implications for individuals and organizations.

Formal Discrimination

Within the context of formal racial discrimination, there is considerable variation as well. Here, we review two forms of formal discrimination. The first typically focuses on racial differences in human resource management (HRM) outcomes. Human resource management systems are designed to help organizations identify, attract, select, deploy, develop, appraise, reward, retain, and release human capital to produce a workforce geared toward creating a sustainable competitive advantage over one's competitors. Unfortunately, racial bias in organizations appears so pervasive that it seems to infiltrate HRM decisions of all types. We review much of the recent research on this topic across the employment life cycle (i.e., acquisition to termination). The second form of formal discrimination we cover involves the common tendency for behavior to produce differential rewards or punishment depending on one's identity.

Though there is not a rich literature on racial discrimination in personnel recruitment per se, the existent research clearly indicates that, until recently, most organizational attempts to attract applicants in the United States were designed with White individuals in mind. For instance, in reviewing the literature on targeted recruitment, Avery and McKay (2006) identified several common mistakes made by organizations purportedly seeking racial diversity. Specifically, companies tended to recruit at colleges and universities with relatively small minority enrollments and commonly deployed White recruiters to do so. As a result, the signal sent to the minority job seeker is that the company is not really interested in diversity or, by extension, me. Moreover, there is typically little forethought into the unique community climate issues facing minorities when making employment decisions (McKay & Avery, 2006). Accordingly, many racial minorities perceive chilly climates inside and outside prospective organizations during site visits that lead them to pursue alternative arrangements elsewhere.

The research on racial discrimination during personnel selection has been far more extensive. For instance, several studies (e.g. Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Deros, Ryan, & Serlie, 2014; King, Mendoza, Madera, Hebl, & Knight, 2006) have shown that even having a name associated with racial or ethnic minority groups decreases the likelihood of receiving a callback after submitting a resume for a job opening. Perhaps even more disturbing is other evidence indicating that the resume of a White exconvict received more interest than that of a Black college graduate with no criminal record (Pager, 2003). Racial discrimination is also not limited to this initial stage of selection. In fact, other evidence indicates that individuals will discriminate against racial minorities when choosing a candidate if they believe such behavior is accepted either within their organization (Ziegert & Hanges, 2005) or by their superiors (Umphress, Simmons, Boswell, & Triana, 2008). Sometimes, this takes the form of failing to recognize qualities in minority candidates that are somehow more apparent when the individual in question is a White male (Hewlett, Luce, & West, 2005). Even when racial minorities are selected for executive assignments, it is more likely to be by a poorer performing firm and they are likely to be replaced by a White man, in what the authors term the "savior effect," if the poor performance trend continues during their tenure (Cook & Glass, 2014). In short, racial bias in selection appears so prevalent that many private sector organizations are reluctant to hire minorities *unless* they are unable to attract White applicants to fill their vacancies (Fields, Goodman, & Blum, 2005).

When an applicant is hired by an organization, results suggest disparate treatment continues. In the few studies to consider discrepancies in placement, the research (albeit dated) suggests racial minorities are apt to be assigned to supervisors of their race (Lefkowitz, 1994) and appointed to "racialized" positions that focus primarily on managing diversity within the organization or public relations with minority consumers (Collins, 1997). Similar evidence has emerged in the context of professional sports, where researchers have demonstrated the existence and persistence of a sorting pattern of racial discrimination known as positional stacking (Smith & Leonard, 1997). Essentially, Black players are tracked into peripheral positions involving less decision-making. The problem with such tracking of minority hires is that these roles offer fewer opportunities for advancement, compensation, or skill development, thereby contributing to the perpetuating of the racially imbalanced status quo (e.g., Penner, 2008).

After being assigned to positions, the next relevant component of HRM is performance appraisal. Racial bias in performance appraisal is often difficult to estimate because there are multiple viable explanations for any demonstrated differences in appraisal ratings. In one of the most extensive meta-analyses of racial differences in performance appraisals, McKay and McDaniel (2006) found that White incumbents were rated significantly higher than their Black counterparts ($d = .27$). Though its impact was certainly not the largest of the explanatory factors they examined, they did find some evidence of discrimination. A subsequent study by McKay and his colleagues (McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008) indicated that racial differences in objectively measured job performance were null

when organizational climates were more supportive of diversity and significant when they were not, again suggesting that discrimination helps account for some of the racial differences in performance. There is even evidence that baseball umpires (particularly those who are White) call fewer strikes on pitches thrown by minority than White pitchers (Parsons, Sulaeman, Yates, & Hamermesh, 2011). Compounding matters further, performance appraisal is particularly tricky within consumer-driven industries where the “customer is king” paradigm remains one of the most influential approaches to management. The problem is that customers are racially biased in favor of White over Black service personnel and report higher levels of satisfaction with the former than with the latter even when the two perform comparably (Hekman et al., 2010). Interestingly, however, interventions like structured free recall appear particularly promising for helping to reduce the impact of racial bias in performance appraisal ratings (Baltes, Bauer, & Frensch, 2007).

Given that appraisals tend to be biased in favor of White employees, it is not surprising that compensation often follows a similar pattern. For instance, in examining the impact of demographics on service sector compensation, Joshi, Liao, and Jackson (2006, p. 466) found that “the salaries of people of color were \$2,405.46 lower than those of their White peers.” A subsequent, more comprehensive study estimated that when human capital (e.g., education, training) is held constant, Black men earn 12% less than White men and Black women earn 9% less than White women (Kim, 2009). A commonly employed approach to rectifying perceived underpayment by one’s employer is to seek employment with another company at a higher salary. Unfortunately, in a form of differential returns, this tactic benefits White individuals more than it does Black individuals (Dreher & Cox, 2000), which may explain why race differentials expand as individuals grow older (Barnum, Liden, & DiTomaso, 1995). Even in companies implementing HRM programs designed to focus on performance, “significant demographic differences occur in the allocation of salary increases over time, even after controlling for education, job experience and performance, job title, work unit, and supervisor” (Castilla, 2012, p. 554).

Organizations are responsible for developing the knowledge, skills, and abilities of their personnel, and efforts toward this end also tend to be distributed inequitably. Racial minorities often find it disproportionately challenging to gain comparable access to mentors or training as their White counterparts (Blake-Beard, Murrell, & Thomas, 2007; Yang, 2007). For instance, a review of the workplace development literature from 1980 to 2005 indicated that Black and Hispanic employees found it more difficult to gain entry to organizational training and development programs (Brooks & Clunis, 2007). Moreover, a recent study of healthcare providers recently indicated that Black physicians found it more difficult than White physicians to find a mentor (Nunez-Smith et al., 2009). It is regrettable that minorities experience difficulties obtaining mentors in general. It is especially unfortunate, however, that they have less access to White male men mentors because research suggests these individuals are better able to sponsor their protégés and set them up for career success (Hu, Thomas, & Lance, 2008; Ragins, 1997).

Race also remains a factor in promotional decisions. In fact, a large-scale study in Canada found that racial minority employees were less likely to be promoted than White employees, particularly at lower organizational levels in a phenomenon labeled “the sticky floor” (Yap & Konrad, 2009). Within the United States, Black managers report slower rates of promotion than their White counterparts and **experience smaller returns on their human capital (James, 2000). Objective evidence paints a similar picture for members of other underrepresented minority groups, in both blue- and white-collar occupations (Elvira & Zatzick, 2002; Wilson & Maume, 2013). Worse still, Black workers experienced occupational status losses relative to their White peers in the 1990s and were disproportionately likely to transition from white- to blue-collar positions (McBrier & Wilson, 2004). Promotional discrimination of this type exists even at the highest organizational levels (i.e., organizational directorships), where racial minorities receive less mentoring, which contributes to them being appointed to fewer corporate boards than comparable White counterparts (McDonald & Westphal, 2012). Moreover, there is evidence of differential returns and punishments in that flattery is less helpful in landing corporate board appointments for minority than for White candidates (Westphal & Stern, 2007) and tardiness diminishes the promotional prospects of minorities more than White employees (Lukseyte, Waite, Avery, & Roy, 2013).**

We also see patterns of racial inequity in employee disciplinary procedures and dismissal. For instance, in the context of professional sports, Black players (employees) are more likely to be penalized for rules infractions than their White counterparts (Hall & Livingston, 2012; Price & Wolfers, 2010). Though studied less often than **discrimination in other HRM facets, researchers have recently called for greater attention to the possibility of racially discriminatory job loss (Bell, Berry, Marquardt, & Green, 2013).** Given the pervasiveness of discrimination in other areas of HRM, it is not surprising that Black employees are more likely than White employees to be dismissed

from their jobs (Wilson, 2005). Moreover, White employees are less likely than Asian, Hispanic, or Black employees to be laid off or downsized (Elvira & Zatzick, 2002; Kalev, 2014).

Interpersonal Discrimination

As social pressures to appear unbiased have increased, people have begun to manifest their racial prejudice in more covert ways. This is not to say that formal discrimination is a thing of the past. In fact, the previous section clearly demonstrates otherwise. Rather, it is to suggest that as the level of formal discrimination has declined somewhat, it has been replaced with racially targeted mistreatment that may be more ambiguous, but can be equally harmful. In fact, a recent meta-analysis (K. P. Jones et al., 2013) revealed that the deleterious effects of formal and interpersonal (though they used the labels “overt” and “subtle”) discrimination on job attitudes and well-being are virtually indistinguishable. Though researchers have identified various forms of interpersonal discrimination, due to space concerns, we limit our discussion primarily to everyday discrimination, microaggressions, bullying, and incivility based on race.

In an effort to provide a more holistic picture of the mistreatment commonly experienced by racial minorities at work in the United States, Deitch et al. (2003) introduced the concept of everyday discrimination. They argued that whereas formal discrimination is a fairly rare occurrence for any particular individual, it is far more commonplace for minorities to experience racial slights from those in their surroundings. Accordingly, they defined everyday racism as the daily “subtle and pervasive manifestations of racism” (p. 1300). To measure this construct, they included events such as being excluded by others, vandalized, set up for failure, or made the target of jokes. Overall, Blacks perceived more everyday discrimination than White employees, and this had negative implications for their well-being. Though Deitch et al. focused on Black-White differences, other research has demonstrated similar effects of what the authors labeled “ethnic workplace harassment” on well-being among other types of minority employees (Raver & Nishii, 2010; Schneider, Hitlan, & Radhakrishnan, 2000).

Around the same time that Deitch et al. (2003) were introducing everyday discrimination, clinicians were developing and refining the similar concept of microaggressions or “brief, everyday exchanges that send denigrating messages to people of color because they belong to a racial minority group” (Sue et al., 2007, p. 273). Though these slights may seem subtle, their effects are both cumulative and emotionally taxing to those who experience them, particularly when the targets are minorities (Wang, Leu, & Shoda, 2011). Microaggressions come from customers as well as other employees (Kern & Grandey, 2009), thereby creating an additional potential impediment to equal employment opportunity for employees in the service sector. Additionally, like formal discrimination, it appears that leaders can set the tone for interpersonal discrimination as ambiguous behavior is less likely to be perceived as a microaggression when a leader has a track record of equitable treatment (Offerman, Basford, Graebner, DeGraaf, & Jaffer, 2013).

Fox and Stallworth (2006) believed it would be helpful to view interpersonal discrimination through the lens of bullying. “Bullying” is a somewhat generic catchall term used to describe mistreatment ranging from subtle rudeness (e.g., silent treatment) to outright emotional abuse (e.g., insults, threats, curses). Though employees of all races reported comparable amounts of general bullying, this was not the case with bullying pertaining to race. Roughly half of the Asian (57%) and Black (50%) employees in their sample and more than a third of the Hispanic (37%) employees reported experiences of racial bullying compared to only an eighth of White respondents. Moreover, responses to this type of abuse included emotional strain and counterproductive work behavior (e.g., revenge). Another type of bullying that has received noteworthy recent attention is the use of racial slurs (Rosette, Carton, Bowes-Sperry, & Hewlin, 2013). Rosette et al. found that Black employees were more likely than White employees to be the targets of racial slurs and that the motive behind these slurs appeared to be maintaining the status quo of minority subordination to the White majority.

More recently, Cortina (2008) proposed incivility as a means for manifesting racism in organizational settings and differentiated general from selective incivility. Whereas both forms may look the same to an outside observer, the difference lies in the motive underlying the behavior. On the one hand, general incivility lacks a clear intent to harm and has no specific basis for identifying targets. On the other hand, selective incivility targets members of particular social groups to express the perpetrator’s prejudices regarding those groups. Supporting this theoretical premise, a recent study found that the relationship between supervisor-subordinate racial dissimilarity and incivility was moderated by supervisor race (Cunningham, Miner, & McDonald, 2013). In particular, White leaders were more

uncivil to their non-White subordinates whereas Black leaders did not treat their subordinates differently based on race. As with everyday discrimination, microaggressions, and bullying, it appears that (1) minorities experience this form of mistreatment more often than members of the White majority and (2) it diminishes the likelihood of the target wanting to stay in their current position (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta, & Magley, 2013; Cunningham et al., 2013).

A somewhat different approach to interpersonal discrimination focuses on differences in the subtle, physical reactions of individuals to targets of differing races. For instance, some individuals exhibit noticeable anxiety when interacting with racial minorities (e.g., Avery, Richeson, Hebl, & Ambady, 2009). This may include behaviors such as fidgeting or even excessive blinking of the eyes. It could even involve outright negativity (i.e., less smiling and enthusiasm and more hostility and annoyance), as was the case in one recent study looking at interpersonal discrimination against Muslim job applicants (King & Ahmad, 2010). Alternatively, people sometimes use physical proximity to express their discomfort at being around minorities. This could take the form of positioning one's self further away from a minority (i.e., racial distancing) or at an angle that makes conversations challenging or ostracizing the other individual altogether (Hebl, Madera, & King, 2008). Fox and Stallworth's (2006) bullying study provides some preliminary evidence that race may contribute to ostracism (see Robinson, O'Reilly, & Wang, 2013, for a recent review on this construct), as 18.9% of respondents indicated they had been excluded from social interactions on the basis of race.

Across these types of interpersonal discrimination, there is a clear pattern. Namely, like its formal counterpart, minorities appear to experience more of it than comparable White employees and this adversely impacts the objective and subjective well-being of the former. Though we do not advocate blaming the victim or suggest that it is somehow the target's responsibility to prevent the perpetrator from discriminating, there is practical value in the growing research devoted to identifying strategies for reducing interpersonal discrimination (e.g., Ruggs, Martinez, & Hebl, 2011). For instance, being extraverted or friendly could aid minorities in circumventing and overcoming others' apprehensions about their identity (Flynn, Chatman, & Spataro, 2001; Singletary & Hebl, 2009).

Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter was to provide an overview of the current state of the literature on racial discrimination and stimulate future research in this area (see Table 1 for suggestions of potentially fruitful avenues of future inquiry). By reviewing the numerous theoretical perspectives that have accumulated on this topic, we aimed to help readers understand *why* people discriminate based on race and *how* such discrimination is manifested. We also wanted to show the breadth of discrimination by showing that members any racial or ethnic group can be targets of discrimination—including those in the White majority. Finally, by comparing and contrasting formal and interpersonal discrimination, we hoped to make two additional impressions. First, we sought to illustrate the pervasiveness of discrimination throughout the various facets constituting HRM. Unfortunately, discrimination is evident in virtually every aspect of the employee lifecycle from pre-hire to fire. Second, the review of interpersonal discrimination should demonstrate the adaptive nature of behavioral manifestations of racism. As pressures to appear unbiased have increased, individuals have developed new and innovative ways of expressing their prejudices while allowing themselves (at least as far as they are concerned) to appear unbiased.

Table 1 Future Research Recommendations

Section 1: Racial Discrimination Theory

Conclusion	Future Research Direction
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In this section we discussed several theories used to explain racism.• We only examined theories that have been used to explain racism in social and applied psychology research.• We did not examine all theories used	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Critical race theory (Bell, 1980) is an important theory that is often used in the legal and educational disciplines (Ladson-Billings, 2010), but has conspicuously been absent from research in applied psychology.• Future research can address whether and how critical race theory can be used to explain racism in organizational settings.

to explain racism.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We discussed how the modern, aversive, and symbolic (MAS) racism theories state that traditional forms of racism have been supplanted by a newer, more current form of racism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several opportunities for scholars to further examine the mediation process through which individuals make decisions and the subsequent boundary conditions that may work to further complicate predictions of racial discrimination in regard to MAS racism theories.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We discussed theory on disparate treatment and adverse impact. • These theories show how people respond to racism via legal mechanisms and the consequences that are likely to result when people experience racism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future research should address how people actually respond to racism or threats based on one's race on an individual occurrence level. That is, most incidences of racism do not result in lawsuits or formal complaints. • It would be particularly enlightening if scholars examined the different types of threat responses (Petriglieri, 2011) that individuals use to immediately respond to racism vis-à-vis the alleged perpetrators.

Section 2: Targets of Race Discrimination

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the existing findings in management and psychology examine discrimination as a Black-White issue or by comparing Whites to non-Whites (i.e., grouping all minority groups together). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discrimination experiences may be unique for different racial/ethnic groups. • Diversity scholars have recently suggested that when examining discrimination issues in future research, it would be best to consider each racial or ethnic group individually (e.g., Ruggs et al., 2013).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research has yet to examine the racioethnic discrimination of American Indians, Native Hawaiians, or Pacific Islanders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future research should address how people in these racial groups respond to racism.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the last decade, the number of people reporting more than one race has increased by 32% (Humes et al., 2011). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future research should investigate the impact of having a biracial identity on discrimination antecedents and outcomes.

Section 3: Types of Racial Discrimination

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not a rich literature on racial discrimination in personnel recruitment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future research should investigate the impact of targeted recruitment on all racial and ethnic minority groups.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Racial discrimination in job loss is studied less often than discrimination in other HRM facets (Wilson, 2005). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers have recently called for greater attention to the possibility of racially discriminatory job loss (Bell et al., 2013).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying strategies for reducing interpersonal discrimination is a practical strategy that can empower racial minorities to try and reduce discrimination (e.g., Ruggs et al., 2011). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A budding area of future research is devoted to identifying strategies for reducing interpersonal discrimination (e.g., Ruggs et al., 2011).

References

- Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2006). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Their roots in big-five personality factors and facets. *Journal of Individual Differences, 27*, 117–126.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other “authoritarian personality.” In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30., pp. 47–92). Orlando, FL: Academic.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*, 113–133.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (2004). A revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale: The short and sweet of it. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 14*, 47–54.
- Alvarez, A., Juang, L., & Liang, C. (2006). Asian Americans and racism: When bad things happen to “model minorities.” *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*, 477–492.
- Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 157–187.
- Avery, D. R., McKay, P. F., & Wilson, D. C. (2008). What are the odds? How demographic similarity affects the prevalence of perceived employment discrimination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 235–249.
- Avery, D. R., Richeson, J. A., Hebl, M. R., & Ambady, N. (2009). It does not have to be uncomfortable: The role of behavioral scripts in Black–White interracial interactions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 1382–1393.
- Awad, G. H., Cokley, K., & Ravitch, J. (2005). Attitudes toward affirmative action: A comparison of color-blind versus modern racist attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*, 1384–1399.
- Ayres, I., Vars, F. E., & Zakariya, N. (2005). To insure prejudice: Racial disparities in taxicab tipping. *Yale Law Journal, 114*, 1613–1674.
- Baltes, B. B., Bauer, C. B., & Frensch, P. A. (2007). Does a structured free recall intervention reduce the effect of stereotypes on performance ratings and by what cognitive mechanism? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 151–164.
- Barnum, P., Liden, R. C., & DiTomaso, N. (1995). Double jeopardy for women and minorities: Pay differences with age. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*, 863–880.
- Bell, M. P., Berry, D. P., Marquardt, D. J., & Green, T. G. (2013). Introducing discriminatory job loss: Antecedents, consequences, and complexities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28*, 584–605.
- Bell, M. P., Marquardt, D., & Berry, D. P. (2014). “Diversity,” immigration, and the new American multi-racial hierarchy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29*, 285–303.
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *American Economic Review, 94*, 991–1013.
- Blake-Beard, S. D., Murrell, A., & Thomas, D. (2007). Unfinished business: The impact of race on understanding mentoring relationships. In B. R. Ragins & K. E. Kram (Eds.), *The handbook of mentoring at work: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 223–248). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S. D., & Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*, 72–97.
- Brody, G. H., Chen, Y., Murry, V. M., Ge, X., Simons, R. L., Gibbons, F. X.,... Cutrona, C. E. (2006). Perceived discrimination and the adjustment of African American youths: A five-year longitudinal analysis with contextual

moderation effects. *Child Development*, 77, 1170–1189.

Brooks, A., & Clunis, T. (2007). Where to now? Race and ethnicity in workplace learning and development research: 1980–2005. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 18, 229–251.

Castilla, E. J. (2012). Gender, race, and the new (merit-based) employment relationship. *Industrial Relations*, 51, 528–562.

Chae, D., & Walters, K. L. (2009). Racial discrimination and racial identity attitudes in relation to self-rated health and physical pain and impairment among Two-Spirit American Indians/Alaska Natives. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99, 144–151.

Cheng, C., & Thatchenkery, T. J. (1997). Why is there a lack of workplace diversity research on Asian Americans? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 33, 270–276.

Collins, S. M. (1997). Black mobility in white corporations: Up the corporate ladder but out on a limb. *Social Problems*, 44, 55–67.

Cook, A., & Glass, C. (2014). Above the glass ceiling: When are women and racial/ethnic minorities promoted to CEO? *Strategic Management Journal*, 35, 1080–1089.

Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 55–75.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, 39, 1579–1605.

Crouter, A. C., Davis, K. D., Updegraff, K., Delgado, M., & Fortner, M. (2006). Mexican American fathers' occupational conditions: Links to family members' psychological adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 843–858.

Cunningham, G. B., Miner, K., & McDonald, J. (2013). Being different and suffering the consequences: The influence of head coach-player racial dissimilarity on experienced incivility. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 48, 689–705.

Dabney, D. A., Dugan, L., Topalli, V., & Hollinger, R. C. (2006). The impact of implicit stereotyping on offender profiling: Unexpected results from an observational study of shoplifting. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33, 646–674.

Deitch, E. A., Barsky, A., Butz, R. M., Chan, S., Brief, A. P., & Bradley, J. C. (2003). Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 56, 1299–1324.

DelCampo, R. G., & Blancero, D. M. (2008). Perceptions of psychological contract fairness of Hispanic professionals. *Cross Cultural Management*, 15, 300–315.

Deros, E., Ryan, A., & Serlie, A. W. (2014). Double jeopardy upon resume screening: When Ahmed is less employable than Aisha. *Personnel Psychology*. doi:10.1111/peps.12078

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

Dipboye, R. L., & Colella, A. (2005). The dilemmas of workplace discrimination. In R. L. Dipboye & A. Colella (Eds.), *Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases* (pp. 425–462). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

DiTomaso, N. (2013). *The American non-dilemma: Racial inequality without racism*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dovidio, J. F., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 276–319). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Affirmative action, unintentional racial biases, and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 52, 51–75.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In E. J. Fiske & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3–32). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (2000). Aversive racism and selection decisions: 1989 and 1999. *Psychological Science*, 11, 315–319.
- Dreher, G. F., & Cox, T. H. (2000). Labor market mobility and cash compensation: The moderating effects of race and gender. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 890–900.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk*. Chicago, IL: McClurg.
- Duckitt, J. (1992a). Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1182–1193.
- Duckitt, J. (1992b). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Ehrlich, H. J. (1973). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Ekehammar, B., & Akrami, N. (2003). The relation between personality and prejudice: A variable- and a person-centred approach. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 449–464.
- Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Gylje, M. (2004). What matters most to prejudice: Big five personality, social dominance orientation, or right-wing authoritarianism? *European Journal of Personality*, 18, 463–482.
- Elvira, M. M., & Zatzick, C. D. (2002). Who's displaced first? The role of race in layoff decisions. *Industrial Relations*, 41, 329–361.
- Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12, 53–72.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). (2012). *Employees and job applicants*. Retrieved January 18, 2012, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/employees/index.cfm>
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). (2014a). *Race-based charges FY 1997–FY 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/race.cfm>
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). (2014b). *Significant EEOC race/color cases*. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/initiatives/e-race/caselist.cfm>
- Estreicher, S., & Harper, M. C. (2008). *Cases and materials on employment discrimination and employment law* (4th ed.). St. Paul, MN: Thomson Reuters.
- Fields, D. L., Goodman, J. S., & Blum, T. C. (2005). Human resource dependence and organizational demography: A study of minority employment in private sector companies. *Journal of Management*, 31, 167–185.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902.
- Fiske, S. T., & Lee, T. L. (2008). Stereotypes and prejudice create workplace discrimination. In A. P. Brief (Ed.), *Diversity at work* (pp. 13–52). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Flynn, F. J., Chatman, J. A., & Spataro, S. E. (2001). Getting to know you: The influence of personality on impressions and performance of demographically different people in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 414–442.

- Foley, S., Kidder, D. L., & Powell, G. N. (2002). The perceived glass ceiling and justice perceptions: An investigation of Hispanic law associates. *Journal of Management*, 28, 471–496.
- Ford, R. T. (2008). *The race card: How bluffing about bias makes race relations worse*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2006). How effective is an apology in resolving workplace bullying disputes? *Dispute Resolution Journal*, 61, 54–63.
- Fryberg, S. A. (2003, June). *Free to be me? The impact of using American Indians as mascots*. Invited address at the 16th Annual Convention of American Indian Psychologists and Psychology Graduate Students, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.
- Gabbidon, S. L. (2003). Racial profiling by store clerks and security personnel in retail establishments: An exploration of “shopping while Black.” *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 19, 345–364.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). Aversive form of racism. In *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61–89). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gates, H. L., Jr. (1997). *Thirteen ways of looking at a black man*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Gatewood, R. D., & Field, H. S. (2001). *Human resource selection* (5th ed.). Stamford, CT: Thomson Learning.
- Gee, G. C., Ro, A., Shariff-Marco, S., & Chae, D. (2009). Racial discrimination and health among Asian Americans: Evidence, assessment, and directions for future research. *Epidemiologic Reviews*, 31, 130–151.
- Gee, G. C., Spencer, M., Chen, J., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2007). A nationwide study of discrimination and chronic health conditions among Asian Americans. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97, 1275–1282.
- Gilbert, D. T., & Hixon, J. G. (1991). The trouble of thinking: Activation and application of stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 509–517.
- Golden, M. (2005). *Don't play in the sun: One woman's journey through the color complex*. New York, NY: Anchor.
- Goldman, B., Gutek, B., Stein, J., & Lewis, K. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employment discrimination in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 32, 786–830.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64–86.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4–27.
- Greenwald, A. G., Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E. L., & Banaji, M. R. (2009). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 17–41.
- Guyll, M., Matthews, K. A., & Bromberger, J. T. (2001). Discrimination and unfair treatment: Relationship to cardiovascular reactivity among African American and European American women. *Health Psychology*, 20, 315–325.
- Hall, E. V., & Livingston, R. W. (2012). The hubris penalty: Biased responses to “celebration” displays of black football players. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 899–904.
- Harris, A.-M., Henderson, G. R., & Williams, J. D. (2005). Courting customers: Assessing consumer racial profiling and other marketplace discrimination. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing, Policy Watch: Commentaries and Viewpoints*, 24, 163–171.
- Harrison, M. S., & Thomas, K. M. (2009). The hidden prejudice in selection: A research investigation on skin color bias. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39, 134–168.
- Heaven, P. C. L., & Bucci, S. (2001). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and personality: An

analysis using the IPIP measure. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 49–56.

Hebl, M., Madera, J. M., & King, E. (2008). Exclusion, avoidance and social distancing. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity resistance: Manifestation and solutions* (pp. 127–150). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hekman, D. R., Aquino, K., Owens, B. P., Mitchell, T. R., Schilpzand, P., & Leavitt, K. (2010). An examination of whether and how racial and gender biases influence customer satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 238–264.

Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O. (2002). The Symbolic Racism 2000 Scale. *Political Psychology*, 23, 253–283.

Hewlett, S. A., Luce, C. B., & West, C. (2005). Leadership in your midst. *Harvard Business Review*, 83, 74–82.

Hiel, A. V., & Mervielde, I. (2005). Authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Relationships with various forms of racism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 2323–2344.

Hu, C., Thomas, K. M., & Lance, C. E. (2008). Intentions to initiate mentoring relationships: Understanding the impact of race, proactivity, feelings of deprivation, and relationship roles. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 148, 727–744.

Hughes, D., & Dodge, M. (1997). African American women in the workplace: Relationships between job conditions, racial bias at work, and perceived job quality. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 25, 581–599.

Humes, K. R., Jones, N. A., & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010*. 2010 Census Briefs. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.

Huynh, Q.-L., Devos, T., & Goldberg, R. (2013). The role of ethnic and national identifications in perceived discrimination for Asian Americans: Toward a better understanding of the buffering effect of group identifications on psychological distress. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*. Advance online publication.

James, E. H. (2000). Race-related differences in promotions and support: Underlying effects of human and social capital. *Organization Science*, 11, 493–508.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2013). Not so subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*. doi:10.1177/0149206313506466

Joshi, A., Liao, H., & Jackson, S. E. (2006). Cross-level effects of workplace diversity on sales performance and pay. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 459–481.

Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., & Carvallo, M. R. (2002). Non-conscious forms of system justification: Implicit and behavioral preferences for higher status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 586–602.

Kaiser, C. R., & Pratt-Hyatt, J. S. (2009). Distributing prejudice unequally: Do Whites direct their prejudice toward strongly identified minorities? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 432–445.

Kalev, A. (2014). How you downsize is who you downsize: Biased formalization, accountability, and managerial diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 79, 109–135.

Kao, G., & Thompson, J. S. (2003). Racial and ethnic stratification in educational achievement and attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 417–442.

Kern, J. H., & Grandey, A. A. (2009). Customer incivility as a social stressor: The role of race and racial identity for service employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14, 46–57.

Kieval, S. (2009). Discerning discrimination in state treatment of American Indians going beyond reservation boundaries. *Columbian Law Review*, 109, 94–137.

Kim-Prieto, C., Goldstein, L. A., Okazaki, S., & Kirschner, B. (2010). Effect of exposure to an American Indian mascot on the tendency to stereotype a different minority group. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 40, 534–553.

- Kim, M. (2009). Race and gender differences in the earnings of black workers. *Industrial Relations*, 48, 466–488.
- King, A. G., & Spruell, S. P. (2001). Coca-Cola takes the high road. *Black Enterprise*, 31, 29.
- King, E. B., & Ahmad, A. S. (2010). An experimental field study of interpersonal discrimination toward Muslim job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 881–906.
- King, E. B., Mendoza, S. A., Madera, J. M., Hebl, M. R., & Knight, J. L. (2006). What's in a name? A multiracial investigation of the role of occupational stereotypes in selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 1145–1159.
- Kraiger, K., & Ford, J. K. (1985). A meta-analysis of ratee race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 56–65.
- Kravitz, D. A. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Beyond selection—The role of affirmative action. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 173–193.
- Kunda, Z., & Spencer, S. J. (2003). When do stereotypes come to mind and when do they color judgment? A goal-based theoretical framework for stereotype activation and application. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 522–544.
- Landy, F. J. (2005). *Employment discrimination litigation: Behavioral, quantitative, and legal perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Lefkowitz, J. (1994). Race as a factor in job placement: Serendipitous findings of “ethnic drift.” *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 497–513.
- Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (1997). Category and stereotype activation: Is prejudice inevitable? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 275–287.
- Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Inter personal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 483–496.
- Lin, M. H., Kwan, V. S. Y., Cheung, A., & Fiske, S. T. (2005). Stereotype content model explains prejudice for an envied outgroup: Scale of anti-Asian American stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 34–47.
- Luksyte, A., Waite, E., Avery, D. R., & Roy, R. (2013). Held to a different standard: Racial differences in the impact of lateness on advancement opportunity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86, 142–165.
- Lundman, R. J., & Kaufman, R. L. (2003). Driving while Black: Effects of race, ethnicity, and gender on citizen self-reports of traffic stops and police actions. *Criminology*, 41, 195–220.
- Lynn, M., Sturman, M., Ganley, C., Adams, E., Douglas, M., & McNeil, J. (2008). Consumer racial discrimination in tipping: A replication and extension. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 38, 1045–1060.
- Mallol, C., Holtom, B., & Lee, T. (2007). Job embeddedness in a culturally diverse environment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22, 35–44.
- McBrier, D. B., & Wilson, G. (2004). Going down? Race and downward occupational mobility for white-collar workers in the 1990s. *Work and Occupations*, 31, 283–322.
- McConahay, J. B. (1983). Modern racism and modern discrimination: The effects of race, racial attitudes, and context on simulated hiring decisions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 551–558.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–124). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? It depends on who is asking and what is asked. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 25, 563–579.
- McConahay, J. B., & Hough, J. C. (1976). Symbolic racism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 32, 23–45.

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- McKay, P. F., & McDaniel, M. A. (2006). A reexamination of Black–White differences in work performance: More data, more moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 538–554.
- McDonald, M., & Westphal, J. (2012). Not let in on the secret to success: How low levels of mentoring from incumbent directors negatively affect women and racial minority first-time directors' appointments to additional corporate boards. *Academy of Management Journal*. doi:10.5465/amj.2011.0230
- McFarland, S. G. (1989). Religious orientations and the targets of discrimination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 324–336.
- McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V., & Abalakina, M. (1993). The authoritarian personality in the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.: Comparative studies. In *Strengths and weaknesses: The authoritarian personality today* (pp. 199–228). New York, NY: Springer.
- McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. (2006). What has race got to do with it? Unraveling the role of racioethnicity in job seekers' reactions to site visits. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 395–429.
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2008). Mean racial-ethnic differences in employee sales performance: The moderating role of diversity climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 349–374.
- Morris, S. B., & Lobsenz, R. E. (2000). Significance tests and confidence intervals for the adverse impact ratio. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 89–111.
- Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Nail, P. R., Harton, H. C., & Decker, B. P. (2003). Political orientation and modern versus aversive racism: Tests of Dovidio and Gaertner's (1998) integrated model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 754–770.
- National Conference of State Legislatures. (2013). *Affirmative action: Court decisions*. Retrieved on July 2, 2014, from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/affirmative-action-court-decisions.aspx>
- Nishii, L. H., & Ozbiligin, M. F. (2007). Global diversity management: Towards a conceptual framework. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18, 1883–1894.
- Noh, S., Kaspar, V., & Wickrama, K. A. (2007). Overt and subtle racial discrimination and mental health: Preliminary findings for Korean immigrants. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97, 1269–1274.
- Nunez-Smith, M., Pilgrim, N., Wynia, M., Desai, M. M., Jones, B. A., Bright, C., ... Bradley, E. H. (2009). Race/ethnicity and workplace discrimination: Results of a national survey of physicians. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 24, 1198–1204.
- Oakes, P. J., & Turner, J. C. (1980). Social categorisation and intergroup behavior: Does minimal intergroup discrimination make social identity more positive? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 295–301.
- Offermann, L. R., Basford, T. E., Graebner, R., DeGraaf, S. B., & Jaffer, S. (2013). Sights, snubs, and slurs: Leader equity and microaggressions. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 32, 374–393.
- Ong, A. D., Burrow, A. L., Fuller-Rowell, T. E., Ja, N., & Sue, D. W. (2013). Racial microaggressions and daily well-being among Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60, 188–199.
- Outtz, J. L. (2002). The role of cognitive ability tests in employment selection. *Human Performance*, 15, 161–172.
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108, 937–975.
- Paradies, Y. (2006). Whitening race: Essays in social and cultural criticism (book review). *Anthropological Forum*, 16, 197–199.
- Park, I. J. K., Schwartz, S. J., Lee, R. M., Kim, M., & Rodriguez, L. (2013). Perceived racial/ethnic discrimination and

- antisocial behaviors among Asian American college students: Testing the moderating roles of ethnic and American identity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 19, 166–176.
- Parsons, C. A., Sulaeman, J., Yates, M. C., & Hamermesh, D. S. (2011). Strike three: discrimination, incentives, and evaluation. *American Economic Review*, 101, 1410–1435.
- Penner, A. M. (2008). Race and gender differences in wages: The role of occupational sorting at the point of hire. *Sociological Quarterly*, 49, 597–614.
- Perez, D., Fortuna, L., & Alegría, M. (2008). Prevalence and correlates of everyday discrimination among U.S. Latinos. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36, 421–433.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57–75.
- Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal and external motivation to respond without prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 811–832.
- Ployhart, R. E., & Holtz, B. C. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Strategies for reducing racioethnic and sex subgroup differences and adverse impact in selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 153–172.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741–763.
- Price, J., & Wolfers, J. (2010). Racial discrimination among NBA referees. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125, 1859–1887.
- Qin, D. B., Way, N., & Mukherjee, P. (2008). The other side of the model minority story: The familial and peer challenges faced by Chinese American adolescents. *Youth and Society*, 39, 480–506.
- Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 482–521.
- Raver, J. L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 236–254.
- Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2001). The role of personality and group factors in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 37, 427–434.
- Ricci v. DeStefano, 129 S. Ct. 2658 (2009).
- Rindova, V. P., Williamson, I. O., Petkova, A. P., & Sever, J. M. (2005). Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 1033–1049.
- Robinson, S. L., O'Reilly, J., & Wang, W. (2013). Invisible at work: An integrated model of workplace ostracism. *Journal of Management*, 39, 203–231.
- Rosette, A. S., Carton, A. M., Bowes-Sperry, L., & Hewlin, P. F. (2013). Why do racial slurs remain prevalent in the workplace? Integrating theory on intergroup behavior. *Organization Science*, 24, 1402–1421.
- Rosette, A. S., Leonardelli, G. J., & Phillips, K. W. (2008). The White standard: Racial bias in leader categorization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 758–777.
- Roth, P. L., Bobko, P., & Switzer, F. S. (2006). Modeling the behavior of the 4/5ths rule for determining adverse impact: Reasons for caution. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 507–522.
- Ruggs, E. N., Law, C., Cox, C. B., Roehling, M. V., Wieners, R. L., Hebl, M. R., & Barron, L. (2013). Gone fishing: I/O psychologists' missed opportunities to understand marginalized employees' experiences with discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology-Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 6, 39–60.

- Ruggs, E. N., Martinez, L. R., & Hebl, M. R. (2011). How individuals and organizations can reduce interpersonal discrimination. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5, 29–42.
- Ruttimann, J. (2009, May 29). Breaking through the “bamboo ceiling” for Asian American scientists. *Science Careers*. Retrieved from http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_magazine/previous_issues/articles/2009_05_29/sciencecareers
- Sackett, P. R., & Lievens, F. (2008). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59(1), 419–450. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093716
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262–274.
- Schneider, K. T., Hitlan, R. T., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2000). An examination of the nature and correlates of ethnic harassment experiences in multiple contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 3–12.
- Schreer, G. E., Smith, S., & Thomas, K. (2009). Shopping while Black: Examining racial discrimination in a retail setting. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39, 1432–1444.
- Shinagawa, L. H., & Kim, D. Y. (2008). *A portrait of Chinese Americans: A national demographic and social profile of Chinese Americans*. Maryland: Asian American Studies Program, University of Maryland.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2001). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Martin, M., & Stallworth, L. (1991). Consensual racism and career track: Some implications for social dominance theory. *Political Psychology*, 12, 691–721.
- Singh, V., & Point, S. (2004, August). Promoting diversity management: New challenges and new responses by top companies across Europe. *Management Focus*. Cranfield School of Management. Retrieved from www.cranfield.ac.uk/som/research/centres/cdwbl.
- Singletary, S. L., & Hebl, M. R. (2009). Compensatory strategies for reducing interpersonal discrimination: The effectiveness of acknowledgments, increased positivity, and individuating information. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 797–805.
- Smith, E., & Leonard, W. M. (1997). Twenty-five years of stacking research in major league baseball: An attempt at explaining this re-occurring phenomenon. *Sociological Focus*, 30, 321–331.
- Stone, D., Johnson, R. D., Stone-Romero, E. F., & Hartman, M. (2006). A comparative study of Hispanic-American and Anglo-American cultural values and job choice preferences. *Management Research*, 4, 8–21.
- Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J. M., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., & Torino, G. C. (2007). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13, 72–81.
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62, 271–286.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information*, 13, 65–93.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Talaska, C., Fiske, S. T., & Chaiken, S. (2008). Legitimizing racial discrimination: A meta-analysis of the racial attitude-behavior literature shows that emotions, not beliefs, best predict discrimination. *Social Justice Research*, 21, 263–296.

- Tarman, C., & Sears, D. O. (2005). The conceptualization and measurement of symbolic racism. *Journal of Politics*, 67, 731–761.
- Tatum, B. D. (1999). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Tetlock, P. E., Kristel, O. V., Elson, S. B., Green, M. C., & Lerner, J. S. (2000). The psychology of the unthinkable: Taboo trade-offs, forbidden base rates, and heretical counterfactuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 853–870.
- Thomas, K. M. (2008). *Diversity resistance in organizations*. New York, NY: Erlbaum.
- Tomkiewicz, J., Bass, K., & Vaicys, C. (2005). Comparing fear of success and fear of appearing incompetent among African Americans' and Whites' business candidates. *Equal Opportunities International*, 24, 19–29.
- Triana, M. C., García, M. F., & Colella, A. (2010). Managing diversity: How organizational efforts to support diversity moderate the effects of perceived racial discrimination on affective commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 817–843.
- Umphress, E. E., Simmons, A. L., Boswell, W. R., & Triana, M. D. C. (2008). Managing discrimination in selection: The influence of directives from an authority and social dominance orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 982–993.
- Unzueta, M. M., Everly, B. A., & Gutiérrez, A. S. (2014). Social dominance orientation moderates reactions to Black and White discrimination claimants. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 54, 81–88.
- van Ginkel, W. P., & van Knippenberg, D. (2009). Group information elaboration and group decision making: The role of shared task representations. *Organization Behavior and Human Performance*, 105, 82–97.
- van Hiel, A., Kossowska, M., & Mervielde, I. (2000). The relationship between openness to experience and political ideology. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 741–751.
- van Knippenberg, D., Haslam, S. A., & Platow, M. J. (2007). Unity through diversity: Value-in-diversity beliefs, work group diversity, and group identification. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 11, 207–222.
- van Knippenberg, D., & van Ginkel, W. P. (2010). The categorization-elaboration model of work group diversity: Wielding the double-edged sword. In R. J. Crisp (Ed.), *The psychology of social and cultural diversity* (pp. 257–280). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Verissimo, A. D. O., Gee, G. C., Ford, C. L., & Iguchi, M. Y. (2014). Racial discrimination, gender discrimination, and substance abuse among Latina/os nationwide. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 20, 43–51.
- Volpone, S. D., & Avery, D. R. (2013). It's self defense: How perceived discrimination promotes employee withdrawal. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18, 430–448.
- Wang, J., Leu, J., & Shoda, Y. (2011). When the seemingly innocuous “stings”: Racial microaggressions and their emotional consequences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37, 1666–1678.
- Wellman, D. (1977). *Portraits of White racism*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Westphal, J. D., & Stern, I. (2007). Flattery will get you everywhere (especially if you are a male Caucasian): How ingratiation, boardroom behavior, and demographic minority status affect additional board appointments at US companies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 267–288.
- Whitbeck, L., Walls, M., & Welch, M. (2012). Substance abuse prevention in American Indian and Alaska Native communities. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 38, 428–435.
- Williams, D. R., Costa, M., & Leavell, J. P. (2010). Race and mental health: Patterns and challenges. In T. L. Scheid & T. N. Brown (Eds.), *A handbook for the study of mental health: Social contexts, theories, and systems* (2nd ed., pp. 268–290). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Williams, J. D., Henderson, G. R., & Harris, A. (2001). Consumer racial profiling: Bigotry goes to market. *New Crisis*, 108, 22.
- 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., & Maume, D. (2013). Men's race-based mobility into management: Analyses at the blue collar and white collar job levels. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 33, 1–12.
- Yang, S. (2007). Racial disparities in training, pay-raise attainment, and income. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 25, 323–335.
- Yap, M., & Konrad, A. M. (2009). Gender and racial differentials in promotions: Is there a sticky floor, a mid-level bottleneck, or a glass ceiling? *Industrial Relations*, 64, 593–619.
- Yu, X., & Goyette, K. (2004). *A demographic portrait of Asian Americans*. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau/Russell Sage Census 2000 Series.
- Ziegert, J. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2005). Employment discrimination: The role of implicit attitudes, motivation, and a climate for racial bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 553–562.

Derek R. Avery

Derek R. Avery, Department of Human Resource Management, Fox School of Business, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Sabrina D. Volpone

Sabrina D. Volpone is a doctoral student in the Human Resource Management program at Temple University's Fox School of Business. She received her master's degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from the University of Houston. Her research interests include diversity in organizations - including but not limited to race/ethnicity, sex, and sexual orientation - and the social networks of minority employees. Her research has been published in journals such as *Personnel Psychology*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, and *Human Resource Management* and she serves as a reviewer for many of these publications. Further, she has been a consultant for organizations such as ExxonMobil's Technical Training Division, Men's Wearhouse, and Saudi Aramco.

Oscar Holmes IV

Oscar Holmes IV, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

