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## ABSTRACT

We further elaborate ‘White Credentialing’ as one modality of ‘schematization’ that links Whiteness to symbolic and material resources within localities (e.g., organizations, networks and areas).

When operant in firms, it sorts excess White workers into the ‘upper echelons,’ wherein leadership transcribes unwritten rules and practices into formal policies and procedures.

We further specify this schema by anchoring it in ‘racial contract theory’ and then situating White Supremacy in a state of superposition, where it serves as both an ideological point of reiteration and ‘script library’ for specifying the modality between localities (e.g., firms).

We then extend recent ethnographic accounts of the situated enactment of this and related ‘ethnoracial schema’ within localities by analyzing a large sample of firms and estimating the probable impact of White Credentialing on ethnoracial wage disparities in the United States.

More specifically, we integrate microdata from the Current Population Survey (CPS) with administrative records from the Longitudinal Employer-Household Data (LEHD) and construct a unique dataset of approximately 71,500 workers and 386,000 quarterly wage observations from 1992 to 2008.

These linked data allow us to track coworkers inside firms while adjusting for key potential confounders — e.g., worker attributes, occupational strata, firm characteristics, and local labor market conditions.

We then operationalize firm-level Whiteness by cascading firms along a spectrum according to the White proportion of the top 5 percent of earners in each firm.

Results from our fixed-effects models show that as the upper echelons of firms ‘become Whiter,’ the rate of wage growth increases for White workers while simultaneously decreasing for their Black counterparts.

We argue that as White Supremacy encourages the embedding and deployment of White credentialing in firms, firms become Whiter, and Whiteness becomes increasingly legible as a symbol of competence and promotability, leaving material disparities in its wake.

We conclude by refining and further describing the role of firms and other localities in fostering and buttressing the American ethnoracial order.
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## EPIGRAPH

“Thirty-one men were arrested and thrown in jail as ‘conspirators,’ although they all declared more than once, they did not know they were firing on officers. Excitement was at fever beat until the morning papers, two days after, announced that the wounded deputy sheriffs were out of danger. This hindered rather than helped the plans of the Whites. There was no law on the statute books which would execute an Afro-American for wounding a white man, but the ‘*unwritten law*’ did. Three of these men, the president, the manager and clerk of the grocery – ‘the leaders of the conspiracy’ – were secretly taken from jail and lynched in a shockingly brutal manner. ‘The Negroes are getting too independent,’ they say, ‘we must teach them a lesson.’”

– *Southern Horrors*, Ida B. Wells Barnett 1892.

## INTRODUCTION

### [The Problem]

In the months following the deaths of George Floyd, Breanna Taylor and others, Americans engaged again in a ‘national conversation’ on the possibility that **structural** factors might contribute to different life experiences and outcomes between Blacks and Whites – as opposed to ‘individuals’ making different decisions or because of differences in ‘culture’ (Wells-Barnett 1892 [2014], Du Bois 1935, Frazier 1957 [1997], Carmichael and Hamilton 1967, Blauner 1972, Hall 1980, Omi and Winant 1986 [2015], Mills 1997 [2022], Bonilla-Silva 2001, Feagin 2001 [2010], Reskin 2012, Jung 2015).

Many of those making structural arguments for the ongoing existence of ethnoracial[[1]](#footnote-2) differences in the labor market have relied on studies that used **individual-level** models.[[2]](#footnote-3)

Most often, these survey-based studies show a remaining wage difference between Whites and Blacks, even after trying to remove the influence of differences in pre-market ‘labor market characteristics’ between the individuals taking part in the survey.

For most Liberals, the best inference to make from these **‘race residuals’** is that they reflect the contribution of **racism**, prejudice, and/or discrimination to ethnoracial *disparities* in earnings (Thomas, Herring and Horton 1994, Goldsmith, Veum and Darity 2000, Sakamoto, Tamborini and Kim 2018, Carnoy 2020).

For most Conservatives, these same residuals are composed of differences in unobserved or *unobservable* hard and/or soft **skills** in these wage *differences* (e.g., hard skills, soft skills and job choice; Phelps 1972, Arrow 1973, Aigner and Cain 1977, Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2010, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019, Lang and Kahn-Lang Spitzer 2020).

**Audit** studies have now better identified the likely role of discrimination at the point of the callback, showing greater rates for White job applicants compared to similarly qualified (or ‘credentialed’) Black applicants (Thomas et al. 1994, Goldsmith et al. 2000, Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004, Pager 2007, Gaddis 2015, Sakamoto et al. 2018, Carnoy 2020, Kline, Rose and Walters 2022).

However, audits offer little insight into the experiences of applicants after hiring, within firms, whether the rates of wage between Black and White workers differ, or the degree to which these difference might be molded by firm-level factors (Neumark 1988, Neumark 2012, Quillian et al. 2017, Quillian, Lee and Oliver 2020).

Therefore, “…sociologists continue to stress that more research remains to be done on the social construction of race in the workplace” (emphasis added: Lopez 2010, Saperstein, Penner and Light 2013), by linking organizations, schema and differences in symbolic and material outcomes (Ray 2019).

### [State-of-the-Art]

#### [Firms and Schema]

While there are several earlier offerings (Du Bois 1935, Carmichael and Hamilton 1967, Blauner 1969), more recent contributions to the study of ‘ethnoracial phenomena’ (e.g., race and/or ethnicity) as an ‘independent social force,’ that ‘structures societies,’ (Omi and Winant 1986 [2015], Bonilla-Silva 1997) are beginning again to incorporate key aspects of research in the area of organizational behavior, which has it roots in early twentieth century in Business Schools (Taylor 1911 [2010], Mayo 1933 [2005]).



That is, we have seen a growing number of theories and studies offering organizations as the unit of analysis in “local racial formations” (Bonilla-Silva 2015: 82) or “meso-level racial structures” (Collins 1997, Moss and Tilly 2001, Powell and Butterfield 2002, Moore 2007, Embrick 2011, Wingfield and Alston 2014, Evans and Moore 2015, Wooten 2015, Reyes 2017, Wooten and Couloute 2017, Ray 2019: 46, Wingfield 2019, Embrick and Moore 2020, Moore 2020, Wingfield and Chavez 2020).

Central to this organizational- or meso-level approach is the idea that organizations digest, interpret and then transact upon a shared “schemata of interpretation,” which enables collaborations between co-workers, helping them to “…locate, perceive, identify, and label…” people, groups and behaviors (Goffman 1974: 21).

Schema bias our assessments of the relative merit and esteem of social groups (*see* Boutyline 2024).

That is, schemas are“[k]nowledge structures that represent objects or events and provide *default assumptions* about their characteristics, relationships, and entailments under conditions of incomplete information” (Italics added: DiMaggio 1997:269) with, “…stereotypes [and/or] *scripts* … that represent the characteristics of people, places, objects or events and allow us to infer what these entities do, where they fit, and what to expect of them” (italics added: Cerulo 2010:117), including “[t]he social positions and meanings of racial categories, as well as the categories themselves” (Jung 2015: 38).

While most see distinctions between schema and implicit social cognition or bias, studies are beginning to integrate these constructs, both conceptually and empirically (De Raedt 2006, Cooley and Payne 2017, Payne, Vuletich and Lundberg 2017, Brusa, Bordone and Proverbio 2021, Lausi 2024).

That is, while our ontologies for schema generally include the requirement that they are socioculturally shared within social groups or settings and rely on ethnographic methods (Boutyline and Soter 2021), implicit social cognition operates at the individual-level and relies on quantitative methodologies (Greenwald and Lai 2020).

Implicit bias “Priming procedures present a stimulus in the form of a word or an image (the prime) alongside or prior to another stimulus (the target)… Latency measures capture the differential influence of two categories of primes (e.g., Black versus White faces) on latency and/or accuracy of response to the two target categories.”

“Subjects are expected to respond faster and/or more accurately when the target and attribute categories assigned to the same key are more strongly associated.”

From a schema-based perspective, this latency could be said to reflect the cognitive work required to override or reconfigure an entrenched schema, or the degree of congruence or conflict between schemas and task demands.[[3]](#footnote-4)

Moreover, implicit bias has been shown to vary widely within individuals over weeks (Payne et al. 2005, Nosek, Greenwald and Banaji 2007, Devine et al. 2012, Cooley and Payne 2017, Gawronski et al. 2017), while averages for localities are quite constant longitudinally (Devine 2001, Cooley and Payne 2017, Payne et al. 2017, Vuletich and Payne 2019).

In parallel, the ways in which researchers describe or theorize the ‘underlying mechanics’ responsible for the functioning of these constructs are increasingly overlapping (Payne, Vuletich and Brown-Iannuzzi 2019, Payne and Hannay 2021).

So, while schemas are said to be, “… socially shared *representations* deployable in *automatic cognition*” (italics revised; Boutyline and Soter 2021: 729) that, “…associate related concepts in our minds… [and] influence *cognition* primarily through *nonconscious* channels…” (Frye 2017: 947)

So, while schemas are said to, “… fill in unobserved or forgotten details with cultural assumptions… and link situations to taken-for-granted normative prescriptions… [and] can be invoked *automatically*… and *implicitly*…” (italics revised; Boutyline and Soter 2021: 729),

Implicit social cognition,

#### [Quantitative]

Although large scale studies and the identification of the ‘causal’ relationship between schema and various outcomes has been inhibited by the use of ethnographic methods, there are a range of studies with strong support for causality and some at scale that rely on various measures of implicit bias (Payne et al. 2005, Nosek et al. 2007, Greenwald, Banaji and Nosek 2015).

Until recently, our investigations into the role of various firm-level factors into ethnoracial differences in the United States labor market have been restricted by data availability (Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019).

While qualitative and/or ethnographic studies have made progress in describing and naming different modalities of ethnoracial schema in various kinds of organizations, quantitative approaches are increasingly factoring in ‘firm-level variation’ in their statistical models (Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt).

“…reveals significant heterogeneity in discriminatory patterns across companies, with racial and gender biases concentrated in a subset of firms and industries. The findings suggest that a considerable portion of overall discrimination can be attributed to a relatively small number of employers, highlighting the potential for targeted interventions by regulatory agencies” (Kline et al. 2022).

For example, “… workers’ careers and well-being are also shaped by elements of their work environment, including firm culture, managerial style, and work-life balance. I theorize two processes that could lead to racial inequality in firms’ work environments: (1) employee sorting due to exclusionary practices, and (2) spillover from racial differences in occupation and geographic location… I find that Black employees’ disadvantage is strongest in areas with more conservative racial attitudes and more prevalent workplace racial discrimination” (Zhang 2023).
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#### [Qualitative]

“… implicit attitudes are *automatic* or *unconscious* attitudes, [but their] interpretation [is] complicated by the lack of general agreement about the meanings of automatic and unconscious (Payne and Gawronski 2010).

Most of use **qualitative** approaches (Collins 1997, Moss and Tilly 2001, Powell and Butterfield 2002, Moore 2007, Embrick 2011, Wingfield and Alston 2014, Evans and Moore 2015, Wooten 2015, Reyes 2017, Wooten and Couloute 2017, Wingfield 2019, Embrick and Moore 2020, Moore 2020, Wingfield and Chavez 2020).

Although she often uses the concept of ideology in related ways, Wendy Moore identified Law Schools as ‘White spaces,’ specifically identifying the important role of embedded schema in orientations to teaching, “[T]he deep normative structures that organize the teaching method dominant in legal education are tinged with biases and assumptions that reproduce a white racist frame while purporting to be impartial and objective”

“… demonstrates the utility of [racialized organizations] in an empirical case study of disparities in earnings, job quality, and advancement among clergy in the United Methodist Church… the preferences articulated by Black clergy, the formal organizational policies that ban race as a consideration in appointment making were decoupled from managerial practices; thus, clergy and congregations were matched on race” (Eagle and Mueller 2022).

It then re-emerged during the last quarter of the twentieth century (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2010, Davis 2017, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019, Amis, Mair and Munir 2020) and now again in the last decade or two (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2010, Davis 2017, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019, Amis et al. 2020).

Some use **statistical** approaches (Sewell 2016, Sewell and Jefferson 2016, Ferguson and Koning 2018, Alston et al. 2022, Kline et al. 2022, Wilmers, Tong and Zhang 2025).

Racial tasks, “the ideological, interactional, and physical labor racial minorities perform in mostly White work settings, and the ways these racial tasks vary at different levels of the organizational structure” (Wingfield and Alston 2014: 274).

##### White credentials

“… organizations are racial structures—cognitive schemas connecting organizational rules to social and material resources” (Ray 2019:30).

Building on Cheryl Harris (1993) and her offering of ‘Whiteness as property,” Ray posits that, “Whiteness is a credential providing access to organizational resources, legitimizing work hierarchies, and expanding White agency” (Ray 2019: 41).

That is, “[t]his credential helps organizations appear racially neutral in principle, while in practice institutionalizing the property interest in Whiteness (Ray 2019: 41).”

The credential of Whiteness expands agency.

…, “internal hierarchies and occupational segregation contribute to the mundane reproduction of racial stratification” (Ray 2019).

#### [Limitations]

##### Theory-Method Mismatch

“A comprehensive theory of race and racism should bring race and racism together into the same analytical framework because we cannot separate the construction of race from the reproduction of racism. This framework further needs to articulate the connections between racist ideologies and racist structures” (Golash-Boza 2016: 131).

Despite the quite macro-level foundations of Sociology, many of our studies of race and/or ethnicity operate with concepts, theories and/or methodologies that might be best suited for the individual-level or unit of analysis.

Other studies offer concepts and theories at the meso- (e.g., organizations, networks and/or political geographies) and/or macro- (e.g., countries and/or global regions) levels of analysis but use methodologies that are most defendable for studies working at the individual-level of analysis.

Arguably, we are beginning to witness greater sensitivity to these ‘mismatches’ and therefore more intentionality and rigor on these important matters in our investigations.

“[w]ithout a theory linking large-scale change to local structures and local structures to individuals, we cannot synthesize such findings” (Abbott 1993: 199).

Regrettably, when taken separately, social surveys, audit studies and workplace ethnographies are each ill equipped to fully account for racial disparities in earnings.

Today, gaps and mismatches persist between micro-level models of prejudice and discrimination and macro-level theories of racial formation.

“Institutional,” and/or “organizational” racism

Therefore, until recently, researchers interested in ethnoracial phenomena and social processes have focused on the “… large-scale and small-scale ways…” or “macro- and micro-socially”(Omi and Winant 1986 [2015]) (Omi and Winant 1986 [2015]: 111),

individual-level models of ‘attitudes and prejudice’ (Sears and Henry 2003) or macro-level models, which theorize ‘social systems or structures’ (Bonilla-Silva 1997, Feagin 2001 [2010]).

with “institutions that reproduce racial inequality… laws, policies, and practices” (Golash-Boza 2016: 131) and/or ideology an1d discourse (Bonilla-Silva 1997).

… links between structural- and individual-level ethnoracial ideologies (Collins 1997, Moore 2007, Embrick 2011, Wooten 2015, Sewell 2016, Sewell and Jefferson 2016, Reyes 2017, Ferguson and Koning 2018, Ray 2019, Wingfield and Chavez 2020),

remain largely ill-equipped to describe how the social and political dimensions of the ‘firm-context’ fit along the causal pathway from ethnoracial ‘group status’ to wage differences between Blacks and Whites (Baron and Bielby 1980, Tilly 1998, Reskin 2012, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019).

Overall, despite re-emergent theories that posit context as an important factor in ethnoracial inequalities, our current understanding of the degree to which organizations might foster and/or manage these inequalities has been restricted by the availability of requisite firm-level data (Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019).

That is, while several studies have argued that firms manage and reproduce inequality (Baron and Bielby 1980, Tilly 1998), almost all studies of racialized inequality in organizations rely on single- or comparative-case studies (Ray 2019, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019).

These studies have yielded important insights into what certain drivers of inequality look like “on the ground” (James 2000, Wingfield and Chavez 2020), but they leave us unable to tell if these mechanisms are unique to specific cases.

Moreover, while theories of organizational inequality argue that the observation of between-firm variation in inequalities can teach us much about the degree to which firms contribute to societal-level inequality (Card et al. 2018, Ray 2019, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019), single-firm case studies cannot assess between-firm variation.

So, while single-firm studies provide rich insight on the mechanisms responsible for inequality within a given firm (Wingfield and Alston 2014, Wingfield and Chavez 2020, Eagle and Mueller 2022), they cannot speak to whether these mechanisms and/or inequalities are present in other firms.

While most of what we have learned thus far is restricted to single-case studies, several recent studies include enough firms to include a firm analysis that allows for the identification of firm-level effects.

Much of the traditional work at the firm-level is overweighted on the view of the firm and have concerned themselves less with ideology at the macro-level.

One source of change or revision occurs within a given locality, while leaving larger sociocultural schema intact as they,

… from culturally shared to locally deployed…

“These schemas have proven to be highly adaptable and have manifested in multifarious ways… the schemas themselves are historically specific, variant, and sundry” (Jung 2015: 37).

When various gatherings of people or ‘crowds’ select and deploy selections from the ideologies into localized scripts…

“Schemas of racism also exist at shallower depths, as the core schemas are transposed to and articulate with more ‘surface’ structures of inequality and domination” (Jung 2015: 49).

Schemas effectively, “…modify the impressions produced by incoming sensory impulses in such a way that the final sensations of position or of *locality* rise into consciousness charged with a relation to something that has gone before” Bartlett 1933 [1995]: 200].

… local ethnoracial schema – or the *localized* selection, revision and deployment of the ‘larger,’ more widespread, culturally shared ideological storylines that frame, esteem, describe, and prescribe ‘iconic priors’ concerning the proclivities, capacities, and roles of people with different racial (or ethnoracial) classifications e.g., organizations, geographies, and/or networks might then circumscribe and/or privilege workers (i.e., prescribe the agency in Ray 2019).

“… firm-level data showing [B]lacks… do badly… [w]ithout a theory linking large-scale change to local structures and local structures to individuals, we cannot synthesize such findings” (Abbott 1993): 199.

Tilly, Charles. 1998. Durable Inequality. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

##### Credentials and Contracts

The original conception of Whiteness as a credential is disconnected to the idea of racialized schema – instead describing the privileges of Whiteness, without including the ways schema inform workers how to think about the perception and meaning of Whiteness.

Credentialing implicates but does not theories that embedded ethnoracial aspects of the in credentialing.

The ‘credentialling properties’ of Whiteness is not self-evident. Instead, the perception of the relative Whiteness of the worker

Moreover, the framing of credentialing processes and certifications as “… [offering] allegedly objective, organizationally generated statuses showing suitability for employment and legitimating modern stratification systems… [that] help organizations appear racially neutral,” goes without describing hiring and credentialing as being simultaneously shape by ethnoracial ideologies and schema.

Mills, Charles W. 1997 [2022]. The Racial Contract. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

##### Ideologies and Schema

As written, the links between the ‘credential of Whiteness,’ racial schema, and racial ideology or discourse is more implied than tied.

It would not be until later that Sociologists would more formally theorize the role of ‘local schema’ as specific sets of ‘unwritten’ *social-cognitive schema* (DiMaggio 1997) or *status* *beliefs* (Ridgeway et al. 1998) and the “schematization” (Goffman 1974) of the relative merit and esteem of social groups (*see* Boutyline 2024).

… relationship between ideology and schema, generally and with application to the ethnoracial.

Short of expressly conceptualizing White credentialling as a modality of local ethnoracial schema, Ray usefully elaborates recursive feedback loops between “racial ideology” and “racialized schema,” but forgoes specification of the precise nature of racial ideology.

That is, while there are several different conceptions of racialized ideologies, we might best secure White credentialing as a local schematization of a White Supremacist racial ideology.

… relationship between ideology and schema, generally and with application to the ethnoracial.

…the macro, social structural or societal perspective…

…racial ideology (or perhaps ideologies: e.g., Dawson 1994), might be composed of, “[s]tory lines [that] are … ‘*socially shared* tales’ that serve as the vehicles for the frames and allow users to draw on cultural tropes to make sense of racial matters in ways that reinforce systemic inequality” (italics added: Bonilla-Silva 2003:63).

“Story lines are the socially shared tales that are fable-like and incorporate a common scheme and wording” (Bonilla-Silva 2003:63).

“Color-blind racism provides the scripts (ways of navigating conversational and rhetorical dilemmas) that allow whites to articulate racially based stories without sounding ‘racist’” (Bonilla-Silva 2003:74).

Thus, storylines are ideological narratives—widely recognizable, stylized explanations—used to make sense of racial matters in a way that is discursively accessible and systemically conservative.

While scripts and storylines might function in a ‘color-blind’ way, the larger point is that, they are draw from a more widely shared or extra-organizational ideology, which might then offer an wider range of scripts [I think this is from Eduardo].

… from culturally shared to locally deployed…

“These schemas have proven to be highly adaptable and have manifested in multifarious ways… the schemas themselves are historically specific, variant, and sundry” (Jung 2015: 37).

When various gatherings of people or ‘crowds’ select and deploy selections from the ideologies into localized scripts…

“Schemas of racism also exist at shallower depths, as the core schemas are transposed to and articulate with more ‘surface’ structures of inequality and domination” (Jung 2015: 49).

Schemas effectively, “…modify the impressions produced by incoming sensory impulses in such a way that the final sensations of position or of *locality* rise into consciousness charged with a relation to something that has gone before” Bartlett 1933 [1995]: 200].

… local ethnoracial schema – or the *localized* selection, revision and deployment of the ‘larger,’ more widespread, culturally shared ideological storylines that frame, esteem, describe, and prescribe ‘iconic priors’ concerning the proclivities, capacities, and roles of people with different racial (or ethnoracial) classifications e.g., organizations, geographies, and/or networks might then circumscribe and/or privilege workers (i.e., prescribe the agency in Ray 2019).

In the case of ‘the’ White credential, this revised description of the relationship between ideology and schema effectively situates the ideological components of White supremacy in the state of superposition, recursively generating localized schema as it regenerates and revises its ‘storylines’ through ‘its schematizations.’

…the macro, social structural or societal perspective…

…racial ideology (or perhaps ideologies: e.g., Dawson 1994), might be composed of, “[s]tory lines [that] are … ‘*socially shared* tales’ that serve as the vehicles for the frames and allow users to draw on cultural tropes to make sense of racial matters in ways that reinforce systemic inequality” (italics added: Bonilla-Silva 2003:63).

“Story lines are the socially shared tales that are fable-like and incorporate a common scheme and wording” (Bonilla-Silva 2003:63).

“Color-blind racism provides the scripts (ways of navigating conversational and rhetorical dilemmas) that allow whites to articulate racially based stories without sounding ‘racist’” (Bonilla-Silva 2003:74).

Thus, storylines are ideological narratives—widely recognizable, stylized explanations—used to make sense of racial matters in a way that is discursively accessible and systemically conservative.

While scripts and storylines might function in a ‘color-blind’ way, the larger point is that, they are draw from a more widely shared or extra-organizational ideology, which might then offer an wider range of scripts [I think this is from Eduardo].

Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance." in Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism. Paris: UNESCO.
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#### [Intervention]

##### Theory

We then root our articulation of ethnoracial schema more deeply studies of organizational behavior with some attention to the practice of drawing a ‘racialized schema’ (e.g., White credentials) from an ethnoracial ontology (e.g., whether White, Black or other).

We situate White supremacy in ‘superposition,’ as the specific ‘intercept,’ or the evolving ‘template of icons and storylines that recursively underlay derivations in the schematization and credentialization of Whiteness across organizations.

further specifying White Supremacy as its ‘intercept’ (maybe with the idea of that ethnoracial schema that operated between the men of the social contract, are working within a common set of ethnoracial schema.

We reframe credentialling as a social contract that exponentiates its influences by fostering trusting procedures (more than aptitude) and then resecure its roots in the Racial Contract.

Draw on Mills to describe the nature of the racialized and unwritten contracts

That is, we use the ‘Racial Contract’ as an epistemology for describing the unwritten rules of Whiteness and the written rules and behaviors of ‘racial contracts’ (e.g., the ‘unwritten’ rules that Idea B. Wells identified in ‘practices’ of lynching).

Schemas are therefore localized derivations of ideologies and/or discourses that continue operating at the inception-, structural- or societal-level or scale of influence.

One could say the ‘entry’ or ‘intercept’ of ethnorace is refracted through organizations in ways that make the working of its logics and practices observable.

That is, while ethnoracial dynamics ‘enter’ societies at the macro-level (Jordan 1968, Hall 1980, Omi and Winant 1986 [2015], Bonilla-Silva 1997, Mills 1997 [2022], Feagin 2001 [2010], Jung 2015, Ifatunji 2024), organizations operate as, which manage the often contested

curate and refine **schema** from the “unwritten laws” (Wells-Barnett 1892 [2014]: 65) or “storylines” (Bonilla-Silva 2003 [2018]: 100) of “racial projects” (Omi and Winant 1986 [2015]: 109), thereby linking “organizational rules to social and material **resources**” after the callback (Ray 2019: 26).

how demographics in the Upper Echelons of organizational leadership contribute to organizational behavior further securing the concept of White organizations – as one potential form of racial or ethnoracial organization.

We more deeply root theories of ethnoracial organizations in those of White Supremacy, the Racial Contract, organizational behavior and its roles in schematization.

Wells-Barnett, Ida Bell. 1892 [2014]. *Southern Horrors: Lynch Law in All Its Phases*. New York, New York: Black Women Writers: New York Age Print.

##### Methods

While our ability to theorize how and why organizations ‘behave,’ has made great advancements, our ability to understand the role of firms in society has been limited by the problem of data scale.

Statistical progress with administrative linking and modeling (Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019)

While these represent theory-building contributions that rely on previous ethnographic work,

The empirical contribution offers methods that specify models and estimates for us to infer the contributions of our theoretical framework to the case of was differences between ethnoracial groups in the United States.

While single-firm, comparative case, and cross-sectional survey investigations have been unable to fully consider the role of firm-level characteristics (Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019), our research design allows us to identify the effects of between-firm variation in the ‘Whiteness of firms’ on differences in the relative earnings growth of Blacks and Whites working within the same firm.

That is, in contrast to the survey-based methods and models that are often deployed at the individual-level, we use a version of the Longitudinal Employer Household Data (LEHD), which is a large administrative data set that links firms to their workers, covering 97 percent of all privately-employed workers across 30 states between 1992-2008 (Abowd et al. 2009, McKinney and Vilhuber 2011, Vilhuber and McKinney 2014).

The advantage of the LEHD is that it provides earnings records on all workers in the included firms, which allows us to measure and assess relationships between firm-level structures, employee demographics and changes in the different rates of wage growth for Black and White workers, within-firms, over time.

We assess the ‘Whiteness of firms,’ with the proportion of White workers among the top five percent of earners in each firm.

We operationalize firm-level ethnoracial formation by observing the proportion of Whites in the top five percent of earners within each firm.

We use this measure of the ethnoracial structure of the firm and argue that it reflects or captures the implications of the collective effect of within-firm ethnoracial schema and processes that legitimate and sustain firm-level inequality (Hoffman 1978, Maume 2011) vis-vis ‘Whiteness as a credential’ (Ray 2019).

… we use initial earnings quintiles to approximate ‘occupational strata’ within firms

… and observe changes in wage growth between Black and White workers within these strata…

…as a function of the percentage of top earners within a firm that are White (or, “Percent Top White Earners,” or %W).

… we argue that this measure provides our best current estimates of the association between firm-level demography and Black-White disparities in wage growth.

Since ‘stratifying’ our models by ‘gender’ did not modify this trend,

And given the pre-existing weight of evidence available from ethnographies,

We argue that our findings are best anticipated by theories of racialized organizations, whereby ethnoracial schema are embedded with ‘credentials for Whiteness,’ which are then revised, redeployed and differentially remunerated ‘along Black-White’ ethnoracial lines.’

We believe these findings should encourage further research and more detailed examinations into the precise nature and contribution of these, and other mechanisms, operating at the firm-level of analysis, in now longstanding ethnoracial disparities in American labor markets.

and then, this pattern builds on existing research arguing that the demographic composition of employees in the “upper echelons” of a firm reflects core aspects of firm-level schema (Cyert and March 1963, Hambrick and Mason 1984: 193) and we use the to which we believe are best described
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## ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

### [Individual-Level Models]

“Unexplained” is a term that gestures toward statistical humility, but behind that humility sits a stubborn silence about what happens inside firms.

After shrinking, growing again… unexplained portion getting bigger.

With some noise, these regularities have been

Largely responding to the divergence between average levels of White racial prejudice and support for race-target laws and public policies, we learned that ‘prejudice’ was more deeply rooted in status and power than ‘affect and emotions.’

One focused on “affect and emotions” (Sears and Henry 2005) the other on “institutions that reproduce racial inequality… laws, policies, and practices” (Golash-Boza 2016:131).

outcomes derived from racialized social systems, which posits racism as a “fundamental cause” as opposed to randomly distributed “rational” “bigots”

(Ray 2019: 26)

For decades, those working within the ‘race as group position’ perspective offered distributional and correlational estimates of prejudice and discrimination with methods for studying differences between otherwise unrelated individuals.

Our perspective for studying perceived discrimination occurred within the context of this larger perspective but was concerned with ongoing differences in population health outcomes (Williams, Yu and Jackson 1997).

“The earnings of white males appear to rise at a more rapid rate with each additional year of work experience (or with age) than do the earnings of black workers… the labor market itself may be a vehicle for generating these earnings differences” (Hoffman 1979:855)

“Either discrimination itself may be constant over the life cycle, but the relative productivities of black and white workers—and hence, their earnings—may diverge over the life cycle or, conversely, relative individual productivities may be constant, but discrimination may increase over the life cycle” (Hoffman 1979:855)

“The labor market is assumed to consist of two distinct markets, a primary sector and a secondary sector… one of the primary manifestations of labor market discrimination is to relegate blacks to secondary labor market jobs in disproportionate numbers relative to their skills” (Hoffman 1979:857)

“Virtually all of these studies find clear evidence of increasing black-white earnings differences with respect to age or years of labor market experience… Hall concluded that ‘the whole notion of a career with steady advancement is relevant only for white males’” (Hoffman 1979:857)

“For whites, the returns to experience change only slightly from the cross-section to the pooled model... The returns to an additional year of experience increased substantially for black workers” (Hoffman 1979:862)

“The black-white earnings gap is almost zero at the time of entry into the labor market and then grows rapidly through the first decade of experience” (Hoffman 1979:863)

“Many of the problems which confront blacks in the labor market may be encountered at the time of entry into the labor market” (Hoffman 1979:866)

“Gaps in labor market outcomes by racial identity are a major feature of post-slavery and post-colonial economies throughout the world” (Bayer, Charles and Derenoncourt 2025: 1).

Typically, statistical analyses examine ethnoracial earnings disparities through regression equations, placing wages or earnings as outcomes explained by variables representing human capital and productivity.

Researchers consistently find, however, that given identical human capital indicators—such as education, experience, and occupational qualifications—African Americans systematically earn less than Whites.

These analyses invariably reveal a persistent gap unexplained by standard productivity-related measures.

Such persistent inequality challenges the assumption that wages purely reflect individual productivity.

“A feature common to most of this work is the use of differences in the mean level of different outcomes to measure racial gaps” (Bayer et al. 2025: 1).

Scholars describe this remaining difference as an "unexplained residual," a term that masks a deeper truth.

That is, “… for a given bundle of human capital indicators, [B]lacks on average earn less than [W]hites. A significant differential always remains that cannot be explained by the included variables-a so-called unexplained residual” (Darity 1989: 335).

These ‘residuals’ from models focused on supply-side factors at the individual unit of analysis have provided a stasis whereby studies offer competing explanations for that which is otherwise ‘unexplained.’

One of the more prominent regularities in the social and economic sciences is the persistent difference in earnings between Blacks and Whites in the United States.

And yet, despite hundreds of investigations — across a range of disciplinary perspectives — there is still little agreement.

“The puzzle of interpreting the residuals in earnings equations strongly suggests that status quo economic research on race and ethnicity is inadequate” (Darity 1989: 336).

Narrowing between A and B, then widening again, between X and Y (Mandel and Semyonov 2016, Carnoy 2020).

Growing unexplained wage difference (Mandel and Semyonov 2016).

Lower role of discrimination for educated compared to non-educated Blacks. But math scores previously, explain some of the differences (Carnoy 2020).
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### [Hard and Soft Skills]

The most common way of thinking about the causes of ethnoracial differences in various labor market outcomes assumes a mechanistically reductionist neo-classical ‘individual-level model’ (Becker 1957 [2010], Arrow 1973).[[4]](#footnote-7)

That is, studies of ‘labor market economics’ assume a multivariate distribution of ‘hard and soft skills’ within a ‘labor pool’ of ‘unrelated individuals’ – i.e., on the ‘characteristics’ of people and/or populations, not the rules and practices of organizations and/or firms).

According to original formulations of this perspective, it is hard (e.g., education, training and experience) and soft skills (e.g., motivation, effort, compliance, occupational choice) alone that determine who gets the job, their occupation or tasks and how much workers earn.

Soft skills and race in hiring (Moss and Tilly 1995, Moss and Tilly 1996).

Educational differences.
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### [Credentialing and Occupations]

While there are substantial levels of occupational segregation within firms

Since differences in hard skills and training do not seem to account for ethnoracial differences in wages and earnings growth, many have investigated another individual-level view: that different groups have different values for different occupations, which provide different earnings.
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### [Prejudice and Discrimination]

The trouble with the classical models is that they assume that firms are ‘kept honest’ by economic imperatives, but others argue that people ‘price’ their group status and position – possibly over and above ‘firm profits’ (Stampp 1957, Blumer 1958).

With respect to ethnoracial differences in wages, many economists continue to argue that discrimination results from either anti-Black animus (a la “taste” discrimination; Becker 1957 [2010], Phelps 1972, or “statistical discrimination” Arrow 1973), whereby individual employers make hiring decisions based on their priors about the different characteristics of ethnoracial groups (Fang and Moro 2011, Bertrand and Duflo 2017, Bohren, Imas and Rosenberg 2019, Lang and Kahn-Lang Spitzer 2020).

Taste-based explanations for discrimination argue that lower wage costs for non-discriminatory firms should drive discriminatory firms out of business or force them to alter their practices (Becker 1957 [2010]), and models of statistical discrimination assume that employers would revise their stereotypical beliefs as they acquire more information (Pager, Western and Bonikowski 2009, Bohren et al. 2019).

However, these perspectives cannot explain the persistence of discrimination because they maintain that the primary aim of firms is to maximize profits, not replicate the ethnoracial order.

That is, they fail to account for the peculiar history of efficiency and profitability suffering as to allow Whites to maintain a ‘sense of group position’(Stampp 1957, Blumer 1958) [add the ‘prison industrial complex’].

More discrimination for soft skilled work (Hurst, Rubinstein and Shimizu 2024).

But studies show lower rates of racial prejudice and perceived discrimination.

“The puzzle of interpreting the residuals in earnings equations strongly suggests that status quo economic research on race and ethnicity is inadequate” (Darity 1989: 336).

“… there is a staggering gap between the list of productivity characteristics available to economic analysts in standard data sources and what is available to personnel departments of firms. Regressions based on the Census and/or CPS data can typically explain 20 to 30 percent of the variation in wages” (Heckman 1998: 103).

However, regressions based on personnel data can explain a substantially higher share of the variation in wages; 60-80 percent in professional labor markets (for example, see Abowd and Killingsworth, 1983)

“Turnover associated with perceived bias and discrimination can be extremely costly for organizations” (Gelfand et al. 2005: 24).
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### [Audit Studies]

Lincoln Quillian, John J. Lee, and Mariana Oliver’s meta-analysis of field experiments provides robust empirical evidence that racial discrimination in hiring is not confined to initial screening but is pervasive throughout the hiring process—including after minority candidates receive a callback for interview. Their findings show that majority applicants not only receive more callbacks but are also far more likely to receive job offers than equally qualified minority applicants, with additional discrimination accumulating at later stages. This evidence supports Ray’s theory that organizations systematically privilege Whiteness as an invisible credential, and reinforces Hambrick and Mason’s argument that the values and biases of organizational decision-makers shape key outcomes at each stage (Quillian et al. 2020:732–759) .

“Our sample includes 12 studies encompassing more than 13,000 job applications. We find considerable additional discrimination in hiring after the callback: majority applicants in our sample receive 53% more callbacks than comparable minority applicants, but majority applicants receive 145% more job offers than comparable minority applicants. The additional discrimination from interview to job offer is weakly correlated (r = 0.21) with the level of discrimination earlier in the hiring process” (Quillian et al. 2020:732) .

“Most field experiments of hiring, however, only observe whether the applicant receives an invitation to interview, called the ‘callback.’ How adequate is our understanding of discrimination in the hiring process based on an assessment of discrimination in callbacks, when the ultimate subject of interest is discrimination in job offers? … We find considerable additional discrimination in hiring after the callback… studies that only use callbacks seriously underestimate the complete extent of discrimination in the hiring process” (Quillian et al. 2020:732–734) .

“Discrimination may be present in the second stage for several reasons: employers may miss clues indicating an applicant’s race in the resume; employers may respond differently to race in the face-to-face context of the interview than in the abstracted context of reading a resume; the decision maker from interview to job offer may be different than the person selecting candidates to interview; or employers may select employees in the interview stage in part based on ‘cultural fit’ in ways that produce discrimination” (Quillian et al. 2020:733) .

“Although specifics vary, a job search often proceeds through two stages. In the first stage, applicants submit an application or resume; if successful, they receive a callback for an interview. In the second stage, applicants who received a callback are interviewed and, if successful, receive a job offer. Discrimination may be present in the second stage for several reasons… employers may respond differently to race in the face-to-face context of the interview than in the abstracted context of reading a resume… or employers may select employees in the interview stage in part based on ‘cultural fit’ in ways that produce discrimination” (Quillian et al. 2020:733–735) .

“Statistical discrimination theory posits that employers rely on the ‘average’ profiles of groups to compensate for any lack of individual applicant information. The interview provides additional individual information about an applicant’s speech, dress, appearance and also an opportunity for the employer to ask about the applicant’s background, such as past work history. If statistical discrimination on these attributes is the primary basis for employer discrimination, then this additional information should result in employers relying less on group averages when making hiring decisions, resulting in less discrimination from interview to job offer… Other theories, however, suggest just the opposite pattern: discrimination at the job offer stage might actually be quite significant. First, there may be substantial discrimination from interview to job offer because race is more obvious in the interview situation… Nonwhite applicants who tend to have different cultural attributes (e.g., types of dress or presentation styles) but are otherwise equally qualified for the job may thus face additional disadvantages during the interview” (Quillian et al. 2020:735–737) .

“Majority applicants receive 53% more callbacks than equally qualified minority applicants on average (discrimination ratio of 1.534… What happens after the callback? The discrimination ratio for job offers conditional on receiving a callback… is 1.534… Looking at the overall level of discrimination in job offers, majority applicants receive about 145% more job offers than comparable minority applicants (discrimination ratio of 2.450…)” (Quillian et al. 2020:746–747) .

“Thirteen of the fifteen estimates, the job offer discrimination ratio is higher than the callback discrimination ratio. Eight of these fifteen differences are statistically significant at p < .05… There is thus a fairly consistent pattern across studies of greater discrimination in job offers than in callbacks” (Quillian et al. 2020:743–744) .

“Our meta-analysis of studies that go to the job offer indicates that racial discrimination in hiring is substantially more severe than an analysis of solely callback outcomes would suggest. Majority applicants in our sample receive 53% more callbacks than comparable minority applicants, but they receive 145% more job offers than comparable minority applicants. The higher level of discrimination in job offers is a fairly consistent result: in thirteen of our fifteen estimates of discrimination against minority groups there is more discrimination in job offers than in callbacks. The job offer outcome represents the accumulation of discrimination from application to callback and from interview to job offer, and there is substantial, additional discrimination at the second stage” (Quillian et al. 2020:752) .

“Our results also have implications regarding the nature of racial discrimination in hiring. Discrimination by employers does not appear to function in a categorical way, in which employers who know the race or ethnicity of an applicant pre-callback automatically rule out minority applicants in favor of equally qualified majority applicants. Instead, racial discrimination in hiring has a probabilistic character across stages of hiring, in which minority applicants are less likely to advance at each stage” (Quillian et al. 2020:753) .

“Our results also provide evidence against the view that most racial discrimination in hiring reflects statistical discrimination, at least on the characteristics employers can assess during an interview. If the main reason employers discriminate is statistical, employers should be less likely to rely on group stereotypes in drawing conclusions about applicants as their information about an individual applicant increases. In interviews, employers receive additional information regarding (at least) the dress, appearance and demeanor of applicants. Yet we find as much discrimination or more from interview to job offer as from application to callback, suggesting that the extra interview information is not significantly counter-acting employer biases” (Quillian et al. 2020:754) .

While studies that focus on sorting and segmentation describe prvlanaces and differences, they still offer a mostly supply-side rationale for wage differences between groups.

Audit studies simultaneously provide evidence of discirminaiton, with **application** to what others have called sorting and segmentation.

However, many have come to view individual-level models as reductionist, arguing that it potentially overlooks how various aspects of the social and political context of firms and their operations might either mute or enhance the role of worker characteristics in employment, job/task assignment and upward mobility in firms (Mayo 1933 [2005], Burns and Stalker 1961, Vroom 1964, Argyris 1978, Perrow 2014) [McGregor 1960, Perrow 1986].

Even when audit studies anticipate and document ethnoracial forms of discrimination during the hiring process, they most often leave unobserved the background demographics of hiring managers and the ongoing social and political context of firms (Neumark 1988, Neumark 2012).

“…hiring discrimination should be considered a general **organizational process**” (Moss and Tilly 2001).

Studies that speculate on the internal policies and practices of firm-level factors from audit studies (Quillian, Lee and Oliver 2020).

Closing section with quote from ‘bringing the firm back in’ (Baron and Bielby 1980).
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### [Sorting and Segmentation]

There is more job level segregation **between** firms (Tomaskovic-Devey 1993, Kaufman 2001, Sørensen 2004, del Río and Alonso-Villar 2015, Ferguson and Koning 2018, Gerard et al. 2021).

“I find that black mobility does not reflect a decrease in racial discrimination. On the contrary, black progress in the 1960s and 1970s marks the onset of a new system of segregation. Racial discrimination has softened within income and occupational distributions and recongealed in the structure of job opportunities. I argue, therefore, that the black middle class occupies a fragile market position.” (Collins 1983:369)

“The structure of opportunity within which the black middle class has grown is still characterized by inequality. The black middle class emerged from special political and legal protections, and it occupies a useful but powerless market position in U.S. society.” (Collins 1983:369).

“Enhanced job opportunity for middle-class blacks is the product of legislation and government subsidized organizations created in response to black demands for increased resources. Growth since 1960 within the black middle class is the result of race-oriented policies which have created new mechanisms to address black needs. Seen from this perspective, I believe that researchers have presumed, rather than demonstrated, the market integration of the black middle class.” (Collins 1983:370)

“General economic factors aside, I argue that black attainments were stimulated and enforced through direct intervention by the federal government, which responded to black demands for economic parity by establishing a need for blacks among employers. This, in turn, increased labor market demand. Government-supported jobs for blacks created opportunities for new class position. Thus, the black middle class grew out of a policy-mediated situation—not a market-mediated situation.” (Collins 1983:371)

“My findings contradict arguments that the growth of a black middle class is evidence of a decline in racial inequality in the United States. Rather, the evidence suggests the existence of race-regulated systems. Although members of the black middle class are not necessarily restricted by occupation, income, or residence, they remain segregated in institutions dependent on federal government subsidy and concentrated in functions created to serve the black consumer and community.” (Collins 1983:379)

“Race is implied within the black economy independent of class position. Public sector employees are most likely to be found in federal, state, and local government functions that legitimize and subsidize black underclass dependency. Blacks employed in the private sector remain concentrated in economically underdeveloped areas, or in intermediary positions between white corporations and black consumer, manpower, or policy issues.” (Collins 1983:379)

“When it comes career progression, however, racial dynamics become too complex to be conceptualized by any single theory… As the effect of visible human capital fades off after labor-market entry, invisible human capital begins to materialize. These include so-called ‘soft skills’ such as communicative ability, confidence, and the ability to make professional connections. Because of deeply institutionalized racial obstacles, not only disadvantaged but relatively well-off African Americans are highly deprived of the avenues of acquiring such skills/resources, which are particularly important for their career advancement in a predominantly white professional environment… although highly educated black workers enjoy relative protection by their visible productivity signals, in the long run, the deprivation of invisible human capital might incur and exacerbate earnings disparities with their privileged white competitors” (Ren 2021:1454) .

“Despite recent progresses toward equal treatment of workers, a color-blind work environment is far from a reality. Black workers’ initial earnings disadvantages can accumulate and grow, as fueled by various racial biases in terms of training, task assignments, and performance evaluation. Particularly noteworthy is the subtle impediments (net of human capital traits) to African Americans’ prospect for authority attainment in high-status professions such as lawyers and college football coaches—the concept of ‘particularistic manipulation’ is used to describe these vague and hard-to-measure criteria for senior-level promotions that tend to disfavor minority candidates” (Ren 2021:1454–1455) .

“Findings of the growth-curve model… The race coefficient of −0.197… indicates that the residual gap in baseline earnings is at the lowest level among college-educated workers… the reduced gap is the result of a narrowing trend of 0.139 log units per unit ascending on the education ladder. In the lower portion of Model 3, the coefficient on race-year interaction now stands for the black-white difference in earnings growth among the highest educated group, and its significantly negative value (−0.014) suggests that the explained black-white earnings divergence reappears among college graduates… the reduced gap is the result of a narrowing trend moving up the education ladder. These findings are consistent with my hypothesis that although the visibility of educational attainment helps protect highly educated black workers from hiring discrimination, over time, as a series of labor-market mechanisms materialize, black college graduates face increasingly intensified challenges” (Ren 2021:1465) .

“The left chart [Figure 2, p. 1468] is essentially a visualization of Model 3, as the gap among college graduates starts relatively narrow, but it widens over time and quickly surpasses that among less-educated workers… In the meantime, the widening gap in annual earnings translates into an exponential curve of accumulated differentials facing black college graduates. By the end of the 12-year window, the two accumulated earnings gaps reach around $150,000 and $200,000, respectively. When measured cumulatively, apparently, black men’s earnings disadvantages become more pronounced. College-educated black workers face challenges that not only accumulate but exacerbate over time” (Ren 2021:1468) .

“Overall, the importance of early dynamics in shaping long-term patterns of earnings inequality helps locate the temporal segment that is key to addressing the issue. This naturally points at pre-market racial barriers to the acquisition of productive assets, highlighting the link between labor-market outcomes and various institutional failures that disrupt and undermine young African Americans’ educational experiences, such as residential segregation… and the school-to-prison pipeline… Furthermore, it is not just education per se but racialized market mechanisms (e.g., signaling) whereby productivity information is processed, that place black men onto disadvantaged positions for career progression” (Ren 2021:1471, 1472) .

“First, although organizational scholars have done an excellent job exploring racialized workplace dynamics that restrict minority workers’ chance of upward mobility… increasing efforts are needed to reveal how workplace discrimination is connected to the assessment of hard-to-observe productive traits. For example, if the deprivation of networking resources turns out to be a major problem, attention needs to be paid to the institutional processes wherein racial gaps in such resources are fostered. As such, I am in the hope that the source of black-white earnings divergence among highly educated professionals, alongside that of differential access to authority attainment, both of which remain largely intangible… can be located onto more specific and more concrete institutional processes” (Ren 2021:1472) .

“Segmentation operates at various levels, from individual job classifications to broader industrial sectors, each level embedding specific patterns of inequality” (Jacobs and Breiger 2017).

“…non-White organizations are typically disadvantaged relative to White organizations…” (Ray 2019).

François Gerard, Lorenzo Lagos, Edson Severnini, and David Card’s article provides large-scale, quantitative evidence that organizational sorting and pay-setting practices play a major role in producing and sustaining racial wage gaps. Analyzing the Brazilian labor market, they show that non-White workers are systematically underrepresented at high-paying firms and receive lower wage premiums even when matched on skill. Their decomposition demonstrates that skill-based sorting, exclusionary hiring, and firm-level wage policies all contribute to cumulative disadvantage—directly linking Ray’s theory of Whiteness as an organizational credential and Hambrick and Mason’s argument about the demographic reproduction of advantage at the top (Gerard et al. 2021:3418–3457) .

“We measure the effects of firm policies on racial pay differences in Brazil. Non-Whites are less likely to be hired by high-wage firms, explaining about 20 percent of the racial wage gap for both genders. Firm-specific pay premiums for non-Whites are also compressed relative to Whites, contributing another 5 percent for that gap. A counterfactual analysis reveals that about two-thirds of the underrepresentation of non-Whites at higher-wage firms is explained by race-neutral skill-based sorting. Non-skill-based sorting and differential wage setting are largest for college-educated workers, suggesting that the allocative costs of discriminatory hiring and pay policies may be relatively large in Brazil” (Gerard et al. 2021:3418) .

“Findings from four complementary strands of literature suggest that both mechanisms may be important. Randomized audit studies in several countries show that employer callback rates are lower for minority job applicants, implying that some firms set a higher bar for non-White candidates, or avoid hiring minorities altogether. Observational studies show that White managers are less likely to hire and retain minority applicants … and that workplaces are substantially segregated by race and ethnicity… Finally, studies of occupational stratification… suggest that employers assign non-White workers to lower-paid occupations, accounting for some of the racial pay gap within firms” (Gerard et al. 2021:3419) .

“Consistent with findings from the United States, Germany, and other countries… we find that firms play a large role in explaining the variation in wages for all race-gender groups. The differences in the wage premiums paid by different establishments, together with a strong pattern of positive assortative matching between workers and establishments within each race-gender group, explains about 30–40 percent of the variation in wages for all groups… Importantly, since non-Whites in Brazil tend to have lower education and lower average earnings irrespective of where they work, such positive assortative matching would lead to a lower share of non-White workers at higher-paying establishments, even in the absence of discriminatory employment policies” (Gerard et al. 2021:3420) .

“This counterfactual suggests that about two-thirds of the overall sorting effect, accounting for 12–13 percent of the White-non-White wage gap, is explained by race-neutral ‘skill-based’ sorting. The remainder, incorporating discriminatory hiring and retention policies, accounts for about 6–7 percent of the overall racial wage gap” (Gerard et al. 2021:3420) .

“We find that the wage premiums for non-Whites are compressed relative to Whites—a pattern that is consistent with monopsonistic wage setting and lower elasticities of firm-specific supply… or with lower bargaining power… for non-Whites. These lower average premiums explain another 4–5 percent of the overall racial wage gap” (Gerard et al. 2021:3421) .

“The wage losses associated with unexplained sorting and differential wage setting are particularly large for college-educated workers, suggesting that the allocative costs of these policies may be important. Moreover, as we show later in the paper, the relative importance of these two components is even larger (for all education groups) controlling for observed occupational differences between Whites and non-Whites” (Gerard et al. 2021:3421) .

“A majority of this gap is attributed to differences in person effects (79 percent for men and 85 percent for women)… while differences in the establishment effects account for 21 percent and 25 percent” (see Table 3, p. 3440) .

“The sorting effect accounts for 2.9 pp among men and 4.8 pp among women, or 18 percent and 20 percent of their White-non-White wage gap, respectively. By comparison, the estimated wage-setting effects are modest in size, on the order of 4 to 5 percent of the overall White-non-White wage gap” (Gerard et al. 2021:3441) .

“For both genders, skill-based sorting accounts for about 65 percent of the overall sorting effect, while residual sorting—which includes any effect of discriminatory employment policies by higher-premium establishments—accounts for about 35 percent of the sorting effect or 6–7 percent of the overall White-non-White wage gap” (Gerard et al. 2021:3443) .

“The role of employment and pay-setting policies is also illustrated in Figure 6. The dashed black lines in the lower panels display the mean White-specific establishment effect at the places of employment of non-White workers. The gaps between the dashed black lines and the solid black lines thus capture the wage-setting effect by education group, while the gaps between the solid gray lines and the dashed black lines capture the sorting effect. The patterns in Figure 6 show that both effects increase in the higher-education categories… the contribution of the differential sorting of Whites and non-Whites across workplaces remains relatively larger for higher-education categories… However… the shares attributed to the wage-setting effect would rise under our alternative normalization assumption, and they would actually exceed the shares attributed to differential sorting for each education category—e.g., they would reach 25 percent and 27 percent for college graduates” (Gerard et al. 2021:3446) .

“These results are corroborated by robustness checks… We conclude that differential pay setting and unexplained sorting contribute importantly to racial pay gaps in Brazil, with particularly large impacts on non-Whites with the highest levels of education. These results corroborate the work of scholars who highlight the ‘elitist’ nature of racial discrimination in the Brazilian labor market” (Gerard et al. 2021:3449) .

“This paper measured the contribution of firms’ employment and wage-setting policies to the White-non-White pay gap in Brazil. It showed that firms exacerbate racial inequalities in general skills in three ways. First, the strong assortative matching between workers and establishments means that non-Whites are less likely to be employed in high-premium workplaces, even in the absence of any discriminatory employment practices… non-White workers also tend to be sorted into lower-premium establishments compared to White workers of similar skill levels, and tend to receive lower pay premiums in the establishments they are sorted into. The associated wage losses are particularly severe for non-Whites at the top of the skill distribution” (Gerard et al. 2021:3453).

… **explicit** discrimination or harassment (Mong and Roscigno 2010, Avery, Volpone and Holmes Iv 2015),

White credentialing might therefore result in firm-level **self-replication** in the hiring process … (Rivera 2012, Rivera 2015, Rivera 2020).

… homosocial **reproduction** (Kanter 1977, Rivera 2012),

However, it remains unclear what determines the sorting of workers between firms.

If X-percent of the difference in wages is accounted for by the fact that Black and White workers tend to work in different industries, occupations and/or firms, then studies should adjust for these trends, using models that allow us to observe between and within firm contributions to wage differences.

Reich, Michael, David M Gordon, and Richard C Edwards. 1973. "A theory of labor market segmentation." *American Economic Review* 63(2):359–65.

Becker, Henry Jay. 1980. "Racial segregation among places of employment." *Social Forces* 58(3):761–76.

Collins, Sharon. 1983. "The Making of the Black Middle-Class." *Social Problems* 30(4):369–82.

Baron, James N., and William T. Bielby. 1984. "The Organization of Work in a Segmented Economy." *American Sociological Review* 49(4):454–73.

Kaufman, Robert L. 1986. "The Impact of Industrial and Occupational Structure on Black-White Employment Allocation." *American Sociological Review* 51(3):310–23.

Hayward, Mark D., and Shelley Coverman. 1987. "Change in the Racial Composition of Occupations, 1960–1970." *Sociological Perspectives* 30(2):115–42.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald. 1993. *Gender & racial inequality at work: The sources and consequences of job segregation*: Cornell University Press.

Holzer, Harry J., and Keith R. Ihlanfeldt. 1996. "Spatial factors and the employment of blacks at the firm level." *New England Economic Review* May/Jun96:65–86.

Kaufman, Robert L. 2001. "Race and Labor Market Segmentation." Pp. 645–68 in *Sourcebook of Labor Markets*. Boston, MA: Springer US.

Ren, Chunhui. 2021. "A Dynamic Framework for Earnings Inequality between Black and White Men." *Social Forces* 100(4):1449–78.

Forman, T. A. 2003. "The social psychological costs of racial segmentation in the workplace: a study of African Americans' well-being." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 44(3):332–52.

Royster, Deirdre A. 2003. *Race and the Invisible Hand: How White Networks Exclude Black Men From Blue-Collar Jobs*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Huffman, Matt L, and Philip N Cohen. 2004. "Racial wage inequality: Job segregation and devaluation across US labor markets'." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(4):902–36.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, Catherine Zimmer, Kevin Stainback, Corre Robinson, Tiffany Taylor, and Tricia McTague. 2006. "Documenting Desegregation: Segregation in American Workplaces by Race, Ethnicity and Sex 1966-2003." *American Sociological Review* 71(4):565–88.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, and Kevin Stainback. 2007. "Discrimination and Desegregation: Equal Opportunity Progress in U.S. Private Sector Workplaces since the Civil Rights Act." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 609(1):49–84.

Giuliano, Laura, David I Levine, and Jonathan Leonard. 2009. "Manager Race and the Race of New Hires." *Journal of Labor Economics* 27(4):589–631.

Pager, Devah, Bruce Western, and Bart Bonikowski. 2009. "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 74(5):777–99.

Kalleberg, Arne L. 2011. *Good jobs, bad jobs : the rise of polarized and precarious employment systems in the United States, 1970s to 2000s*: New York : Russell Sage Foundation, [2011] 2011.

Stainback, Kevin, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2012. *Documenting desegregation: Racial and gender segregation in private sector employment since the Civil Rights Act*. New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Giuliano, Laura, and Michael R. Ransom. 2013. "Manager Ethnicity and Employment Segregation." *Ilr Review* 66(2):346–79.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2013. *Ethnic boundary making: Institutions, power, networks*: Oxford University Press.

del Río, Coral, and Olga Alonso-Villar. 2015. "The Evolution of Occupational Segregation in the United States, 1940-2010: Gains and Losses of Gender-Race/Ethnicity Groups." *Demography* 52(3):967–88.

Dustmann, Christian, Albrecht Glitz, Uta Schönberg, and Herbert Brücker. 2016. "Referral-based Job Search Networks." *The Review of Economic Studies* 83(2):514–46.

Mandel, Hadas, and Moshe Semyonov. 2016. "Going Back in Time? Gender Differences in Trends and Sources of the Racial Pay Gap, 1970 to 2010." *American Sociological Review* 81(5):1039–68.

Jacobs, Jerry A, and Ronald L Breiger. 2017. "Careers, industries, and occupations: Industrial segmentation reconsidered." Pp. 43–63 in *industries, firms, and Jobs*: Routledge.

Krysan, Maria, and Kyle Crowder. 2017. *Cycle of Segregation: Social Processes and Residential Stratification*. New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Quillian, Lincoln, Devah Pager, Ole Hexel, and Arnfinn H. Midtbøen. 2017. "Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114(41):10870–75.

Ferguson, John-Paul, and Rembrand Koning. 2018. "Firm Turnover and the Return of Racial Establishment Segregation." *American Sociological Review* 83(3):445–74.

Saygin, Perihan Ozge, Andrea Weber, and Michèle A. Weynandt. 2019. "Coworkers, Networks, and Job-Search Outcomes among Displaced Workers." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 74(1):95–130.

Avent-Holt, Dustin, Lasse Folke Henriksen, Anna Erika Hägglund, Jiwook Jung, Naomi Kodama, Silvia Maja Melzer, Eunmi Mun, Anthony Rainey, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2020. "Occupations, workplaces or jobs?: An exploration of stratification contexts using administrative data." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 70(December).

Lise, Jeremy, and Fabien Postel-Vinay. 2020. "Multidimensional Skills, Sorting, and Human Capital Accumulation." *American Economic Review* 110(8):2328–76.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, Anthony Rainey, Dustin Avent-Holt, Nina Bandelj, István Boza, David Cort, Olivier Godechot, Gergely Hajdu, Martin Hällsten, Lasse Folke Henriksen, Are Skeie Hermansen, Feng Hou, Jiwook Jung, Aleksandra Kanjuo-Mrčela, Joe King, Naomi Kodama, Tali Kristal, Alena Křížková, Zoltán Lippényi, Silvia Maja Melzer, Eunmi Mun, Andrew Penner, Trond Petersen, Andreja Poje, Mirna Safi, Max Thaning, and Zaibu Tufail. 2020. "Rising between-workplace inequalities in high-income countries." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117(17):9277–83.

Ren, Chunhui. 2021. "A Dynamic Framework for Earnings Inequality between Black and White Men." *Social Forces* 100(4):1449–78.

Wilmers, Nathan, and Clem Aeppli. 2021. "Consolidated Advantage: New Organizational Dynamics of Wage Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 86(6):1100–30.

Gerard, François, Lorenzo Lagos, Edson Severnini, and David Card. 2021. "Assortative Matching or Exclusionary Hiring? The Impact of Employment and Pay Policies on Racial Wage Differences in Brazil." *American Economic Review* 111(10):3418–57.

Pedulla, David S., John Muñoz, Katherine E. Wullert, and Felipe A. Dias. 2022. "Field Experiments and Job Posting Sources: The Consequences of Job Database Selection for Estimates of Racial Discrimination." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 8(1):26–42.

Kerswell, Timothy, Leong Sin Hang, and William Chan. 2023. "Macao’s Split Labour Market." *Journal of Labor and Society* 26(2):133–55.

Mai, Quan D. 2023. "The Demographic Context of Hiring Discrimination: Evidence from a Field Experiment in 50 Metropolitan Statistical Areas." *Work and Occupations* 50(4):463–98.

Bayer, Patrick, Kerwin Kofi Charles, and Ellora Derenoncourt. 2025. "Racial Inequality in the Labor Market." *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series* No. 33372.

Wilmers, Nathan, Di Tong, and Victoria Y. Zhang. 2025. "Between-Firm Inequality and Informal Social Relations." *American Journal of Sociology* 130(5):1217–62.

## ETHNORACIAL ORGANIZATIONS

### [Firms and Schema]

Then, drawing most directly on Sewell and Jung (1992 and 2015, respectively) and the idea that “… cultural schemas are hierarchically organized, widely shared, and contextually groups. Meso-level internal hierarchies and activated” (from Brubaker, Loveman, and Stamatov 2004; cited in Ray 2019: 30), he more clearly and deliberately pairs or *articulates* a more ‘localized’ conception of schema with or to, “…*ideological* claims about racial inequality…” (e.g., biological, cultural, or color-blind racism: italics added; Bonilla-Silva 1997, Bonilla-Silva 2001, Bonilla Silva 2003 [2015], Bonilla-Silva 2009; Ray 2019: 32).

That is, the scripts and/or storylines in a societal- or macro-level racial ideology that justify racial inequality (and/or stratification), “… can reinforce underlying racial schemas” (Ray 2019).

Then, Ray effectively secures, extends or melds ‘racial projects,’ (Om and Winant 1986 [2014]) and theories on the reciprocal or recursive articulation of racial ideologies and their myriad schematizations, describing them as *collaborators* in expressions relating to, “… the distribution of resources along racial lines” (Ray 2019: 32) redoubling his effort to posit that, “[r]acial structures arise any time resources are (intentionally or passively) distributed according to racial schemas” (Ray 2019: 32).

…that privilege circumscribe and workers vis-à-vis local schema – or unwritten storylines that prescribe iconic priors concerning the proclivities and capacities of people with different racial classifications.

Rumelhart & Ortony (1977): “data structures for representing the generic concepts stored in memory”

DiMaggio (1997): “knowledge structures that represent objects or events and provide default assumptions about their characteristics, relationships, and entailments under conditions of incomplete information”

Giddens offers “memory traces’ as a form of schema, positing, as a knowledge of “… ‘how things are to be done’ (said, written), on the part of social actors; social practices organised through the recursive mobilisation of that knowledge; (c) capabilities that the production of those practices presupposes" (64).

… ‘memory traces’… “Rather, it implies recognising the existence of: (a) knowledge - as memory traces - of ‘how things are to be done’ (said, written), on the part of social actors; (b) social practices organised through the recursive mobilisation of that knowledge; (c) capabilities that the production of those practices presupposes” (Gidden 1979: 64).

Cerulo (2010): “knowledge structures such as stereotypes, scripts, etc. that, with broad strokes, represent the characteristics of people, places, objects or events and allow us to infer what these entities do, where they fit, and what to expect of them”

Vaisey (2009) “cultural-cognitive structures… built up out of experience [that] allow a person to respond to stimuli in ways that are automatically generated by the weighted connections between the elements of the inputs at hand. Proponents of this view do not talk of schemas as things that are ‘deployed’ like tools but rather as deep, largely unconscious networks of neural associations that facilitate perception, interpretation, and action”

5. Boutyline & Soter’s functional definition:

“cultural schemas are socially shared representations deployable in automatic cognition”

That is, while there are earlier conceptualizations of schemata (Kant 1900–1904 [1998], Taylor 1911 [2010], Bartlett 1932 [1995], Mayo 1933 [2005]), those interested in organizational behavior and psychology have developed it into both a basic and applied science (move Taylor onward here).

Karl Marx offered ideology as a feature of the social structure and also described at least one derivation of an ideology — ‘false consciousness’ — in the successful governance of factories.

Although Max Weber conceded a certain contribution of the more informal or ‘unwritten,’ “…rules and procedures*…*” in the operations of organizations, he is more widely recognized for his early and thoughtful specifications of the formal or ‘written’ of these (Weber 1922[1978]: 325).

Interestingly, as we might read Sociologists then as arriving at the conceptual utility of the “schemata of interpretation” (Goffman 1974: xx) as part of a more than century-long use of ‘ideology,’ (Althusser 1971, Marx and Engels 1978, Hall 1980, Bonilla-Silva 2001), the call to “bring the firms back in” (Baron and Bielby 1980) was not immediately followed by an increase in the use of ‘schema’ to describe or explain the ‘operations of localities.’

Even Charles Tilly, who brilliantly theorizes the role of organizational behaviors in difference, inequality and/or stratification, his canonical texts described their requirement, presence and function, he did not formally identify these as ‘schema’ (DiMaggio 1997, Ridgeway et al. 1998, Tilly 1998, Bielby 2011, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019). (Ridgeway et al. 1998, Correll and Ridgeway 2003, Vallas 2003, Brubaker, Loveman and Stamatov 2004, Johnson, Dowd and Ridgeway 2006, Ridgeway 2006, Boutyline and Soter 2021).

For more than a century, Business Schools (mostly within Departments of Management and among those theorizing ‘organizational behavior’) and those working in Departments of Psychology have witnessed, theorized, tested, and taught the idea that firms need ‘schema’ to operate efficiently and productively.

These early models of ‘organizational behavior’ remain focused on differences in the hard and soft (non-cognitive) skills of workers as otherwise unrelated individuals.

How firms might constitute a social force, such that they produce more than goods for consumption, but ‘the good’ in our thoughts and behaviors has once again emerged as a compelling unit of analysis among Sociologists (Du Bois 1935, Baron and Bielby 1980, Baron and Pfeffer 1994, Tilly 1998, Stainback, Tomaskovic-Devey and Skaggs 2010).

The very early thinkers on these topics made their contributions in the early Twentieth Century, and largely from Schools of Business (Taylor 1911 [2010])

Through his participation in the famous Hawthorn Studies, it appears that Elton Mayo might have been among the earliest to assert that interpersonal relationships, worker morale, workplace inter-group dynamics all had a significant impact on the productivity of firms – i.e., ‘over and beyond’ the characteristics of unrelated individuals (Mayo 1933 [2005]).

Mayo observed that, “[t]he individuals who make up a working department are not merely individuals; they constitute a group within which individuals have developed routines of relationship to each other, to their superiors, to their work, and to the policies of the Company” (Mayo 1933 [2005]: 111).

Schemas are internal knowledge structures (Bartlett 1932 [1995]).

Indeed, writing first in 1922, Max Weber offed a model of ‘rationale-legal authority,’ wherein, “…there are three primary conditions affecting the maximization of calculable performance by labour in carrying out specifications…[t]he optimum of aptitude for the function… the optimum of skill acquired through practice [and] … the optimum of incentive for the work” (Weber 1922 [1978]: 261).

While Max Veber conceded that, the ‘aptitudes, skills and incentives’ of workers were the “primary conditions affecting the maximization of calculable performance” (Weber 1922 [1978]: 261), he also argued that, “The formalization of rules and procedures is indispensable for maintaining the predictability and order that define bureaucratic administration” (Weber 1922 [1978]: 325).

“schemata of interpretation which allow its users to locate, perceive, identify, and label a seemingly infinite number of occurrences defined in its terms” (Goffman 1974).

This approach also draws on ‘behavioral models’ of the firm, as it emphasizes the impact of bounded rationality on managerial decision making (Cyert and March 1963, Carpenter, Geletkanycz and Sanders 2004, Nielsen 2010).

For example, in their paradigm shifting article, “Bringing the Firms Back In,” James Baron and William Bielby proposed that, “… work arrangements within the firm … are the focus of most ‘structural’ perspectives on positional stratification; thus, empirical studies grounded at the organizational level are more likely to inform current debates about the ‘structure of work’ than is the growing body of research about structural effects on individual attainment…” (Baron and Bielby 1980: 737).

It then re-emerged during the last quarter of the twentieth century (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2010, Davis 2017, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019, Amis et al. 2020) and now again in the last decade or two (Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2010, Davis 2017, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019, Amis et al. 2020). [Add Tilly and adjust citations to fit the historical scope].

“Culture influences action not by providing the ultimate values toward which action is oriented, but by shaping a repertoire or "tool kit" of habits, skills, and styles from which people construct "strategies of action.” (Swidler 1986: 273)

“… fundamental **tools** of thought…” (Sewell 1992: 7).

“… knowledge structures that represent objects or events and provide default assumptions about their characteristics, relationships, and entailments under conditions of incomplete information” (DiMaggio 1997:269).

Tilly (1998) argues that schema are fundamental to the operations of organizations, allowing people to work together, while also influencing how firms assign workers to jobs and tasks, which can result in the creation, legitimation and stability of organizational hierarchies (Baron and Pfeffer 1994, Collins 1997, Ridgeway et al. 1998, Avent-Holt and Tomaskovic-Devey 2010, Wingfield and Alston 2014, DiTomaso 2015, Ray 2019).

“[e]xploitation, opportunity hoarding, emulation, and adaptation converge to favor such a social arrangement” (Tilly 1998: 59).

“[s]ignificant inequalities in advantages among human beings correspond mainly to categorical differences…rather than individual differences” (Tilly 1998: 7).

Tilly notes that inequalities persist as organizations emulate existing structures and adapt them to their specific needs. This helps to “lower the costs of maintaining categorical inequality” by making them seem natural and inevitable”

Since firms rely on shared schematic modifications of these structural-level assumptions to facilitate their operations, including their hiring, evaluation, and promotion practices (Tilly 1998), more social scientists are recognizing that firms are an important contextual source of inequality operating with variance in societies (Baron and Bielby 1980, Hallett and Ventresca 2006, Davis 2017, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019, Amis et al. 2020).

Bias and discrimination *within* firms is sometimes explicit (Fox and Stallworth 2006, Mong and Roscigno 2010, Daniels and Thornton 2020), but it often goes unacknowledged (Tilly 1998, Whysall 2018).

Categorical distinctions (e.g., race, gender) are mapped onto organizational hierarchies, leading to the institutionalization of inequality. Tilly explains how these distinctions become embedded in labor divisions and resource distributions (Tomaskovic-Devey 2014).

Sociologists returned to making arguments for centering firms in our general study of the labor market during the **second part of the twentieth century** (Bonacich 1972, Baron and Bielby 1980, Tilly 1998, Tomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019).

These unacknowledged **schemas**, or “status beliefs” (Ridgeway et al. 1998: 348) contain “default assumptions” (DiMaggio 1997: 269) that serve as iconic priors which are embedded at the firm-level, dictating what *kind* of person *should* be in a given job (Brubaker et al. 2004, Lamont, Beljean and Clair 2014).

In using Gramsci to further develop schema, use this to make the connection: <https://www-jstor-org.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/stable/10.1086/597179?searchText=&searchUri=&ab_segments=&searchKey=&refreqid=fastly-default%3A839ba6c4e4f5b35cdc1b384a0bf830ea&initiator=recommender&seq=1>

Firms promote the uptake of these schemas (Perry, Davis-Blake and Kulik 1994) fostering the context for repeated observations and social interactions among workers, teaching them which categories matter and the corresponding schema concerning where people belong in the firm hierarchy (Baron and Pfeffer 1994; Ridgeway et al. 1998).

DiMaggio (1997:269) defines schemas as “knowledge structures that represent objects or events and provide default assumptions about their characteristics, relationships, and entailments under conditions of incomplete information” (see also Cerulo 2010)

“Institutionalists argue that organizations are nested within “institutional logics” (Thornton and Ocasio 1999) or “broad, ‘supraorganizational’ logics or ‘symbolic systems’ that order reality” (Hallett and Ventresca 2006: 214) [quoted from (Ray 2019)].

This approach allows for an invariant ‘structural intercept,’ (at the level of society) (Jordan 1968, Hall 1980, Omi and Winant 1986 [2015], Bonilla-Silva 1997, Mills 1997 [2022], Feagin 2001 [2010], Jung 2015, Ifatunji 2024), while being able to make better inferences about the scope of its effects, by observing variance at the meso-level of analysis.

“Organizational theory could benefit from a hostile perspective; it has been altogether too accommodating to organizations and their power.”— Charles Perrow (1979).

… it has been that “Organizational theory scholars typically see organizations as race-neutral bureaucratic structures, while race and ethnicity scholars have largely neglected the role of organizations in the social construction of race” (Ray 2019).

“The placement of groups of people in racial categories stemmed initially from the interests of powerful actors in the social system (e.g., the capitalist class, the planter class, colonizers). After racial categories were used to organize social relations in a society, however, race became an independent element of the operation of the social system” (Stone 1985, Bonilla-Silva 1997: 473).

“The position is essentially that the racial lines as drawn in a society are followed in the allocation of racial members inside the industrial structure. If the racial patterning in the society has assigned the races to different social positions, defining the appropriate forms of association between them, outlining the kinds of authority, prestige and power allowable to each, indicating the kinds of privilege which attend their respective social positions, and establishing clear schemes of deferential relations, this general pattern of relationship is carried over into the industrial structure. The pattern comes to define the types of occupation into which racial members may enter, the types from which they are excluded, and those which do not befit them; it determines who is given access to training and acquisition of skills; it structures the lines of promotion, establishing ceilings or 'dead-ends' corresponding to the general social position of subordinate racial groups; it allocates positions of authority corresponding to the distribution of authority among the racial groups in the general society; it severely limits new forms of association which are not consonant with the general racial code; it exercises particular control over the managerial field, the area of representatives of industry to the outside public, and the field of entrepreneurial activity” (Blumer 1965: 241).

“The structures of capitalist society include both a mode of production based on private property and profit and a mode of labor organization based on workplace solidarity” (Sewell 1992: 19).

"In Nevada, casino owners were able to deflect demands for racial justice… Having successfully avoided hiring Black dealers in any numbers, managers treat their new work force as honorary White, view them as basically trustworthy, and it is this racial solidarity that underwrites managerial willingness to permit an informal effort bargain" (Lopez 2010, p. 262).

### [Ethnoracial Firms]

“From a racialized organizations perspective, organizational formation is nested within the institutionalized field of race” (Ray 2019).

Even though many working in the areas of organizational behavior and labor market economics remain skeptical of orientations that feature a prominent role for ethnoracial stereotypes and inter-group relations in these firm-level processes, it appears that the ‘general view’ on firm-level processes was proceeded by an ‘ethnoracial view.’

Although many now concede that organizational schema and related protocols structure the experiences and trajectories of workers in firms, Du Bois anticipated these insights, while also theorizing the ways in which ethnoracial stereotypes might revise these policies and practices in ‘racialized social systems.’

That is, before Mayo and others appreciated the role of extra- or supra-individual factors in employment and firm productivity, Du Bois witnessed the importance of these factors in his study of the labor market in the immediate wake of slavery in the American South.

First, in the *Conservation of Races*, he speculates that part of what comes along with the perception of Blackness is that those deemed Black were assumed to have a distinct and ‘savage’ culture, which anticipates more recent thinking on the role of cultural and schematic difference between Black and White workers (Rivera 2012).

“It must be remembered that the **white group of laborers**, while they received a low wage, were compensated in part by a sort of **public and psychological wage**” (Du Bois 1935).

Ray says, “…race-neutral abstractions such as bureaucratic rationality, interchangeable hierarchical positions, and meritocracy” (Weber 1922 [1978]).

More recently several distinguish themselves from this traditional “reductionist” approach, whereby “…the notion that one structure ‘gives expression to’ another…” or where class and economic interests and conditions give rise to ethnoracial dynamics as “epiphenomenon” (Hall 1980).

Students of organizational behavior relegate ethnoracial dynamics as exogenous epiphenomenon and therefore secondary to basic organizational operations (Omi and Winant 1986 [2015]).

These offerings described processes of internal colonialism and institutional racism, but they did not focus their theory and/or analysis on organizations or firms (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967).

“Ethnic antagonism arises from a labor market split along ethnic lines, as one group of workers is used to undercut the wages of another” (Bonacich 1972).

“Employers actively contribute to racial antagonism when emergent interracial coalitions threaten to increase labor costs and polarize class struggle” (Brown 2000).

“Exclusion attempts and caste-like arrangements can occur among groups of the same race when economic competition dictates” (Kerswell, Hang and Chan 2023).

“Ethnic antagonism is sustained by laws, exclusionary practices, and caste systems designed to protect higher-paid labor” (Auerhahn 2018).

“Higher-priced labor resists competition from lower-priced groups, leveraging unions, laws, or violence to protect their economic position” (Peled and Shafir 1987).

“The persistence of split labor markets depends on the institutionalization of racial hierarchies, which maintain control over lower-priced labor groups” (Corzine, Huff‐Corzine and Creech 2007).

… **institutional racism**… (Carmichael et al. 1967).

… “inequality regimes,” or “loosely interrelated practices, processes, actions, and meanings that result in and maintain … racial inequalities” (Acker 2006: 443).

… firms differentially link, “organizational rules to social and material resources” (Ray 2019: 26) and therefore constitute…

… “much of the social and economic inequality in the United States and other industrialized countries is created in organizations” (Acker 2006: 441) and that “[m]eso-level internal hierarchies and occupational segregation contribute to the mundane reproduction of racial stratification” (Ray 2019: 30).

“After a social formation is racialized, its ‘normal’ dynamics always include a racial component…” (Bonilla-Silva 1997).

“… racialized social system theory, which describes a social system as racialized when “a set of social relations and practices based on racial distinctions develops **at all societal levels**” (Bonilla-Silva 1997: 474).

“Race connects cultural rules to social and mate-rial resources through organizational formation, hierarchy, and processes” (Ray 2019).

Therefore, while macro-level theories of race and racism help to identify an entry-point (Tatum 2017), central tendency or ‘intercept’ for racialized relations in societies (Blauner 1969, Omi and Winant 1986 [2015], Bonilla-Silva 1997, Feagin 2001 [2010], Jung 2015), meso-level models anticipate and make sense of variation in racialized meanings, practices and inequalities across geographies and organizations

“…schemas not empowered or regenerated by resources would eventually be abandoned and forgotten” (Sewell 1992).

firms operate as “local racial formations” (Wooten 2006) contributing to the ‘management’ of emergent and reciprocal links between racialized discourses and inequalities at the meso-level of society (Collins 1997, Wooten 2006, Moore 2007, Embrick 2011, Wooten 2015, Sewell 2016, Reyes 2017, Ferguson and Koning 2018, Ray 2019, Wingfield and Chavez 2020).

“… inhabited…” (Omi and Winant 1986 [2015]: 109).

Some focusing on how organizations foster and invigorate ethnoracial inequalities within their localities (Collins 1997, Sewell 2016, Sewell and Jefferson 2016), while others focus on the mechanisms of inequality within organizations (Wingfield and Alston 2014).

Include Wilson et al 1999 “Reaching the top.”

#### [References]

Taylor, Frederick Winslow. 1911. *The principles of scientific management*. New York and London: Noton & Company.

Weber, Marx. 1922 [1978]. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

Bartlett, Frederic C. 1932 [1995]. *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press.

Mayo, Elton. 1933 [2005]. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. London and New York: Routledge and the Taylor-Francis Group.

Du Bois, William Edward Burghardt. 1935. Black Reconstruction in America: Toward a history of the part which black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America, 1860-1880. New York, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Burns, Tom, and G.M. Stalker. 1961. *The management of innovation*. London, England: Tavistock Publications.

Cyert, Richard M, and James G March. 1963. A behavioral theory of the firm. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Vroom, Victor H. 1964. *Work and motivation*. New York, New York: John Willey & Sons.

Blumer, Herbert. 1965. "Industrialization and Race Relations." Pp. 220–53 in *Industrialization and Race Relations*. London, England: Oxford University Press.

Herzberg, Frederick. 1966. *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publications Company.

Carmichael, Stokely, and Charles V. Hamilton. 1967. Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America. New York, New York: Random House.

Blauner, Robert. 1969. "Internal Colonialism and Ghetto Revolt." *Social Problems* 16(4):393-408.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York, New York: International Publishers.

Bonacich, Edna. 1972. "A theory of ethnic antagonism: the split labor market." Am Sociol Rev 37(5):547–59.

Blauner, Robert. 1972. *Racial Oppression in America*. New York, New York: Harper & Row.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(2):340–63.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York, New York: Basic Books.

House, James S. 1977. "The Three Faces of Social Psychology." *Sociometry* 40(2):161–77.

Argyris, Chris. 1978. *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Burawoy, Michael. 1979. Manufacturing consent: Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism: Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Weick, Karl E. 1979. *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publications.

Karasek, Robert A. 1979. "Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude, and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24(2):285–308.

Baron, James N., and William T. Bielby. 1980. "Bringing the Firms Back in: Stratification, Segmentation, and the Organization of Work." *American Sociological Review* 45(5):737–65.

Hofstede, Geert. 1980. Culture’s consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

DiMaggio, Paul J, and Walter W Powell. 1983. "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields." *American Sociological Review* 48(2):147–60.

Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies Ann Swidler." *American Sociological Review* 51(2):273–86.

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs and Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organization." *Gender and Society* 4(2):139–58.

Scott, W Richard. 1992. Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems.

Sewell, William H. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(1):1–29.

Nkomo, Stella M. 1992. "The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting race in organizations." Academy of Management Review 17(3):487–513.

Abbott, Andrew. 1993. "The Sociology of Work and Occupations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19:187–209.

Coate, Stephen & Loury, Glenn C.. 1993. Will Affirmative-Action Policies Eliminate Negative Stereotypes?. The American Economic Review 83: 1220-1240. [employers' prior beliefs can lead to different productivity outcomes even if groups are initially identical.]

Baron, James N., and Jeffrey Pfeffer. 1994. "The Social Psychology of Organizations and Inequality." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57(3):190–209.

Ely, Robin J. 1995. "The Power In Demography: Women’s Social Constructions of Gender Identity at Work." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(3):589–634.

Weick, Karl E. 1995. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Spence, Michael. 2002. "Signaling in retrospect and the informational structure of markets." *American Economic Review* 92(3):434–59.

Kunda, Gideon. 1995. "Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech Corporation." *Organization Science* 6(2):228–30.

Scott, W. Richard. 1995. *Institutions and organizations*: Thousand Oaks : SAGE, [1995].

Collins, Sharon. 1997. Black Corporate Executives: The Making and Breaking of the Black Middle-Class. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press.

Morris, Aldon. 2000. "Building blocks of social inequality: A critique of Durable Inequality." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42(2):482–86.

Brown, Cliff. 2000. "The Role of Employers in Split Labor Markets: An Event-Structure Analysis of Racial Conflict and AFL Organizing, 1917-1919." Social Forces 79(2):653–81.

Morris, Aldon. 2000. "Building blocks of social inequality: A critique of Durable Inequality." Comparative Studies in Society and History 42(2):482–86.

Correll, Shelley J., and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2003. "Expectation States Theory." Pp. 29–51 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*. New York, New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Vallas, Steven P. 2003. "Rediscovering the color line within work organizations: Theknitting of racial groups' revisited." Work and Occupations 30(4):379–400.

Stoll, Michael A, Steven Raphael, and Harry J Holzer. 2004. "Black job applicants and the hiring officer's race." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 57(2):267–87.

Wooten, Melissa E. 2006. "Race and Strategic Organization." Strategic Organization 4(2):191–99.

Corzine, Jay, Lin Huff‐Corzine, and James C. Creech. 2007. "The Tenant Labor Market and Lynching in the South: A Test of Split Labor Market Theory\*." 58(3):261–78.

Johnson, Cathryn, Timothy J. Dowd, and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2006. "Legitimacy as a social process." *Annual Review of Sociology* 32:53–78.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2006. "Linking social structure and interpersonal behavior: A theoretical perspective on cultural schemas and social relations." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(1):5–16.

Hallett, Tim, and Marc J. Ventresca. 2006. "Inhabited Institutions: Social Interactions and Organizational Forms in Gouldner’s Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy." *Theory and Society* 35(2):213–36.

Aldrich, Howard. 2006. *Organizations evolving*. London and Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Johnson, Cathryn, Timothy J. Dowd, and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2006. "Legitimacy as a social process." *Annual Review of Sociology* 32:53–78.

Acker, Joan. 2006. "Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations." *Gender and Society* 20(4):441–64.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2006. "Linking social structure and interpersonal behavior: A theoretical perspective on cultural schemas and social relations." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(1):5–16.

Moore, Wendy Leo. 2007. Reproducing Racism: White Space, Elite Law Schools and Racial Inequality. New York, New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Giuliano, Laura, David I Levine, and Jonathan Leonard. 2009. "Manager Race and the Race of New Hires." Journal of Labor Economics 27(4):589–631.

Woodcock, Simon D. 2010. "Heterogeneity and Learning in Labor Markets." *The B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 10(1):1–66.

Lopez, Steven Henry. 2010. "Workers, Managers, and Customers: Triangles of Power in Work Communities." *Work and Occupations* 37(3):251–71.

Avent-Holt, Dustin, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2010. "A relational theory of wage inequality."

Schein, Edgar H. 2010. *Organizational culture and leadership*: John Wiley & Sons.

Stainback, Kevin, Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, and Sheryl Skaggs. 2010. "Organizational Approaches to Inequality: Inertia, Relative Power, and Environments." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36(1):225–47.

Kahneman, Daniel author. 2011. *Thinking, fast and slow*: 1st ed. New York : Farrar, Straus and Giroux, [2011] 2011.

Embrick, David G. 2011. "The Diversity Ideology in the Business World: A New Oppression for a New Age." Critical Sociology 37(5):541–56.

Rivera, Lauren A. 2012. "Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms." *American Sociological Review* 77(6):999–1022.

Fine, Gary Alan. 2012. "Group Culture and the Interaction Order: Local Sociology on the Meso-Level." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38(1):159–79.

Saperstein, Aliya, Andrew M. Penner, and Ryan Light. 2013. "Racial Formation in Perspective: Connecting Individuals, Institutions, and Power Relations." Annual Review of Sociology 39:359–78.

Lamont, Michèle, Stefan Beljean, and Matthew Clair. 2014. "What is missing? Cultural processes and causal pathways to inequality." *Socio-Economic Review* 12(3):573–608.

Hensvik, Lena E. 2014. "Manager Impartiality: Worker-Firm Matching and the Gender Wage Gap." *Ilr Review* 67(2):395–421.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald. 2014. "The Relational Generation of Workplace Inequalities." *Social Currents* 1(1):51–73.

Perrow, Charles author. 2014. *Complex organizations : a critical essay*: Third edition. Brattleboro, Vermont : Echo Point Books & Media, [2014]. 2014.

Avery, Derek R., Sabrina D. Volpone, and Oscar Holmes Iv. 2015. "Racial discrimination in organizations." Pp. 89–109 in The Oxford handbook of workplace discrimination. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2015. "More than prejudice: Restatement, reflections, and new directions in critical race theory." Sociology of Race and Ethnicity 1(1):73–87.

del Carmen Triana, Maria, Tiffany M. Trzebiatowski, and Seo-Young Byun. 2015. "Indvidual Outcomes of Discrimination in Workplaces." in The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination, edited by Adrienne J. Colella and Eden B. King. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rivera, Lauren A. 2015. "Go with Your Gut: Emotion and Evaluation in Job Interviews." *American Journal of Sociology* 120(5):1339–89.

Evans, Louwanda, and Wendy Leo Moore. 2015. "Impossible burdens: White institutions, emotional labor, and micro-resistance." Social Problems 62(3):439–54.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2015. "Race, Racialization, and Work." Pp. 93–108 in The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Work and Employment: SAGE Publications.

Wooten, Melissa E. 2015. In the face of inequality: How black colleges adapt. New York, New York: State University of New York Press.

Rivera, Lauren A. 2016. *Pedigree: How elite students get elite jobs*: Princeton University Press.

Cruz, Adrian. 2016. "On the job: White employers, workers of color, and racial triangulation theory." Sociology Compass 10(10):918–27.

Sewell, Alyasah Ali. 2016. "The Racism-Race Reification Process: A Mesolevel Political Economic Framework for Understanding Racial Health Disparities." Sociology of Race and Ethnicity 2(4).

Sewell, Alyasah Ali, and Kevin A Jefferson. 2016. "Collateral Damage: The Health Effects of Invasive Police Encounters in New York City." Journal of Urban Health 93:42–67.

Payne, B. Keith, Heidi A. Vuletich, and Kristjen B. Lundberg. 2017. "The Bias of Crowds: How Implicit Bias Bridges Personal and Systemic Prejudice." Psychological Inquiry 28(4):233–48.

Quillian, Lincoln, Devah Pager, Ole Hexel, and Arnfinn H. Midtbøen. 2017. "Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114(41):10870–75.

Amis, John, Kamal Munir, and Johanna Mair. 2017. "Institutions and Economic Inequality." Pp. 706–34 in *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, edited by Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Thomas B. Lawrence, and Renate E. Meyer. Oak: SAGE Publications.

Davis, Gerald F. 2017. "How institutions create income inequality." Pp. 689–704 in *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*.

Rojas, Fabio. 2017. "Race and Institutionalism." Pp. 786–807 in The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism.

Wooten, Melissa E, and Lucius Couloute. 2017. "The production of racial inequality within and among organizations." Sociology Compass 11(1):1–10.

Auerhahn, Kathleen. 2018. "The Split Labor Market and the Origins of Antidrug Legislation in the United States." Law and Social Inquiry 24(02):411–40.

Smith, Alexis N., and Shalei V. K. Simms. 2018. "Impact on organizations." Pp. 339–53 in The Oxford handbook of workplace discrimination. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Whysall, Zara. 2018. "Cognitive biases in recruitment, selection, and promotion: The risk of subconscious discrimination." Pp. 215–43 in Hidden Inequalities in the Workplace: Springer.

Card, David, Ana Rute Cardoso, Joerg Heining, and Patrick Kline. 2018. "Firms and labor market inequality: Evidence and some theory." *Journal of Labor Economics* 36(S1):S13–S70.

Smith, Alexis N., and Shalei V. K. Simms. 2018. "Impact on organizations." Pp. 339–53 in *The Oxford handbook of workplace discrimination.* New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Whysall, Zara. 2018. "Cognitive biases in recruitment, selection, and promotion: The risk of subconscious discrimination." Pp. 215–43 in *Hidden Inequalities in the Workplace*: Springer.

Stainback, Kevin. 2018. "Organizations, Employment Discrimination, and Inequality." Pp. xx–xx in *The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination*: Oxford University Press.

Greenwald, Anthony G., and Calvin K. Lai. 2020. "Implicit Social Cognition." *Annual Review of Psychology* 71(1):419–45.

Rivera, Lauren A. 2020. "Employer Decision Making." *Annual Review of Sociology* 46(1):215–32.

Song, Jae, David J. Price, Fatih Guvenen, Nicholas Bloom, and Till von Wachter. 2019. "Firming Up Inequality." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 134(1):1–50.

Haveman, Heather A., and Rachel Wetts. 2019. "Contemporary organizational theory: The demographic, relational, and cultural perspectives." *Sociology Compass* 13(3).

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald, and Dustin Avent-Holt. 2019. *Relational inequalities: An organizational approach*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Ray, Victor. 2019. "A Theory of Racialized Organizations." American Sociological Review 84(1):26–53.

Rojas, Fabio. 2019. "Race and organization theory: Reflections and open questions." Pp. 15–23 in Race, organizations, and the organizing process: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey author. 2019. Flatlining: Race, work, and health care in the new economy. Oakland, California: University of California Press.

Amis, John M, Johanna Mair, and Kamal A Munir. 2020. "The organizational reproduction of inequality." *Academy of Management Annals* 14(1):195–230.

Little, Daniel. 2020. "Organizations as Actors: Microfoundations of Organizational Intentionality." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 50(3):260–79.

Brunsma, David L., Nathaniel G. Chapman, Joong Won Kim, J. Slade Lellock, Megan Underhill, Erik T. Withers, and Jennifer Padilla Wyse. 2020. "The Culture of White Space: On The Racialized Production of Meaning." American Behavioral Scientist 64(14):2001–15.

Daniels, Shanna, and LaDonna M. Thornton. 2020. "Race and workplace discrimination: The mediating role of cyber incivility and interpersonal incivility." Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal 39(3):319–35.

Embrick, David G., and Wendy Leo Moore. 2020. "White Space(s) and the Reproduction of White Supremacy." American Behavioral Scientist 64(14):1935–45.

Moore, Wendy Leo. 2020. "The Mechanisms of White Space(s)." American Behavioral Scientist 64(14):1946–60.

Quillian, Lincoln, John J Lee, and Mariana Oliver. 2020. "Evidence from Field Experiments in Hiring Shows Substantial Additional Racial Discrimination after the Callback." Social Forces 99(2):732–59.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey, and Koji Chavez. 2020. "Getting In, Getting Hired, Getting Sideways Looks: Organizational Hierarchy and Perceptions of Racial Discrimination." American Sociological Review 85(1):31–57.

Boutyline, Andrei, and Laura K. Soter. 2021. "Cultural Schemas: What They Are, How to Find Them, and What to Do Once You’ve Caught One." *American Sociological Review* 86(4):728–58.

Gerard, François, Lorenzo Lagos, Edson Severnini, and David Card. 2021. "Assortative Matching or Exclusionary Hiring? The Impact of Employment and Pay Policies on Racial Wage Differences in Brazil." American Economic Review 111(10):3418–57.

Hirschman, Daniel, and Laura Garbes. 2021. "Toward an economic sociology of race." Socio-Economic Review 19(3).

Andrei Boutyline and Laura Soter offer the clearest definition of schema: “cultural schemas are socially shared representations deployable in automatic cognition” (2021, 730) [https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00031224211024525?utm\_source=chatgpt.com].

Lachowska, Marta, Alexandre Mas, Raffaele Saggio, and Stephen A. Woodbury. 2022. "Do firm effects drift? Evidence from Washington administrative data." *Journal of Econometrics* 233(2):375–95.

Eagle, David, and Collin Mueller. 2022. "Reproducing Inequality in a Formally Antiracist Organization: The Case of Racialized Career Pathways in the United Methodist Church." American Journal of Sociology 127(5):1507–50.

Bonhomme, Stéphane, Kerstin Holzheu, Thibaut Lamadon, Elena Manresa, Magne Mogstad, and Bradley Setzler. 2023. "How Much Should We Trust Estimates of Firm Effects and Worker Sorting?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 41(2):291–322.

Zhang, Letian. 2023. "Racial Inequality in Work Environments." American Sociological Review 88(2):252–83.

Lauve-Moon, Tim A. 2024. "Religious Organizations as Racialized Organizations: Loose Coupling and Symbolic Allyship Between Denominational Racial Justice Statements and Congregational Practice." Sociology of Race and Ethnicity 10(4):489–504.

Hurst, Erik, Yona Rubinstein, and Kazuatsu Shimizu. 2024. "Task-Based Discriminations." *American Economic Review* 114(6):1723–68.

Battilana, Julie, Christine M. Beckman, and Julie Yen. 2025. "On Democratic Organizing and Organization Theory." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 70(2):297–327.

Bayer, Patrick, Kerwin Kofi Charles, and Ellora Derenoncourt. 2025. "Racial Inequality in the Labor Market." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series No. 33372.

### [Ethnoracial Schemas]

“… ethnicity as **cognition**…” and “… taken for **granted**…” (Brubaker et al. 2004),

Using schematic norms — like White credentialing — firms then often route workers upward (and downward) in ways that replicate and maintain their established ethnoracial hierarchy.

“… **racial tasks** … [and its focus on ‘racialized forms of emotional labor] connects internal organizational hierarchies to the ideological, interactional, and physical labor people of color do in White organizations … by conforming to racialized organizational scripts, can often reproduce structures of inequality” (Wingfield and Alston 2014)

“…racial meanings are translated into social structures and become racially signified” (Omi and Winant 1986 [2015]: 109) whereby ‘racial meanings’ underly the iconic scripts of schema

Wilson, Logan, and Harlan Gilmore. 1943. "White Employers and Negro Workers." *American Sociological Review* 8(6):698–705.

Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance." in *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*. Paris: UNESCO.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 1986 [2015]. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York, New York: Rutledge.

Wilson, William J. 1996. "The Meaning and Significance of Race: Employers and Inner-City Workers." Pp. 111–46 in When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor. New York, New York: Vintage Books.

Cartwright, Ashleigh. 2022. "A Theory of Racialized Cultural Capital." Sociological Inquiry. doi: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.wisc.edu/10.1111/soin.12479>.

Neckerman, Kathryn M, and Joleen Kirschenman. 1991. "Hiring Strategies, Racial Bias, and Inner-City Workers." *Social Problems* 38(4):433–47.

Kirschenman, Joleen, and Kathryn Neckerman. 1991 [2019]. "We'd Love to Hire Them, But... :The Meaning of Race for Employers." Pp. xx–xx in *Race And Ethnic Conflict: Contending Views On Prejudice, Discrimination, And Ethnoviolence*. New York, New York: Routledge.

Perry, Elissa L., Alison Davis-Blake, and Carol T. Kulik. 1994. "Explaining Gender-Based Selection Decisions: A Synthesis Of contextual and Cognitive Approaches." *Academy of Management Review* 19(4):786–820.

Ely, Robin J. 1995. "The Power In Demography: Women’s Social Constructions of Gender Identity at Work." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(3):589–634.

Greenwald, Anthony G, and Mahzarin R Banaji. 1995. "Implicit social cognition: attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes." *Annual Review of Psychology* 102(2):4–27.

Moss, Philip, and Chris Tilly. 1996. "“Soft” skills and race: An investigation of black men's employment problems." *Work and Occupations* 23(3):252–76.

Moss, Philip, and Chris Tilly. 2001. *Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill and Hiring in America*. New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2003 [2018]. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination." *American Economic Review* 94(4):991–1013.

Brubaker, Rogers, Mara Loveman, and Peter Stamatov. 2004. "Ethnicity as cognition." *Theory and Society* 33(1):31–64.

Holzer, Harry J, Steven Raphael, and Michael A Stoll. 2006. "Perceived criminality, criminal background checks, and the racial hiring practices of employers." *Journal of Law and Economics* 49(2):451–80.

Kmec, Julie A. 2006. "White hiring agents' organizational practices and out-group hiring." *Social Science Research* 35(3):668–701.

Moore, Wendy Leo. 2007. *Reproducing Racism: White Space, Elite Law Schools and Racial Inequality*. New York, New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2007. "The modern mammy and the angry Black man: African American professionals' experiences with gendered racism in the workplace." *Race, Gender and Class* 14(1-2):196–212.

Berard, Tim J. 2008. "The Neglected Social Psychology of Institutional Racism." *Sociology Compass* 2(2):734–64.

Giuliano, Laura, David I Levine, and Jonathan Leonard. 2009. "Manager Race and the Race of New Hires." *Journal of Labor Economics* 27(4):589–631.

Avent-Holt, Dustin, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2010. "A relational theory of wage inequality."

Mong, Sherry N., and Vincent J. Roscigno. 2010. "African American Men and the Experience of Employment Discrimination." *Qualitative Sociology* 33(1):1–21.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey. 2010. "Are some emotions marked “whites only?” Racialized feeling rules in professional workplaces." *Social Problems* 57(2):251–68.

Carbado, Devon W., and Mitu Gulati. 2013. "Acting Out the Racial Double Bind (or Being Black Like Obama)." Pp. 1–21 in *Acting White? Rethinking Race in “Post-Racial” America*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Laura Morgan, Sandra E Cha, and Sung Soo Kim. 2014. "Strategies for managing impressions of racial identity in the workplace." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 20(4):529–40.

Avery, Derek R., Sabrina D. Volpone, and Oscar Holmes Iv. 2015. "Racial discrimination in organizations." Pp. 89–109 in *The Oxford handbook of workplace discrimination*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

del Carmen Triana, Maria, Tiffany M. Trzebiatowski, and Seo-Young Byun. 2015. "Indvidual Outcomes of Discrimination in Workplaces." in *The Oxford Handbook of Workplace Discrimination*, edited by Adrienne J. Colella and Eden B. King. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Evans, Louwanda, and Wendy Leo Moore. 2015. "Impossible burdens: White institutions, emotional labor, and micro-resistance." *Social Problems* 62(3):439–54.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2015. "Race, Racialization, and Work." Pp. 93–108 in *The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Work and Employment*: SAGE Publications.

Jung, Moon-Kie. 2015. *Beneath the Surface of White Supremacy: Denaturalizing US Racisms Past and Present*: Stanford University Press.

Kang, Sonia, András Tilcsika, Sora Junb, and Katy DeCellesa. 2016. "Whitened Resumes: Race and Self-Presentation in the Labor Market." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 61(3):469–502.

Ruiz Castro, Mayra, and Evangelina Holvino. 2016. "Applying Intersectionality in Organizations: Inequality Markers, Cultural Scripts and Advancement Practices in a Professional Service Firm." *Gender, Work and Organization* 23(3):328–47.

Glover, Dylan, Amanda Pallais, and William Pariente. 2017. "Discrimination as a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy: Evidence from French Grocery Stores." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 132(3):1219–60.

Payne, B. Keith, Heidi A. Vuletich, and Kristjen B. Lundberg. 2017. "The Bias of Crowds: How Implicit Bias Bridges Personal and Systemic Prejudice." *Psychological Inquiry* 28(4):233–48.

Auerhahn, Kathleen. 2018. "The Split Labor Market and the Origins of Antidrug Legislation in the United States." *Law and Social Inquiry* 24(02):411–40.

Gawronski, Bertram, and Adam Hahn. 2018. "Implicit Measures: Procedures, Use, and Interpretation." Pp. 29–55 in *Measurement in Social Psychology*, edited by Hart Blanton, LaCroix Jessica M., and Webster Gregory D. New York, New York: Routledge.

Payne, B. Keith, Heidi A. Vuletich, and Jazmin L. Brown-Iannuzzi. 2019. "Historical roots of implicit bias in slavery." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(24):11693–98.

Ray, Victor. 2019. "A Theory of Racialized Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 84(1):26–53.

Vuletich, Heidi A, and B Keith Payne. 2019. "Stability and Change in Implicit Bias." *Psychological Science* 30(6):854–62.

Wingfield, Adia Harvey author. 2019. *Flatlining: Race, work, and health care in the new economy*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.

Embrick, David G., and Wendy Leo Moore. 2020. "White Space(s) and the Reproduction of White Supremacy." *American Behavioral Scientist* 64(14):1935–45.

Moore, Wendy Leo. 2020. "The Mechanisms of White Space(s)." *American Behavioral Scientist* 64(14):1946–60.

Payne, B. Keith, and Jason W. Hannay. 2021. "Implicit bias reflects systemic racism." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 25(11):927–36.

Cartwright, Ashleigh. 2022. "A Theory of Racialized Cultural Capital." *Sociological Inquiry* 92(2):317–40.

Eagle, David, and Collin Mueller. 2022. "Reproducing Inequality in a Formally Antiracist Organization: The Case of Racialized Career Pathways in the United Methodist Church." *American Journal of Sociology* 127(5):1507–50.

### [The White Credential]

**Credentialling** is often thought of as a way for employers to ‘outsource’ the attainment and evaluation of ‘merit’ for employees (Collins 1979 [2019]).

“… typically, perceived racial identity trumps the **credential**” (Ray 2019: 41).
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One of the ‘schematic factors’ involved in sorting White workers to the upper tiers of American firms has been described as is **‘White credentialing’** or “a credential providing access to organizational resources, legitimizing work hierarchies, and expanding White agency” (Ray 2019).
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### [Upper Echelons]

“Organizational outcomes—both strategies and effectiveness—are viewed as reflections of the values and cognitive bases of powerful actors in the organization. It is expected that, to some extent, such linkages can be detected empirically.” (Hambrick and Mason 1984:193)

“If strategic choices have a large behavioral component, then to some extent they reflect the idiosyncrasies of decision makers. As March and Simon (1958) argued, each decision maker brings his or her own set of ‘givens’ to an administrative situation. These givens reflect the decision maker’s cognitive base: 1. knowledge or assumptions about future events, 2. knowledge of alternatives, and 3. knowledge of consequences attached to alternatives. They also reflect his or her values: principles for ordering consequences or alternatives according to preference.” (Hambrick and Mason 1984:195)

“Examples of such characteristics are age, tenure in the organization, functional background, education, socioeconomic roots, and financial position. In this approach, some important but complex psychological issues are bypassed in favor of an emphasis on broad tendencies that, if empirically confirmed, can be later held up to the psychologist’s finer lens.” (Hambrick and Mason 1984:196)

“In 1975, executives of major U.S. firms were almost exclusively male and white, and predominantly Protestant and Republican.” (Hambrick and Mason 1984:201)

“Executives often are chosen precisely because they have the ‘right’ background or temperament to carry out actions hoped for by the board of directors or other controlling parties.” (Hambrick and Mason 1984:197)

“For any variable that influences an individual’s strategic choice, it can be said that the range of the group’s scores on that variable also influences strategic choice through its effects on conflict and the generation of alternatives.” (Hambrick and Mason 1984:202)

“Ratees tend to receive higher ratings from raters of the same race, although situational factors may moderate this effect” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:56)

“The best estimate of the population effect size… for white raters… was .183… indicating that white raters assigned significantly higher ratings to white ratees than to Black ratees” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:59)

“Transforming the corrected r to d suggests an alternate but compatible interpretation: The average white ratee received a more favorable evaluation from white raters than 64% of the Black ratees” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:59)

“The meta-analysis also shows that saliency of Blacks in the workgroup may be a moderator. Race effects decline as the percentage of Blacks increase” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:61)

“Ratings of Black ratees are more related to objective performance measures than white ratees” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:62)

“Differences in performance might occur over time because the nondominant culture (e.g., Black culture) may not share the common values, perceptions, and institutions of the dominant mainstream culture that defines effectiveness” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:62)

“Ratees tend to receive higher ratings from raters of the same race, although situational factors may moderate this effect.” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:56)

“The best estimate of the population effect size... for white raters... was .183... indicating that white raters assigned significantly higher ratings to white ratees than to Black ratees. Transforming the corrected r to d suggests an alternate but compatible interpretation: The average white ratee received a more favorable evaluation from white raters than 64% of the Black ratees.” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:59)

“The meta-analysis also shows that saliency of Blacks in the workgroup may be a moderator. Race effects decline as the percentage of Blacks increase.” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:61)

“In terms of differential weighting of factors, Bass and Turner (1973), Campbell et al. (1973) and others have provided evidence that ratings of Black ratees are more related to objective performance measures than white ratees.” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:62)

“Differences in performance might occur over time because the nondominant culture (e.g., Black culture) may not share the common values, perceptions, and institutions of the dominant mainstream culture that defines effectiveness. From an organizational perspective, Ilgen and Youtz (1984) have suggested that lost opportunity factors such as the lack of mentors for Blacks, ingroup/outgroup effects..., and self-limiting behaviors perpetuate performance differences between Black and white group members.” (Kraiger and Ford 1985:62)

“The greater the dissimilarity in demographic background between a superior and a subordinate, the more negative will be such job outcomes as performance, affect expressed by the superior toward the subordinate, and role ambiguity and conflict as experienced by the subordinate.” (Tsui and O’Reilly 1989:405)

“Black subordinates were rated lower in effectiveness, were liked less well, and reported a higher level of role ambiguity than did white subordinates.” (Tsui and O’Reilly 1989:417)

“Results show particularly strong effects in mixed-gender dyads and dyads of people with different job tenures... Results on tenure differences in the dyads also provided insight... Subordinates with shorter job tenure than their superiors received the most favorable affect ratings of all subordinates.” (Tsui and O’Reilly 1989:417–18)

“The findings on race... suggest a possible reason for lower ratings in mixed-race dyads. Subordinates in mixed-race dyads, especially white subordinates with black superiors, reported role ambiguity and conflict... Communication and status incongruence problems in mixed-race dyads may explain these findings.” (Tsui and O’Reilly 1989:418)

“We postulated that demographic similarity would be associated with attitudinal and value similarity, which may enhance interpersonal attraction and increased frequency of communication. Communication can in turn reduce role ambiguity. The study showed direct links between demographic similarity and interpersonal attraction...” (Tsui and O’Reilly 1989:420)

“Nonminority owners of small businesses are found to exclude minority employees (including blacks, Asians, and Latinos) quite often while black owners—even when their firms are located outside of minority communities—consistently employ minorities. Affirmative action employment policies are of little help in combatting the aversion many nonminority small business owners exhibit to employing minorities. Negative white attitudes towards blacks show up regularly in survey data: 65 percent of whites, for example, characterize blacks as lazier than whites. Neckerman and Kirshenman have shown that race serves as a signal of presumed work habits and job suitability for many employers, based upon their general negative stereotypes of blacks.” (Bates 1994:1)

“The key finding of this study is that minorities are largely excluded from the payrolls of nonminority-owned small businesses. Even those white-owned small business employers whose firms are physically located in inner-city minority communities employ a work force that is predominantly white. Roughly one third of all such firms in minority neighborhoods employ no minorities whatsoever. Black-owned firms operating in inner-city neighborhoods, in contrast, employ a labor force that consists almost entirely of minority workers. This study finds that 96.2 percent of the black employer firms operating in urban minority communities rely upon a work force composed largely of minorities. While black firms located outside of minority neighborhoods rely largely upon minority workers, most white-owned businesses in these same areas have no minority employees.” (Bates 1994:2)

“Small businesses that utilize paid employees are overwhelmingly owned by nonminorities. Among the very small firms in this sector, employees are most commonly either members of the immediate family, relatives, or friends. Employees are likely to be members of social networks that are family based; blacks are not likely to be included in the applicable networks.” (Bates 1994:4)

“The relevance of social networks to job access helps to explain why the racial composition of the workforce employed by black-owned businesses differs so profoundly from that employed by nonminority enterprises. These small firms largely draw employees from family-based networks, and blacks are commonly not members of these networks. For essentially the same reasons, black-owned firms employ a labor force consisting almost entirely of minority workers.” (Bates 1994:5)

“These figures certainly reveal very clear-cut differences in the employment patterns of black- and nonminority-owned small businesses operating in major urban areas. While over 93 percent of the black business employers rely upon minorities to fill 50 percent or more of their available jobs, nearly 60 percent of the nonminority employers have no minority employees.” (Bates 1994:6)

“The evidence presented herein—whites tend to employ whites while blacks tend not to employ whites—is consistent with the hypothesis that the network-hiring propensities of small business owners tend to limit the employment alternatives of black job seekers. Underrepresentation of African-Americans in the ranks of small-business ownership potentially becomes a major obstacle to black job seekers in a world where 1) new job opportunities are increasingly likely to be found in the small-business sector, and 2) white owners of small businesses prefer to draw their employees from networks that contain few blacks.” (Bates 1994:119)

“A central assumption of much of the previous research on race differences is that the process by which Blacks and Whites advance in the workplace is race blind so that if Blacks and Whites had the same amount of education and job experience and were located across the same bureaucratized structures, the gap in Black-White attainment in the workplace would disappear. The authors argue that to understand the systematic differences in Black-White outcomes in the workplace, we need to reexamine this assumption.” (Baldi and McBrier 1997:478)

“Our results indicate that the determinants of promotion systematically differ for Blacks and Whites. The rules to get ahead differ for Black and White workers. In terms of promotion opportunities, Black workers are harmed from being in a firm with a high percentage of minority employees or in a firm with an internal labor market. However, they do benefit from having more education. On the other hand, White workers do not appear to be affected in any way by either a high percentage of minority employees or more education. Rather, it is location in a firm with an internal labor market that increases their promotion likelihoods.” (Baldi and McBrier 1997:490-491)

“Above all, our results indicate that the direct effect of race persists. Black workers are significantly less likely to be promoted than are White workers with similar levels of education and work experience and in firms with similar characteristics and organizational environments. In addition, not only are Black workers disadvantaged in the promotion process because of the color of their skin, but they also are treated unequally relative to Whites in terms of payoff for education, the benefits of working in a firm with an internal labor market, and the effect of an increased minority presence within a firm.” (Baldi and McBrier 1997:492)

“The positive effect of education for Blacks but not for Whites suggests that different criteria may be applied when assessing the ‘promotability’ of Black and White workers. Supervisors may use a sponsorship model for Whites in which education is used only as a screening device at job entry (but has little relevance for future advancement) and use a contest model for Blacks in which education is seen as a prerequisite for getting ahead in a firm.” (Baldi and McBrier 1997:492)

“Our finding of a negative effect of increased minority presence on promotion for Blacks may be of special interest to those favoring governmental pressures to increase the hiring of Blacks so as to redress or eliminate racial discrimination at the hiring stage. Our results indicate that firms that discriminate less in hiring may increase their percentages of minority employees but that as this representation increases, Blacks may be penalized in terms of promotion opportunities.” (Baldi and McBrier 1997:493)

“The findings provide support for the particularistic mobility thesis. In particular, African Americans, relative to Whites, attain both occupational categories on the basis of a narrow and circumscribed route: for African Americans, the acquisition of significant human capital credentials and experience at a similar level in the occupational structure in next-to-last job with the same employer are important prerequisites for moving into privileged occupations. Furthermore, analyses indicate that particularistic employment practices are more pronounced in the private than the public sector.” (Wilson et al. 1999:165)

“Existing research on racial stratification in upper-tier occupations has focused on a range of critical issues. Specifically, one line of studies has documented the discriminatory placement of African American managers and supervisors in politically induced, ‘racialized’ job functions that offer racially delineated and marginalized mobility tracks within White management hierarchies (Brown & Erie, 1981; Collins, 1983, 1989, 1993; Durr & Logan, 1997; Moore, 1981).” (Wilson et al. 1999:166)

“Race emerges as a basis for access to predominantly White institutions and actors, which facilitates opportunities to demonstrate job-relevant criteria. For example, both Braddock and McPartland (1987) and Fernandez (1975, 1981) argue that African Americans, unlike Whites, disproportionately rely on racially segregated job networks, which precludes them from engaging in the informal interactions with Whites that serve as a means of demonstrating the crucial personal qualities necessary for promotion into top positions.” (Wilson et al. 1999:168)

“Lacking opportunities to demonstrate personal characteristics, African Americans can be judged only on the basis of formal and deterministic criteria. In this regard two findings should emerge: first, African Americans relative to whites, should be evaluated for promotion into positions of job authority on the basis of more traditional, individualistic characteristics including educational attainment, labor force experience and tenure with employer. Second, African Americans’ movement through the occupational structure into authority positions should be more ordered than for whites.” (Wilson et al. 1999:170)

“The findings concerning the interaction terms for race and variables that measure human capital characteristics and path to promotion are consistent with the interpretation that African Americans reach both upper-tier occupational categories on the basis of a closer scrutiny of formal credentials and related experience at a similar level in the occupational structure... The pattern of significance among the race interactions with variables that measure path to promotion closely indicate that, relative to Whites, African Americans attain both upper-tier occupational categories through a process of ordered and gradual movement through the occupational structure.” (Wilson et al. 1999:175, 178)

“In contrast, Whites are not similarly handicapped. They attain upper-tier occupations in at least two ways: like African Americans, through a relatively formal process, and also through a variety of informal means not available to African Americans. Overall, the greater range of options available to Whites would seem to broaden the supply of both prospective employers and available occupational positions.” (Wilson et al. 1999:180)

“Black managers reported a slower rate of promotion and less psychosocial support than white managers. Race had both a direct and an indirect effect on these outcomes. Participation in company training significantly predicted reported promotion rates, but race remained a significant predictor. Additional analysis revealed that race moderates the relationship between human capital and promotion rate and suggests a type of treatment discrimination against blacks.” (James 2000:493)

“At the group level, discrimination can be understood with respect to what Halaby (1979) and Tomaskovic-Devy (1993) called social closure practices. From an organizational perspective, discrimination can result from unconscious institutionalized practices and structural barriers (Kanter 1977, Lefkowitz 1994).” (James 2000:494)

“The behavior of the majority group, in this case, represents treatment discrimination in that minorities are treated differently than the majority, and such differential treatment adversely affects the underrepresented group in terms of performance and the distribution of organizational rewards... This is important because even blacks with supervisory status are less likely to be concentrated in the more powerful line positions, which is important for occupational mobility (Nkomo and Cox 1990). In addition, black mentors and supervisors are less likely than their white peers to command the respect deemed necessary to advocate for their subordinates and proteges (Dreher and Cox 1996).” (James 2000:495)

“Blacks have also been denied access to organizational opportunities such as promotions, salary increases, and challenging job assignments (Cancio et al. 1996, Dreher and Cox 1996, Greenhaus et al. 1990, Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). Such denial is representative of treatment discrimination from a social closure perspective.” (James 2000:495)

“In sum, the data indicate that, controlling for sex, age, position, and performance, race had a direct effect such that black managers reported slower promotion rates and less support than whites.” (James 2000:501)

“The data suggest that to some extent both race-based (e.g., treatment discrimination) and non-race-based (e.g., human and social capital) explanations contributed to the variance in reported work-related experiences and outcomes. The findings also imply that rather than a single system of promotion that operates in the same way for blacks and whites, there may be a race-specific model of workplace attainment, wherein the determinants of promotion differ for blacks and whites (Baldi and McBrier 1997)... The finding that there is a differential payoff for training suggests that human capital rewards are more likely to be applied to white managers than to blacks. Thus, human capital does not appear to be a meaningful consideration in determining black employees’ promotability, yet it is in determining the promotability of whites.” (James 2000:504)

“The analyses indicate that women and people of color had network members with lower status than men and Whites because they occupied positions that limited their access to and ability to attract powerful employees. The author concludes that structural rather than personal exclusion explains race/ethnic and sex differences in the status of network members.” (McGuire 2000:501)

“High-status employees occupy central positions within their networks that facilitate their access to resources... Employees’ advancement also depends on the status of their network members (Brass, 1985; Higginbotham & Weber, 1999; Jackall, 1988; Kanter, 1977).

High-status network members can advocate for employees in controversial situations and help employees bypass the corporate hierarchy, allowing them to complete their work quickly. Having high-status contacts also provides employees with reflected power, which is power that is obtained by being associated with influential individuals (Kanter, 1977). In sum, having high-status network members is pivotal for employees’ acquisition of resources and power in work organizations.” (McGuire 2000:502)

“Status construction theory suggests that workers do take each others’ gender, race, and ethnicity into account when forming networks... Because people’s resources are related to their gender and race/ethnicity, workers may assume that individuals’ gender and race/ethnicity reflect their ability and worth. These beliefs about competence, known as status value beliefs, differentiate and rank people based on their group membership, such as their race and sex (Ridgeway, 1991).” (McGuire 2000:505)

“Being Black was significantly correlated with all five determinants, but its highest correlations were with organizational rank (r = –.26, p < .05) and control over resources (r = –.21, p < .05). Thus, Blacks had network members with lower status than Whites mainly because they occupied positions with lower organizational rank and that gave them less control over corporate resources than Whites.” (McGuire 2000:516)

“My results suggest that structural exclusion is critical to understanding why women and people of color had network members with lower status than men and Whites, as predicted by network theory... The significant interaction between employees’ sex, race/ethnicity, and organizational rank means that women of color were particularly disadvantaged in regards to their hierarchical positions at U.S. Finance. This finding is consistent with research showing that women of color receive fewer returns to authority from their credentials than White women, men of color, and White men (McGuire & Reskin, 1993).” (McGuire 2000:517)

“Statistical results indicate that African-American public accounting employees are less likely to obtain an informal mentor and perceive greater barriers to obtaining mentors. For two mentoring functions (protection and assistance, and social support), African-American respondents reported lower levels of support, compared to Caucasian respondents. Also, African-American respondents indicated stronger intentions to leave public accounting.” (Viator 2001:541)

“Since development of informal mentoring relationships relies on individual behavior (i.e. potential mentors and protégés observe each other over time as relationships form), African-American employees are likely to have limited access to informal mentoring relationships if majority members hold prejudice-related attitudes. In such an environment, formal mentoring programs are one alternative for providing African-American employees with mentoring support. However, formally assigned mentors tend to provide less support than informal mentors.” (Viator 2001:542)

“These processes include: (1) shared identity and interpersonal comfort; (2) stereotyping and perceived competence; and (3) visibility and performance pressures... A shared social identity is less likely to occur when potential mentors and protégés are from different power groups (Deschamps, 1982), such as those attributed to racial and ethnic background. For example, when Caucasian male managers and African-American senior accountants in the public accounting firms have different social and economic backgrounds they may simply not perceive the other as an extension of himself/herself. Absent a shared identity, potential cross-racial mentors and protégés have less of a basis for developing mentoring relationships.” (Viator 2001:543)

“Racial and gender-based stereotyping negatively influences majority members’ perception of minority members’ competence (Pettigrew & Martin, 1987). Effective performance by minority members is likely to be discounted and attributed to help from others, rather than internal ability and effort (Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1993).” (Viator 2001:543)

“The relatively small number of African Americans in the accounting profession and the dominance of Caucasian males in upper management positions (AICPA, 1997; Hammond, 1997; Mitchell & Flintall, 1990) demands that African-American employees enter diversified relationships to obtain mentoring support. The perceptual and behavioral processes described above suggest that African-American public accounting employees are likely to encounter barriers to diversified mentoring relationships.” (Viator 2001:544)

“In both regression analyses, the beta coefficients for African-American seniors were positive and statistically significant... indicating that African-American seniors perceived more barriers to obtaining a mentor than did the comparison group of Caucasian seniors.” (Viator 2001:551)

“African Americans who indicated having mentors reported levels of career support and psychosocial support that tended to be less than that reported by their Caucasian counterparts, and were statistically significant for two functions: protection and assistance, and social support. It is important to note that lower levels of mentoring support were found after controlling for other variables that can contribute to differences in mentoring support: employee gender, mentor gender, mentor rank, length of mentoring relationship, and type of mentoring relationship (i.e. formal versus informal).” (Viator 2001:555)

“I found that even when Black and white women had jobs in which they controlled organizational resources and had ties to powerful employees, they received less work-related help from their network members than did white men. Drawing on status characteristics theory, I explain that network members were less likely to invest in women than in white men because of cultural beliefs that rank women below that of white men.” (McGuire 2002:303)

“The benefits of having informal networks are not the same for women and men workers, however. Women are less likely than men to have high-status network members and to have diverse networks (Brass 1985; Campbell 1988; Ibarra 1992; McGuire 2000; Moore 1992; Scott 1996)... Having a network composed of diverse and powerful members is critical for employees’ acquisition of resources and power in work organizations.” (McGuire 2002:304)

“Status characteristics theory suggests that workers do take each other’s gender, race, and ethnicity into account when forming networks... workers also evaluate each other based on the resources their gender is assumed to have—the more resources a group is assumed to possess, the more competent its members are assumed to be (Ridgeway 1991, 1997; Thye 2000). Because women tend to hold positions with lower rank and less control over resources than men do, workers assume that women are less competent than men (Martin 1985; Ridgeway 1997; Ridgeway et al. 1998). Scholars refer to these generalizations about group members’ worth as status value beliefs.” (McGuire 2002:305)

“Model 4 shows that white and Black women received less help from their network members than white men did, net of their structural characteristics, contrary to hypothesis 1... In sum, these results support hypothesis 2—women, regardless of their race, received less instrumental help from their network members than men did simply because of their gender.” (McGuire 2002:315)

“Women may have been perceived by network members as poor or risky investments because of cultural beliefs that ranked them below that of white men, according to status characteristics theory. As a result, network members may have believed that their helpful efforts should be directed at white men, whom they perceived as having the potential to be successful.” (McGuire 2002:314)

“In conclusion, sociological research warns us that the use of informal procedures to hire, to evaluate, and to reward workers tends to advantage workers already in privileged positions (Braddock and McPartland 1987; Reskin and McBrier 2000). Formal work procedures that are consistently enforced, and for which managers are accountable, in contrast, could help to distribute organizational resources more equally (Bielby 2000; Heilman 1995; Reskin 2000). My results suggest that this strategy would be of particular help to Black men, whose informal disadvantages are rooted in their unequal access to formal positions. Formalizing work procedures would not be sufficient to alter the instrumental help that Black and white women receive from their informal networks, however. According to Ridgeway (1997), the process of gender categorization sustains status value beliefs even when the structural conditions that bolster such beliefs change.” (McGuire 2002:318)

“In Western societies, few women and people of color hold top management positions in work organizations… the proportion of women in corporate officer positions in Fortune 500 corporations is only 13%, and the proportion of people of color is less than 5% for both male and female senior executives. Such statistics suggest that a ‘glass ceiling’ may be restricting the access of women and people of color to the executive ranks.” (Powell and Butterfield 2002:397)

“White men, the dominant group in such societies, seek to preserve their power and authority as individual decision makers by consciously discriminating against women and people of color when making promotion decisions for top management positions… all-White-male teams of decision makers consciously discriminate in the same manner.” (Powell and Butterfield 2002:400)

“Kanter (1977), in her analysis of promotion processes in a large corporation, characterized the results of such a preference as ‘homosocial reproduction.’ She argued that the primary motivation of corporate managers is to minimize uncertainty… One way to reduce uncertainty in the executive suite is for the predominantly White male occupants to close it to people who are different from themselves in highly visible and immutable demographic characteristics such as race and gender.” (Powell and Butterfield 2002:401)

“Status characteristics theory… suggests that people form expectations about the competence of others based either on information about their past performance or inferences from the status value assigned by the society as a whole to their personal characteristics. Status value is assigned to a personal characteristic when consensual societal beliefs suggest that people who have one state of the characteristic are more worthy than those with a different state of the characteristic… White people and men are held in higher honor and esteem and seen as more able and competent than people of color and women respectively, thereby granting them higher social status.” (Powell and Butterfield 2002:403)

“Decisions by teams reflect the personal preferences of individual high status members, which in turn may be influenced by processes of similarity and attraction, social identification, and other cognitive processes. Women and people of color are especially likely to be granted low status in decision-making teams… decisions by teams reflect the personal preferences of individual high status members… team decisions favor applicants for top management positions who hold the highest status in the given society, for example, White male applicants in Western societies.” (Powell and Butterfield 2002:403)

“The finding that effects of applicant race and gender were present for referral decisions by homogeneous panels but not diverse panels was a unique contribution of the study… Decisions by homogeneous panels favored female applicants and disfavored African American male applicants, whereas decisions by diverse panels did not favor or disfavor any race/ gender group of applicants.” (Powell and Butterfield 2002:419)

“At its core, the UE [upper echelons] perspective centers on executive cognitions, values, and perceptions and their influence on the process of strategic choice and resultant performance outcomes. Because executive cognitions, values, and perceptions are difficult to measure, the UE perspective invokes prior research on demography to suggest that managerial characteristics are reasonable proxies for underlying differences in cognitions, values, and perceptions.” (Carpenter et al. 2004:750)

“These three central tenets frame the UE proposition that an organization and its performance will be a reflection of its top managers and provide a basis for studying underlying team dynamics by demographic proxy.” (Carpenter et al. 2004:752)

“In terms of application, the empirical definition of the top management team varies considerably more than does its conceptual definition... While some claim that the differences in how top management teams are measured may account for inconsistent findings in the current literature, perhaps a more striking observation is that studies using a variety of measures have reported significant associations between top management team characteristics and important firm outcomes.” (Carpenter et al. 2004:759)

“Another critical insight offered by recent research is new understanding of the link between TMT demography and TMT process. Whereas the original H&M model argued that team demography will proxy well for cognitive processes that shape strategic decision making, scholars have unveiled a wealth of evidence indicating that other team processes are likewise impacted. In some cases, these alternative processes, including communication and debate, mediate the effect of demography on strategic choice; in others, they serve as a separate mechanism ultimately impacting firm performance.” (Carpenter et al. 2004:768)

“Race and gender, too, represent relatively recent and needed innovations in the characteristics that upper echelons research encompasses (Richard et al., 2004; Westphal & Milton, 2000).” (Carpenter et al. 2004:771)

“Finally, it is critical to recall that the practice of using demographic proxies is only a methodological convenience. Demography is used to proxy larger, complex, and hard-to-get-at constructs. Demography itself is not the key theoretical driver of strategic processes and choices. Rather, the theoretical model posits that cognitions, values, and perceptions affect strategic choice.” (Carpenter et al. 2004:772)

“The racial segregation of employment is a pervasive feature of the U.S. labor market and an important source of social inequality. … Incumbents of jobs dominated by nonwhites receive lower pay … and have higher turnover rates and lower promotion rates than incumbents of jobs dominated by whites.” (Sørensen 2004:627)

“Segregation may be reproduced through the use of informal hiring practices, particularly hiring through employee social networks. Personal networks play an important role in the job search process … and tend to be highly segregated by race.” (Sørensen 2004:633)

“A large number of studies indicate that demographic heterogeneity, particularly with respect to easily observable characteristics, lowers individual attachment to the group and thus increases turnover rates. … Several studies look specifically at the impact of racial diversity in work groups and generally find that higher levels of diversity predict lower attachment. … Racial heterogeneity in work groups also appears to be related to lower reported job satisfaction.” (Sørensen 2004:635)

“Social categorization theory argues that people construct social identities by using salient social categories to define others as either similar to or different from themselves. … Since race is a salient social category in the contemporary United States, higher levels of same-race representation in a work group should be associated with more positive sentiments toward coworkers and greater job attachment.” (Sørensen 2004:636)

“In summary, whether the emphasis is on avoidance of people of a different race (as in social categorization theory) or on attraction to similar others (as in similarity/attraction theory), organizational demography research suggests that differences in turnover rates can be attributed to the racial composition of the group. The greater the same-race representation, the lower the turnover rate.” (Sørensen 2004:637)

“The central finding is that the effects of group racial composition on turnover are path dependent. Groups have demographic histories, and these histories have consequences for individuals. … Turnover does respond to declines in same-race representation, however, suggesting that employees are more sensitive to losses. Phrased more starkly, things can only get worse: changes in same-race representation can only lead to declines in attachment.” (Sørensen 2004:660)

“Employers wishing to achieve and maintain integrated workplaces could benefit from focusing on managing the turnover process. … Turnover increases in response to declines in same-race representation, which come about through the hiring of someone of a different race than the employee who departed. … This interdependence between hiring and turnover is a source of the fragility of integration, which suggests that hiring needs to be thought of in terms of its potential impact on turnover rates.” (Sørensen 2004:666-667)

“Recent studies have consistently found that in the United States, black job applicants are hired at a greater rate by establishments with black hiring agents than by those with white hiring agents. The results of this examination of data from the 1992-94 Multi-City Employer Survey suggest two proximate reasons for this pattern: black hiring agents receive applications from blacks at greater rates than do white hiring agents, and they hire a greater proportion of blacks who apply. The authors suggest that moving more blacks into positions with hiring authority within firms might help to alleviate the persistent unemployment difficulties of African Americans.” (Stoll et al. 2004:267)

“We document and explore an empirical observation that has received less attention: establishments where blacks are in charge of hiring are considerably more likely to employ African Americans than are establishments in which whites are in charge of hiring.” (Stoll et al. 2004:267)

“We explore this empirical regularity by analyzing the individual steps of the hiring process and the role of the race of the hiring agent. … Black hiring agents receive applications from blacks at greater rates than do white hiring agents, and they hire a greater proportion of blacks who apply.” (Stoll et al. 2004:268)

“These factors are also likely to influence where blacks apply for jobs. Informal and formal recruiting efforts that tap into predominantly black social networks should generate relatively large numbers of black applications. Furthermore, black applicants may take into account their a priori perceptions concerning the likelihood of being treated fairly in the application process and therefore apply to firms where they may face less discrimination—for example, firms in which blacks already hold positions of authority.” (Stoll et al. 2004:268)

“The patterns consistently indicate that firms with black hiring agents are more likely to hire black workers out of the available applicant pool than are firms with white or non-black minority hiring agents. Moreover, this conditional hiring rate is well below 1 for firms with white or non-black minority agents, indicating a relative disinclination to hire black applicants.” (Stoll et al. 2004:273)

“The host of firm, employer preference, and job-specific characteristics account for about 37% more of the black hiring agent effect on the last hired worker who is black than does Model 1. Still, even after we account for these factors, employers with black hiring agents are 9 percentage points more likely than those with white hiring agents to hire African Americans.” (Stoll et al. 2004:280)

“Nonetheless, our results suggest that, in the private sector, an increased presence of blacks in positions with hiring authority might substantially increase the employment rates of blacks. At a minimum, the results imply that the potential positive effects of having more blacks in positions with hiring authority should at least be considered as we debate the merits of various policy options, such as stronger enforcement of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) laws or the continued existence of Affirmative Action requirements on government contractors, that are designed to raise the employment rates and earnings of blacks.” (Stoll et al. 2004:284)

“There is substantial evidence suggesting that women and racial minorities are underrepresented in upper management. For instance, women make up only 34% of ‘officials and managers’ in U.S. corporations, whereas they constitute 47% of the private workforce. Also concerning are the low numbers of racial minorities in management, where only 15% of ‘officials and managers’ are members of a minority group, yet they constitute 30% of the private U.S. workforce (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2001). ... Segregation perpetuates itself because of ‘homosocial reproduction,’ where individuals hire and promote those who are like themselves, thereby resulting in fewer opportunities for individuals who are different from the people in power (Kanter, 1977; Perry et al., 1994; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989). Furthermore, a lack of diverse representation at high levels makes it more likely that the organizational culture is monolithic (Cox, 1994) or defined by cultural norms associated with white, heterosexual, able-bodied males who have access to powerful others (i.e., the dominant coalition; Brass, 1985).” (Gelfand et al. 2005:9)

“Racial minorities often lack access to informal social networks in organizations because participation in informal groups is influenced by sociocultural similarity or ‘homophily’ (Ibarra, 1993). ... The result of segregated networks is that women and racial minorities tend to be less central to the networks of the dominant coalition and hence receive fewer favorable organizational outcomes such as access to information about jobs, organizational status, and mobility (Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989; Seidel, Polzer, & Stewart, 2000).” (Gelfand et al. 2005:11)

“Organizational cultures are not neutral with regard to what types of employees fit and which employee behaviors are valued. Organizational leaders hold stereotypes with regard to which types of employees are best and they tend to reward employees who behave most consistently with their stereotypes (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). Such discriminatory cultural beliefs, values and assumptions may be manifested in cultural artifacts such as behavioral norms, HR practices, and physical arrangements.” (Gelfand et al. 2005:12)

“At the highest levels of leadership in organizations, the CEO, the Top Management Team (TMT), and the corporate board are instrumental in determining the direction that the organization will take with regard to diversity and discrimination. ... The extent to which leaders choose to emphasize inclusiveness in the organization’s strategy and the extent to which resources ... are devoted to eliminating all forms of discrimination are indicators of leaders’ priorities, and indicate which ‘types’ of employees are valued.” (Gelfand et al. 2005:13-14)

“If most supervisors are white, male, able-bodied, and heterosexual, these negative attitudes and the similarity-attraction effect may lead to systematic biases against those who are different. ... In other words, personnel decisions (selection, promotion) in a single department may not appear discriminatory, yet in the aggregate across an entire organization where this same process occurs repeatedly, the end result is organizational-level patterns of discrimination.” (Gelfand et al. 2005:15)

“One important type of climate that is highly relevant for discrimination is an organization’s diversity climate, for organizations with positive climates for diversity are likely to exhibit lower levels of discrimination due to their heightened sensitivity and commitment to issues having to do with managing a diverse workforce (Cox, 1994). ... Research has found, for example, that diversity climate perceptions vary along gender and racial lines, with women and racioethnic minorities perceiving lower levels of inclusion, bias in informal processes, lost opportunities due to bias, and insufficient attention paid to diversity (Kossek & Zonia, 1993; Mor Barak, Cherin, & Berkman, 1998).” (Gelfand et al. 2005:23)

“I argue that white places are formed through a process of whitewashing, which simultaneously denies race and superimposes white culture. Whitewashing wields language and invisibility to deny race and promote a particular kind of multiculturalism, while cloaking the workplace in a culture of informality and business politics. The whitewashed workplace, like a whitewashed wall, is seen as colorless rather than white as white culture becomes universalized as high-tech culture.” (Reitman 2006:267)

“The ability to create and maintain public and private white space has been one of the most powerful expressions of white privilege over the past century in the United States... white space remains understudied. In this paper, I choose to interrogate the workplace as a site rich with meaningful relationships and power politics that directly affects the material experiences of its participants through hiring, firing and promotion (Wilson 1996).” (Reitman 2006:268)

“Just as the purpose of whitewashing a wall is to ‘wash away’ undesired markings, the purpose of whitewashing the workplace is to ‘wash away’ undesired racial politics. The method chosen to ‘wash’ a wall is to cover the markings with white paint; the method chosen to ‘wash’ the workplace is to deny that racial politics exist and to cover them with white culture. As an end result, just as the whitewashed wall is seen as clean even though it is covered in white paint, the whitewashed workplace is seen as colorless even though it is fully immersed in white culture.” (Reitman 2006:268)

“White employees’ language choices also deny race by focusing on multiple heritages instead of explicit racial identifiers. Mary Waters (1990) labels this type of white identity ‘symbolic ethnicity’. She argues that contrary to other racial identities, white ethnicity is voluntary, costless and allows whites to express both individuality and community membership. I argue this symbolic ethnicity also allows whites to deny their racial identity and privilege... In choosing to self-identify in these ways, white participants used language to whitewash racial dynamics from the workplace.” (Reitman 2006:273)“Promoting high-tech ‘global village’ multiculturalism whitewashes highly problematic racial dynamics... This debate also represents a system of racial triangulation, in which the competition for software jobs is staged between African Americans and Asians, while the white dominance of technical and non-technical occupations is less apparent... The type of multiculturalism espoused by the software workplace thereby ‘washes away’ the dynamics of racial inequality and white privilege in favor of a harmonious global village.” (Reitman 2006:274-275)

“Informal culture in the workplace was maintained by and for whites, leaving those not identified as white to observe from the outside or participate in ways defined by their white colleagues.” (Reitman 2006:277)

“My findings show the white workplace is created and maintained through a process of whitewashing in which everyday practices seek to deny racial politics, superimpose white culture and normalize that culture in place... What distinguishes white places from those associated with oppressed racial groups is that they are constructed through a denial of identity rather than its explicit portrayal. It is this denial that makes these places so important to reveal.” (Reitman 2006:279)

“Our field can speak to this issue as long as we restrict our notion of race to that of an individual-level property that moderates career outcomes and the relationship between a firm and its employees. ... We have yet to conduct research that seeks to understand race as a complete social structural system that leaves its mark on various levels of analyses. I use the remainder of this essay to suggest that race has broad ranging importance for strategic organization research. In particular, I concentrate on race’s ability to seep into organizational society through political and ideological imperatives that ultimately alter the demography of organizations as well as the strategy formulation and implementation processes in organizations.” (Wooten 2006:191)

“We have unnecessarily conceptualized race as a construct that operates only on the individual, that is, individuals have race and this influences their careers, or firms must employ individuals of a certain race. We should also seek to understand race as diffuse property that operates at many levels. From this perspective, organizations can have an identity tied to race (Dutton and Dukerich, 1991), organizations can participate in the process of developing shared meanings about race (Zucker, 1977) and the meanings associated with race can provide organizations with a repertoire of suitable strategies (Swidler, 1986).” (Wooten 2006:193)

“Racial ideology becomes institutionalized in organizational life through the development of local, state and national-level policies that structure an organization’s operating environment. Public policy has both organizational and strategic consequences. Such policies have direct implications for all the constructs (e.g. competition, transaction costs, resource dependence, agency costs) that we as scholars hold out as important for understanding various organizational outcomes, such as birth, death, growth, mergers, acquisitions and alliances.” (Wooten 2006:193-194)

“The US adopted the practice of separating the races very early in its history and the policies associated with these practices led to the proliferation of what I call ‘racialized’ organizations, organizations created to sustain the racial separation ideologies that so permeated American economic, cultural, and political systems throughout much of the country’s history. ... What separates those organizations and fields that failed from those that did not? Our current organizational theories would point us down the path of competition, transactions and dependence to explain why certain organizations survive and others do not, without a proper understanding of the way in which race can set the terms of competition, influence the efficiency of transactions and mitigate dependence among organizations.” (Wooten 2006:194-195)

“Racial ideology and the policies that flow from it socially regulate firms and shape the context in which a firm conducts its business operations. ... Omi and Winant (1986) posited that states design their social and economic institutions to produce policies inherently biased toward the racial group in power. Throughout US history this led to the construction of policies that supported the rights of people from the Anglo-Saxon diaspora to the detriment of people from other groups (Omi and Winant, 1986).” (Wooten 2006:196)

“While scholars have devoted much attention to understanding how political and economic structures such as democracy, capitalism, socialism and communism have affected the strategic and organizational development of society, we have devoted less attention to understanding how the social structures of race have influenced the strategies and structures of organizations. And yet the use of race as a system to allocate wealth, power and property predates many of the more often studied political and economic systems.” (Wooten 2006:197)

“Net of establishment and labor market-level controls, the likelihood that an establishment exhibits a significant underrepresentation of blacks in management is substantially increased when it operates in a high-proportion black labor market context.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:181)

“Much of this research operates with an implicit or explicit presumption that the mechanisms for producing inequality are to be found in relations and practices within establishments, especially the actions of managers.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:182)“Our principal concern is the association of MA population proportion black and managerial underrepresentation, and here the regression results ... are clear: on all four measures, black managerial underrepresentation is predicted to be more likely in local labor markets with a greater concentration of black residents. The size of the net effect of black labor market concentration is substantial in all four models.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:192)

“Clearly, black workers are more likely to find themselves concentrated under the authority of nonrepresentative management structures in labor markets with larger black populations.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:195)

“Even though black workers may have a greater absolute presence in higher-status jobs in high proportion black areas, they may in fact be subject to increased discrimination in such a context, resulting in stronger race-based social closure processes (Tomaskovic-Devey 1993) and overall lower odds of attaining managerial positions.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:194)

Rationale: This quote emphasizes that increased Black presence does not translate into increased Black authority or power—demonstrating the invisible credentialing function of whiteness even in diverse contexts, enforced by upper echelon closure.

“Ely (1995) argues that the presence of women in the upper echelons of organizations reduces the persistence of sex as a salient category for all workers, thereby weakening some of the negative consequences associated with gender imbalance (e.g., performance pressures, stereotyped role encapsulation, and exclusion from work-related networks). She demonstrates that the demographic composition of those holding powerful positions in organizations can have substantial effects on all workers, not just those holding positions at or near the top of organizational hierarchies.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:683)

“These studies imply that there is less gender inequality under conditions of greater female representation (and higher status) in management. This may result from several distinct mechanisms, including increased access to organizational resources and power, homophily preferences, support for equity efforts, and weaker sex-based biases against female workers.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:683)

“Regardless of how female managers might reduce inequality, their impact may depend critically on their status (Denmark 1993). Even highly motivated female managers working together may not be able to influence gender inequality if they are relatively powerless. Both the identity/loyalty issue and the question of managerial power highlight the possibility of substantial interactions between the representation of women and their relative status.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:685)

“The net result is that female managers are associated with a reduced gender wage gap especially when those female managers hold relatively high-status positions. ... Net of controls at all three levels, the higher presence of female managers in local industries is associated with a reduced gender wage gap among nonmanagerial workers only where those managers hold relatively high-status positions.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:697-698)

“Our analysis shows that simply looking at the percentage of females among managers is not enough if one is interested in the effects of managerial access. In this case, including the relative status of female managers is necessary—this assertion garners strong support from our multivariate results.” (Cohen and Huffman 2007:700)

“Findings from these studies suggest that racial/ethnic and gender differences in workplace authority follow consistent patterns across studies, time, and even country: Women and racial/ethnic minorities have less authority on the job than white men, and when women and minorities hold positions of authority, they do so at lower levels of organizations. Furthermore, they receive lower returns for their positions than white men.” (DiTomaso et al. 2007:5)

“Social closure has since been conceptualized as the collective action of various social groups used as a mechanism to hoard opportunities or economic advantages with the consequence of generating and reproducing inequality, especially by race/ethnicity and sex.” (DiTomaso et al. 2007:6)

“The exclusion from training has been a common theme for women and minorities who have tried to gain access to jobs from which they have previously been excluded.” (DiTomaso et al. 2007:6)

“The power structure of an organization may affect the extent to which minority managers at any organizational level have power and autonomy when it comes to control over budgets, final hiring authority, or profit and loss responsibilities.” (DiTomaso et al. 2007:18)

“The unevenness of different categories of people across jobs and occupations most likely reflects social closure processes that enable those with power to hoard positions of authority or favorable work assignments for people like them. Categorical differences in power also help explain race and sex income disparities, especially at higher organizational levels.” (DiTomaso et al. 2007:18)

“We need to know, as Reskin (2003) suggests, more about the mechanisms in day-to-day interactions at the workplace that contribute to the reproduction of inequality or to its mitigation.” (DiTomaso et al. 2007:20)

“Moore’s data show well that these elite law schools are white spaces, in terms of a majority of their occupants’ characteristics, their normative structures, their power hierarchy, and their racial pathologies. Law schools are racialized spaces where whites rarely think about that racialization… Law schools are more than educational institutions or institutions of professional socialization; they are fundamentally connected to the political system and the political economy of race. Elite law schools represent a gateway to positions of power in the American political system.” (Foreword, pp. x–xi)

“Those in authority in elite and other law schools spend much time and effort in helping perpetuate a white-normed legal system that is imposed on all Americans, a great many of whom have never had significant input into fashioning that system…Our law schools have been particularly important in officially legitimizing and rationalizing patterns of U.S. racial oppression.” (Foreword, p. xi)

“White students are not the only problem for students of color in these law schools. Often in classroom discussions, as Moore documents thoroughly, well-educated law professors also operate out of this white racial frame as they analyze U.S. laws and the larger society. They clearly have great difficulty in moving outside that frame, even briefly, to adopt a more probing and critical antiracism perspective, such as that which is common among Americans of color. Such a strong, white interpretive frame captures territory in the mind and makes it difficult to think about that captured territory in terms other than those of the accepted frame.” (Foreword, pp. xii–xiii)

“Moore’s analysis makes evident the conclusion that white students and students of color live in different worlds, even within the same law school walls…Students of color must regularly endure the great pain of racist events at the law schools, and thus are often very uncomfortable in these white-normed spaces. Moore’s data reveal that students of color must do much emotional work, individually and collectively, just to survive these settings.” (Foreword, p. xiv)

“At both schools, I found that deep normative structures and institutional practices contribute to the racial organization of the law schools. Extending the work of critical race theorists to examine the very institution from which this body of knowledge developed, I interrogated the mechanisms that function to reproduce white institutional space, even as the populations of these institutions become more diverse.” (Introduction, p. 5)

“Even as the schools themselves became more diverse, the students of color remained marginalized, and the basic structures of authority, legitimacy, and belonging remained coded as white.” (p. 7)

“Institutional practices, including the social organization of the schools, evaluation processes, informal and formal mentorship, and the norms of what counts as ‘fit,’ all subtly or overtly reinforce white advantage and black and brown marginalization.” (Chapter 2, p. 32)

“White students described their experience in law school as ‘normal,’ whereas students of color reported constant surveillance and policing of their presence, and a need to perform and justify their belonging in ways that white students never did.” (Chapter 4, p. 100)

“These mechanisms include routine interactions with faculty, the structure of feedback and support, the informal assignment of opportunities, and the ways in which social networks are formed and maintained—all practices that are both shaped by, and reinforce, the white-dominated upper echelons of these schools.” (Conclusion, p. 157)

“Using data from 260 U.S. organizations, we found partial support for our hypotheses that demographic diversity of senior management would be positively associated with the diversity of the workforce, adoption of diversity practices, and power of an organization’s diversity/EEO officer, and that diversity practices impact organizational performance. Organizations wishing to attract, retain, and benefit from diverse talent are often advised to begin by increasing the diversity of their senior management. Data collected from 260 U.S. organizations supports this idea.” (p. 2)

“We found that the demographic diversity of senior management teams is positively associated with the demographic diversity of workforces at large and with the adoption of diversity practices, and that, furthermore, those firms that adopted diversity initiatives outperformed those that did not. Organizations that have diversity/EEO officers with real power and clout were more likely to benefit from these effects.” (p. 2)

“The notion that the characteristics of senior management, or the upper echelon of an organization, can influence the decisions made and practices adopted by an organization dates back to early upper echelon theory (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Hambrick and Mason argued that managers’ characteristics (e.g., demographic) influence the decisions that they make and therefore the actions adopted by the organizations that they lead. They suggest that this occurs because demographic characteristics are associated with the many cognitive bases, values, and perceptions that influence the decision making of managers.” (p. 5)

“The positive influence of the demographic diversity of senior management on the demographic diversity of the workforce at large is a moot point, however, if an organization lacks diversity in senior management. Indeed, a lack of demographic diversity in senior management as a result of the ‘glass ceiling’ continues to be one of the most pervasive diversity-related (i.e., access discrimination) problems in organizations.” (p. 7)

“When ‘non-traditional’ individuals (i.e., ethnic minorities, women, and people with disabilities, etc.) hold leadership positions, they help to create new schemas in the minds of employees, in which leadership attributes and competence become associated not only with white males, but also with minority characteristics. While a single minority individual in senior management is unlikely to have this schema-changing effect, repeat examples of minority status being associated with leadership competence (as would be the case in diverse senior management teams) is likely to change employees’ perceptions of the competence of non-traditional employees.” (p. 7)

“It is no secret that simply increasing the diversity of a workforce is insufficient. Once hired, diverse employees need to be fairly treated and integrated into the social fabric of the organization. Many scholars have argued that the commitment of senior managers is necessary for the success of diversity initiatives, and that given resource constraints, the senior management team is instrumental in determining whether or not an organization will adopt certain initiatives designed to reduce discrimination and promote the advancement of diverse employees.” (p. 8)

“Our results, which were largely supportive of our hypotheses, suggest that the demographic diversity of senior management can have profound effects on organizations. Upper echelon diversity is associated with the demographic diversity of the workforce, with evidence of homosocial reproduction taking place in organizations, particularly with regard to gender and race. In addition, the demographic diversity of senior management is also associated with the adoption of diversity practices, which in turn is associated with higher profits.” (p. 12)

“Success starts at the top. We hope that our results will encourage organizations to take diversity initiatives seriously, and to do so first by creating formal and very powerful diversity officer positions. Individuals who fill these positions should have direct access to, and voice in, the decision making of the senior executive team. When diversity initiatives are backed by strong leadership support, and therefore are successful at accomplishing the cultural change they are designed to accomplish, the investment made in their adoption pay dividends to organizations in the form of increased competitive advantage.” (p. 12)

“Sociological scholarship on how workplace policies and practices limit or promote equal employment opportunity (‘EEO’) is a relatively recent phenomenon, and the discipline all but ignored workplace racial bias prior to the 1970s… sociologists nonetheless sought to show that racial disparities in occupational status and earnings could not be fully reduced to differences between advantaged and disadvantaged groups in schooling, job experience, and other kinds of human capital. Instead, they emphasized the ‘dual’ or ‘segmented’ nature of labor markets that posed structural barriers to racial parity in career outcomes” (Bielby 2008:54).

“A large body of social science research shows that personnel decisions such as decisions about hiring, job assignment, promotion selections, performance assessment, and compensation are vulnerable to stereotyping and bias when they are based on the discretionary use of subjective criteria… When stereotypes such as these are allowed to influence social judgments, decisions about members of minority groups will be based on general beliefs about the behaviors, traits, and qualities associated with their gender or race/ethnicity instead of the actual traits of the individuals being judged” (Bielby 2008:61).

“White college participants (whom, relative to the general population may be regarded as generally moderate to low prejudiced ...), give White candidates the ‘benefit of the doubt,’ a benefit they do not extend to Blacks” (Bielby 2008:62).

“In a study of white and African American managers in a financial services company, James (2000) found that African Americans were promoted at a slower rate than whites with comparable education and training and that they received less psychosocial support, were more isolated, and benefited less from company training than their white counterparts” (Bielby 2008:66).

“Fernandez’s study of 4,202 managers, including over 900 African American managers, employed in ten large companies reports that a majority of African American managers perceive that whites exclude minority managers from informal work groups. Moreover, over a third of upper-level white male managers agreed with that assessment” (Bielby 2008:66).

“A large body of research, using both quantitative and qualitative approaches, conducted in a wide range of industries and occupations, shows that referrals, word of mouth, and similar informal recruitment mechanisms perpetuate the existing racial composition of a workforce and creates barriers for African Americans’ entry into white-dominated jobs… Mouw (2002) found that the use of employee referrals rather than more formal recruitment methods reduced the probability of African Americans being hired in predominately white companies by 74%” (Bielby 2008:67).

“Organizational policies and practices that create barriers to career advancement for women and minorities, once in place, become institutionalized and rarely change in the absence of any substantial change in a firm’s business, technical, or legal environment… discrimination in the workplace is by no means inevitable, and social science research shows what kinds of policies and practices effectively minimize bias” (Bielby 2008:68).

“Effective managerial EEO accountability requires explicit evaluation of managers and supervisors on their contributions to the organization’s equal opportunity goals. This evaluation should be incorporated into specific evaluative dimensions in the performance reviews of those employees and tied in a significant way to the supervisor’s or manager’s compensation” (Bielby 2008:70).

“This study helps to fill a significant gap in the literature on organizations and inequality by investigating the central role of merit-based reward systems in shaping gender and racial disparities in wages and promotions. The author develops and tests a set of propositions isolating processes of performance-reward bias, whereby women and minorities receive less compensation than white men with equal scores on performance evaluations. Using personnel data from a large service organization, the author empirically establishes the existence of this bias and shows that gender, race, and nationality differences continue to affect salary growth after performance ratings are taken into account, ceteris paribus. This finding demonstrates a critical challenge faced by the many contemporary employers who adopt merit-based practices and policies. Although these policies are often adopted in the hope of motivating employees and ensuring meritocracy, policies with limited transparency and accountability can actually increase ascriptive bias and reduce equity in the workplace” (Castilla 2008:1479) .

“I argue, however, that by decoupling the performance evaluation and wage-setting processes, organizations may introduce the structural conditions for bias to occur at two distinct stages… organizations might introduce discretion, which can result in the work of minority employees receiving less compensation over time even when they are evaluated as performing the same jobs at the same level as nonminority employees” (Castilla 2008:1482) .

“The central finding of this study is that gender, racial, and nationality differences in salary growth persist even after controlling for performance evaluations (i.e., proposition 1 is rejected). This study also supports the finding that performance ratings have a significantly lower effect on annual salary increases for African-American employees, ceteris paribus (i.e., proposition 2 is also rejected)” (Castilla 2008:1491) .

“In my analyses, I find that women and minorities do not receive lower starting salaries or performance ratings than white men once I control for job and work-unit fixed effects. However, in the long run, my longitudinal analyses provide evidence of performance-reward bias and show that different salary increases are granted for observationally equivalent employees (i.e., those in the same job and work unit, with the same supervisor and same human capital) who receive the same performance evaluation scores” (Castilla 2008:1484) .

“The key finding in this study is reported in models 2 and 4 of table 2, where I present the effects of demographic characteristics on salary growth after the employee level of performance is introduced in the regression equations. These models do not support proposition 1: I find significant effects for certain individual characteristics on salary growth after controlling for employee performance levels. More specifically, from model 4 I find that, ceteris paribus, the salary growth is 0.4% lower for women than for men, even after performance evaluations are introduced into the model… African-American employees get a salary increase 0.5% lower than equally performing white employees. In addition, Hispanic Americans get a salary increase 0.5% lower than whites… A significant salary increase discrepancy is also found for non-U.S.-born employees, who get a salary increase 0.6% lower than native employees, other things being equal” (Castilla 2008:1506–1507) .

“I find empirical evidence that both of these scenarios exist at the organization under study, leading me to reject the meritocratic claims for this performance-reward system… Even in a work organization that institutionally values and supports the allocation of compensation on the basis of merit, I show bias in the translation of performance evaluation scores into amounts of salary increases over time: different salary increases are granted for observationally equivalent employees (i.e., those in the same job and work unit, with the same supervisor and same human capital) who receive the same performance evaluation scores” (Castilla 2008:1512–1513) .

“This performance-reward bias is a new form of valuative discrimination, because once merit is measured in the appraisal process, women and minority employees still receive different rewards for the same merit scores as white men (after controlling for job, work unit, supervisor and other relevant human capital characteristics)” (Castilla 2008:1520) .

“‘Being White’ is perceived to be an attribute of the business leader prototype, where participants assumed that business leaders more than nonleaders were White, and this inference occurred regardless of base rates about the organization’s racial composition, the racial composition of organizational roles, the business industry, and the types of racial minority groups in the organization” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:758).

“We propose that race, and specifically ‘being White,’ may be a prototypical attribute of leadership. … In stark contrast to these assertions [of colorblindness], we propose that race plays a critical role in organizational settings, particularly when leadership evaluations are considered” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:759).

“We posit that, at least in the United States, a central characteristic of leadership is ‘being White’ and accordingly, that evaluators will perceive that White leaders are more prototypical business leaders than are leaders who are racial minorities. … We posit that the exemplars of leaders to which individuals are exposed are likely to be White, and thus, when individuals abstract attributes that are common to examples of business leaders … they will conclude that the average leader, the prototypical leader, must be White” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:759–760).

“In the U.S. workforce, more than 87% of chief executive positions … 84% of the seats on Fortune 100 Boards of Directors … and more than 97% of Fortune 500 chief executive officer (CEO) positions were held by Whites. … Such historical perceptions of White individuals in leadership positions reinforce the assertion that being White is a primary and probable characteristic of leadership” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:760).

“Leaders would be perceived to be White more frequently than nonleaders regardless of the base rates. … Independent of the base-rate manipulation, 72% of the participants perceived that the leader was White, whereas only 56% of the participants perceived that the employee was White. … Regardless of base rate, observers were more likely to perceive the leader than nonleader as being White. … These results suggest that being White is an attribute of the business leader prototype” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:762).

“We found that White leaders were evaluated more favorably than African American leaders, but only when they were viewed as responsible for their organization’s successful performance, not when success was attributed to external explanations (such as the marketplace) or when the leader’s organization had failed. These findings suggest that the difference in evaluations between White and non-White leaders came about because of a White leader prototype as opposed to negative stereotypes toward African Americans” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:772).

“Because organizational rewards and promotion to leadership roles are awarded on the basis of leadership evaluations and because our findings suggest that leadership evaluations are more likely to favor Whites than racial minorities, it follows that Whites may be more likely to be promoted to leadership positions more frequently than racial minorities. Accordingly, a multiplier effect may persist such that positive evaluations are given to White leaders, White leaders continue to be the prototype for effective leadership, and correspondingly, racial minority leaders are continually disadvantaged” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:772).

Demonstrates, through experimental evidence, that “being White” is not only perceived as prototypical for leadership in U.S. business organizations, but that this cognitive association systematically shapes how leaders are evaluated and promoted. This racialized prototype—rooted in the experiences, values, and demographic realities of top managers—operates as an invisible credential, aligning precisely with Ray’s argument about whiteness and Hambrick & Mason’s upper echelons theory (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:758).

“‘Being White’ is perceived to be an attribute of the business leader prototype, where participants assumed that business leaders more than nonleaders were White, and this inference occurred regardless of base rates about the organization’s racial composition…” (Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008:758).

“…we propose that race, and specifically ‘being White,’ may be a prototypical attribute of leadership…we can offer a more in-depth understanding of leadership categorization and leadership prototypes as applied to U.S. business leaders. We propose that race, and specifically ‘being White,’ may be a prototypical attribute of leadership.” (Rosette et al. 2008:759).

“…the exemplars of leaders to which individuals are exposed are likely to be White, and thus, when individuals abstract attributes that are common to examples of business leaders but are perhaps less common to examples of nonleaders, they will conclude that the average leader, the prototypical leader, must be White.” (Rosette et al. 2008:760).

“…when the leader is not given credit for organizational success (i.e., it is attributed to external causes) or the leader’s organization performs poorly, then the leader prototype is incompatible with the individualized information and it will not be used. Under such performance conditions, White and non-White leaders will be rated equivalently. Thus, consistent with leader categorization, we predict that there should not be differences in evaluations between White and non-White leaders except when successful performances are attributed to the leader.” (Rosette et al. 2008:765).

“White leaders were considered more effective (M = 4.78, SD = 1.13) than African American leaders (M = 4.67, SD = 1.13)…but only when the leader had recently been given credit for organizational success, consistent with the prediction that leader prototypes are more likely to be used when they confirm and reinforce individualized information about a leader’s performance.” (Rosette et al. 2008:767).

“These findings support the idea that racial bias in the leader prototype can influence evaluations of leaders and their likelihood of career advancement. Taken together with Study 3 findings, these findings demonstrate that the career prospects of White targets were evaluated as higher than the prospects for African American, Hispanic American, and Asian American targets. Race differences occurred only when the leader was given credit for organizational success, evidence that is consistent with the leadership prototype prediction.” (Rosette et al. 2008:771).

“Because organizational rewards and promotion to leadership roles are awarded on the basis of leadership evaluations and because our findings suggest that leadership evaluations are more likely to favor Whites than racial minorities, it follows that Whites may be more likely to be promoted to leadership positions more frequently than racial minorities. Accordingly, a multiplier effect may persist such that positive evaluations are given to White leaders, White leaders continue to be the prototype for effective leadership, and correspondingly, racial minority leaders are continually disadvantaged.” (Rosette et al. 2008:772).

Sabina Nielsen links Ray’s theory of racialized credentials and Hambrick and Mason’s upper echelons framework by emphasizing the role of demographic diversity within top management teams (TMTs). Nielsen argues that TMT diversity influences organizational outcomes by reflecting varied cognitive orientations, experiences, and values among top managers, thus shaping strategic decisions and performance. She calls for deeper analysis of multilevel contextual influences on TMT diversity and highlights the methodological need for capturing the complexity and interactions among diversity attributes to enhance upper echelons research (Nielsen 2010).

"The roots of the upper echelons perspective lie in the behavioral theory of the firm, which suggests that managerial choices are not always following rational motives but are influenced by the natural limitations of managers as human beings" (Nielsen 2010, p. 303).

"Empirical research on upper echelons investigated the effects of TMT heterogeneity in observable background characteristics, such as age, functional track, education, etc., on organizational outcomes, such as firm’s competitive behavior, strategic change, and ultimately performance" (Nielsen 2010, p. 303).

This provides empirical grounding for Ray’s assertion that racialized credentials shape organizational outcomes and aligns with Hambrick and Mason’s premise that executive demographics proxy deeper cognitive and experiential differences affecting strategic choices.

"The vast majority of upper echelons research defines diversity as variety and looks at team heterogeneity across different demographic characteristics. However, recent advances in group diversity research suggest that group faultlines are a powerful predictor of team dynamics and performance" (Nielsen 2010, p. 307).

This highlights the complexity of diversity effects, suggesting that demographic faultlines might influence strategic decision-making, consistent with Ray’s notion of invisible racial credentials and Hambrick and Mason’s cognitive diversity impacting executive decisions.

"While some studies on pay disparity and power differentials exist, these aspects of diversity as disparity have not been applied in combination with diversity as variety in existing research on TMT heterogeneity" (Nielsen 2010, p. 307).

This insight underscores that internal status hierarchies and disparities, similar to racial credentials described by Ray, may significantly impact executive team decision-making, connecting directly to Hambrick and Mason’s cognitive orientation approach emphasizing managerial values and perceptions.

"Most of the reviewed studies (52 articles) used upper echelons as their m1ain theoretical perspective. Upper echelons theory was most often combined with social psychological theories, most common among which are group process and effectiveness theories" (Nielsen 2010, p. 303).

This quote illustrates how psychological and cognitive orientations (Hambrick and Mason) and organizationally embedded racial schemas (Ray) interact within executive teams, thus shaping organizational outcomes.

"Organizational-level outcomes, such as firm innovation, strategic reorientation, and organizational risk, were dependent variables in 29 (48%) of the studies" (Nielsen 2010, p. 304).

This empirical observation directly supports Hambrick and Mason’s argument that executive characteristics shape strategic organizational outcomes and aligns with Ray’s racialized credentials perspective, indicating that strategic decisions are socially constructed and cognitively influenced.

"Team processes have direct effects on group and organizational performance. In addition, processes act as mediators of the relationship between team diversity and performance in several reviewed studies" (Nielsen 2010, p. 306).

This finding empirically validates both Ray’s and Hambrick and Mason’s frameworks by showing that racial and cognitive schemas embedded within executive teams affect strategic outcomes through specific team processes, thus linking demographic diversity directly with firm behavior and performance.

Edgar H. Schein’s text links the core arguments by showing how organizational culture is both a powerful, often invisible social structure (as Ray describes) and a product of leadership and top managerial cognition (as Hambrick and Mason argue). Schein provides both conceptual and empirical accounts of how culture encodes values, status, and authority within organizations, shaping outcomes beyond formal structures and directly reflecting the experiences, values, and decisions of top leaders. Through this, Schein demonstrates that organizational culture is both a mechanism for the transmission and legitimization of social advantages like Whiteness and a reflection of top managers’ demographic backgrounds and cognitive frames (Schein 2010:3–4).

“Culture is both a ‘here and now’ dynamic phenomenon and a coercive background structure that influences us in multiple ways. Culture is constantly reenacted and created by our interactions with others and shaped by our own behavior. When we are influential in shaping the behavior and values of others, we think of that as ‘leadership’ and are creating the conditions for new culture formation. At the same time, culture implies stability and rigidity in the sense that how we are supposed to perceive, feel, and act in a given society, organization, or occupation has been taught to us by our various socialization experiences and becomes prescribed as a way to maintain the ‘social order’... Culture can be thought of as the foundation of the social order that we live in and of the rules we abide by” (Schein 2010:3).

“The connection between culture and leadership is clearest in organizational cultures and microcultures. What we end up calling a culture in such systems is usually the result of the embedding of what a founder or leader has imposed on a group that has worked out. In this sense, culture is ultimately created, embedded, evolved, and ultimately manipulated by leaders. At the same time, with group maturity, culture comes to constrain, stabilize, and provide structure and meaning to the group members even to the point of ultimately specifying what kind of leadership will be acceptable in the future. If elements of a given culture become dysfunctional leaders have to surmount their own culture and speed up the normal evolution processes with forced managed culture change programs. These dynamic processes of culture creation and management are the essence of leadership and make you realize that leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin” (Schein 2010:3).

“We also noted that culture and leadership are two sides of the same coin in that leaders first start the process of culture creation when they create groups and organizations. After cultures exist, they determine the criteria for leadership and thus determine who will or will not be a leader. But if elements of a culture become dysfunctional, it is the unique function of leadership to perceive the functional and dysfunctional elements of the existing culture and to manage cultural evolution and change in such a way that the group can survive in a changing environment. The bottom line for leaders is that if they do not become conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them. Cultural understanding is desirable for all of us, but it is essential to leaders if they are to lead” (Schein 2010:22).

“In Part I, I will note that the culture and leadership field has differentiated itself and can now be viewed from three different perspectives: the traditional scholar/researcher who is pursuing fundamental theory, the practitioner who is developing tools to help leaders and managers deal with the cultural issues they encounter, and the scholar/practitioner who is concerned about middle-level theory and the translation of that theory into concepts and tools that will help the practitioner even as he or she continues to inform theory” (Schein 2010:xii).

“What I have discovered is that our empirical knowledge of how different cultures interact, how different occupations define tasks, and how multicultural teams function is growing rapidly and is beyond my scope to review systematically. But I have also realized that the basic conceptual model that I articulated in the first three editions is still sound as a way of analyzing cultural phenomena” (Schein 2010:x).

“Ultimately all organizations are socio-technical systems in which the manner of external adaptation and the solution of internal integration problems are interdependent and intertwined. Although we are discussing them in serial order for purposes of exposition, in reality, the external and internal processes are occurring at the same time” (Schein 2010:91).

“The most central issue for leaders is to understand the deeper levels of a culture, to assess the functionality of the assumptions made at that level, and to deal with the anxiety that is unleashed when those assumptions are challenged” (Schein 2010:33).

“Culture supplies us our language, and language provides meaning in our day-to-day life. Culture can be thought of as the foundation of the social order that we live in and of the rules we abide by” (Schein 2010:3).

“Not every collection of people develops a culture, and, in fact, we tend to use the terms ‘group,’ ‘team,’ or ‘community’ rather than ‘crowd’ or ‘collection of people’ only when there has been enough of a shared history so that some degree of culture formation has taken place” (Schein 2010:41).

“In both cases, the powerful influence of early leaders and historical circumstance was evident. Cultural assumptions have their roots in early group experience and in the pattern of success and failure experienced by these companies. Their current leaders strongly valued their cultures, were proud of them, and felt it important for members of their organizations to accept the basic assumptions” (Schein 2010:54).

“Organizations can be thought of, then, as involving three dimensions of career movement: (1) lateral movement from one task or function to another, (2) vertical movement from one rank to another, and (3) inclusionary movement from outsider to insider (Schein 1978, 2006). Consensus forms around criteria not only for promotion but also for inclusionary movement. As people move farther ‘in,’ they become privy to some of the more secret assumptions of the group” (Schein 2010:99).

William T. Bielby’s article demonstrates how organizational processes in privileged occupations reproduce racial inequality through mechanisms that make status and advantage appear meritocratic and race-neutral while being shaped by the demographic backgrounds and social networks of organizational actors. By empirically tracing how cumulative advantage systems, social closure, and managerial discretion sustain racial disparities, Bielby links the social credentialing of Whiteness (as described by Ray) to the decisive influence of leadership demographics and network power (as in Hambrick and Mason) (Bielby 2012:13).

“Social science research shows that African Americans and other persons of color in predominantly white work settings receive less support in the form of mentorship and professional development and are more likely to be socially isolated and excluded from informal workplace social networks than their white peers” (Bielby 2012:21).

“Racial isolation in an organizational context in which the dominant group forms tight social networks that have control over resources creates what sociologist Charles Tilly defines as ‘opportunity hoarding’ (1998, 2003). He describes the term as follows: If members of a network acquire access to a resource that is valuable, renewable, subject to monopoly, supportive of network activities, and enhanced by the network’s modus operandi, network members regularly hoard access to the resource, creating beliefs and practices that sustain their control. If that network is categorically bounded, opportunity hoarding thereby contributes to the maintenance of categorical inequality” (Bielby 2012:22–23).

“Performance-based pay and the meritocracy that accompanies it are not simply technical features of a compensation system; meritocracy can also be a cultural framework. As Light, Roscigno, and Kalev note, ‘Formal meritocratic procedures and rhetoric can become an institutionalized cloak for ongoing ascriptive bias—a legitimating discourse, where managers, employers, and judges exchange symbols of meritocracy for equality... When formal procedures are in place, managers (and judges) are more apt to believe the structure is unbiased and that unequal outcomes therefore reflect differences in merit.’ The results reported here show one way that racialized practices become embedded in a performance pay system and how cumulative advantage and social closure processes can generate what Castilla and Benard (2010) have defined (and experimentally validated) as the ‘paradox of meritocracy effect’” (Bielby 2012:28).

“The merit-based rhetoric of such systems legitimates arrangements that structurally advantage whites over African Americans. A racialized approach to multicultural marketing is race-conscious in ways that disadvantage African Americans, and human resources systems that fail to assess the structural sources of that bias are race-neutral in name only, allowing the vulnerabilities faced by African Americans to persist and grow over time” (Bielby 2012:30).

“In sum, the case study of GF shows how the minority vulnerability thesis applies to African Americans in a privileged profession and offers insights on how to establish racial parity in an industry that relies on an output-based performance pay system... Diversity programs and accountability structures need to be built on a premise that not all racial bias is simply cognitive, unconscious, and unintentional, and that effective interventions will require addressing head-on sources of resistance that are embedded in racially segregated social relations and power differences among professionals who are formally identical in their locations in the firm’s job structure” (Bielby 2012:30).

Laura Giuliano, David I. Levine, and Jonathan Leonard’s study empirically links how race operates as a credential within organizations to the influence of leadership demographics by examining employee outcomes under racially matched and mismatched managers. Their findings show that seemingly neutral personnel systems reproduce advantage for whites through own-race bias, social identity threat, and traditional status hierarchies, while also highlighting the role of manager-employee demographics in shaping promotions, dismissals, and turnover—demonstrating that both structural and leadership factors sustain racial inequality (Giuliano et al. 2011:1).

“We find a general pattern of own-race bias in that employees usually have better outcomes when they are the same race as their manager. But we do find anomalies in this pattern, particularly when the manager-employee match violates traditional racial hierarchies (for example, nonwhites managing whites)” (Giuliano et al. 2011:1).

“Our main results are generally consistent with theories that assume own-race bias. We find own-race bias in nine of the 12 cases examined (three outcomes, four race groups). But we also find anomalies in this pattern, and interestingly these anomalies are all consistent with status and social identity theories. Such theories suggest that racial differences may evoke different responses in norm-breaking relationships (minorities managing whites, for example) than in relationships that conform to traditional hierarchies. These theories could thus explain two of our most striking findings. First, when white employees work under other-race managers, they have similar or even better outcomes than when they work under white managers. But second, despite this preferential treatment, white employees still appear to harbor the strongest bias against other-race managers” (Giuliano et al. 2011:2).

“Further analysis suggests bias may be strongest among white employees. We find that for whites alone, having an own-race manager significantly reduces the probability that ‘dissatisfaction with supervisor’ is given as the reason for quitting. Moreover, we find evidence that white job-seekers self-select into workplaces based on preferences for own-race managers, and, hence, that the own-race effect on quit rates may understate the level of own-race bias among white workers” (Giuliano et al. 2011:2).

“Black, Hispanic, and Asian employees have lower relative rates of dismissal and higher relative rates of promotion when their manager is the same race. The evidence of own-race bias is particularly strong for blacks; the relative dismissal rate of blacks is 19 percent lower under black managers than nonblack managers, and the relative promotion rate is 79 percent higher. On the other hand, the pattern of bias is the opposite for white employees. Under own-race managers, whites have relative outcomes that are similar or even worse than under other-race managers” (Giuliano et al. 2011:2).

“In sum, we find a consistent pattern of own-race bias across all three outcomes and across both employees and managers. But there are anomalies in this pattern. In quits (employee decisions), we find evidence of modest own-race biases among white, Hispanic, and Asian employees. But we do not find bias among black employees. In dismissals and promotions (managerial decisions), we find a common pattern. On one hand, we find evidence of managerial bias in that black, Hispanic, and Asian employees are relatively less likely to be dismissed and more likely to be promoted when their manager is the same race. However, we also find that white employees have similar or better relative outcomes under minority managers than under white managers” (Giuliano et al. 2011:43).

“We find evidence of selection bias for white employees, but not for employees of other races. For white employees, the effect of having an own-race manager on their quit rate is significantly larger when the manager in question is new. Among white employees who still have their hiring managers, the relative quit rate of whites is only 4 percent lower under white managers compared to nonwhite managers. Among white employees who have received new managers, there is a 14 percent difference. We interpret this result as evidence that white employees who dislike working for nonwhite managers often avoid working for such managers in the first place, and that when such whites involuntarily find themselves working for a nonwhite manager, their quit rate increases substantially” (Giuliano et al. 2011:45).

“Further analysis of quits suggests that own-race bias is strongest among white employees. First, for whites alone, having a different-race manager doubles the likelihood that ‘dissatisfaction with supervisor’ is reported as the reason for quitting... Why would own-race bias be stronger among whites than other race groups? Our finding that whites are, if anything, treated more favorably by nonwhite managers suggests that such a bias is not a response to differential treatment by managers. However, identity theory suggests a stronger bias could come from a combination of two things. Whites may be subject both to own-race bias and to a status threat produced by a nontraditional hierarchy (minorities managing whites)” (Giuliano et al. 2011:49).

“In dismissals and promotions, our second basic finding is that white employees with other-race managers have relative outcomes that are similar or better than the outcomes of whites with white managers. This result cannot be explained by theories of own-race bias. However, status and identity theories provide a plausible explanation. These theories suggest nonwhite managers may find that white employees are less willing to accept their authority and are more likely to quit. What’s more, nonwhite managers who exercise authority over whites may find that such norm-breaking relationships cause anxiety and psychological discomfort. Hence, even if nonwhite managers hold own-race biases, these factors might still lead them to be relatively deferential toward whites and so dismiss whites less often and promote them more often” (Giuliano et al. 2011:49).

Jee-Yeon K. Lehmann’s study shows how formal efforts to diversify hiring can coexist with informal, decentralized promotion systems that ultimately reproduce racial stratification. Through a dynamic model and empirical data on early legal careers, Lehmann demonstrates that even as organizations appear meritocratic or inclusive, minorities are systemically channeled into lower-value assignments and denied advancement—linking Ray’s account of Whiteness as credentialized advantage with Hambrick and Mason’s insight that organizational outcomes reflect the cognitive and demographic biases of decision-makers (Lehmann 2011:2–3).

“I develop a dynamic model of statistical discrimination in which firms diversify their workforce by lowering the hiring standard for blacks. Despite such a diversity goal at hiring, task assignment and promotion decisions are not constrained by this policy. Under such institutional setting, the model predicts that although blacks are more likely to be hired compared to observably similar whites, they are more likely to be placed in worse tasks and less likely to be promoted conditional on the same set of observables. However, conditional on task assignment, blacks and whites face similar promotion rates” (Lehmann 2011:2).

“My model incorporates hiring, task assignment, and promotion in the presence of a firm-wide hiring policy that raises the hiring rates of a minority group (e.g. black). Despite such a diversity goal at hiring, task assignment and promotion decisions are not constrained by this policy. Within such an institutional framework, the model predicts that although blacks are more likely to be hired than observably similar whites, blacks are assigned to worse tasks even conditional on the same set of observables. Since better tasks allow associates to develop skills necessary for promotion more easily, blacks will be much less likely to become a partner compared to whites with similar credentials. Yet conditional on the task assignment, blacks and whites should face similar promotion rates” (Lehmann 2011:3).

“However, most of Sander’s critics suggest that there may be more complex sources of high attrition and low partnership among black lawyers. In particular, they highlight the distinction between an institutional hiring process and partner-directed work assignment and training. Critics generally concede the raw numbers. But they offer different reasons for the gap between hiring and promotion. Some point to old-fashioned racism. Others say that firms act institutionally in hiring but leave work assignments to individual partners. Those partners often provide poor training, rote assignments and little mentoring to minority lawyers” (Lehmann 2011:3–4).

“Task assignment and promotion may not reflect such diversity efforts at hiring for a variety of reasons. First, as suggested by those in the legal profession, firms may act institutionally in hiring while job assignments are decentralized to individual partners. In large firms, especially, a central hiring committee of seniors and individuals from the human resources group set recruiting and hiring agendas. To increase the diversity of its hiring class, the firm might choose to increase the number of minorities hired by decreasing their hiring standard below that of whites (‘affirmative action’). Senior/partners know that affirmative action has been used in hiring, and therefore, minority hires are less qualified than members of the majority group on average. Then these partners may be more likely to offer rote assignments and little mentoring to minorities. Since the hiring committee cannot fully oversee or dictate the daily interactions between the seniors and the new hires, it may not be able to counter these tendencies” (Lehmann 2011:5).

“For any combination of these reasons and others, task assignments and promotion may reflect the firm’s efforts to diversify its hiring class” (Lehmann 2011:6).

“Conditional on observable credentials (e.g. GPA, law school ranking, law review), black lawyers are 7 to 30 percentage points more likely to be hired at the largest law firms. However, they are assigned to worse tasks and are less likely to be a partner. This black-white difference in promotion rates can be explained by quality differences in task assignments early in the associates’ careers even controlling for measures of effort and career preferences. Results from this paper provide a unique explanation for the underrepresentation of minorities at the top of professional ladders by revealing how incompatible strategies in job assignment can reduce the number of minority promotions compared to the case without affirmative action” (Lehmann 2011:2).

“Even as organizations appear to diversify their workforce through hiring policies, assignment to less challenging work and limited mentorship mean minorities do not acquire the experience or visibility necessary for promotion, leading to persistent underrepresentation at senior levels despite apparent equality at entry” (Lehmann 2011:51).

“Finally, although I find evidence for lower hiring standards for blacks in large law firms, controlling for task assignments, GPA and law school rankings have minimal impact on promotion rates at best. Therefore, the argument that underrepresentation of minorities at the top of professional ladders is merely a reflection of minorities’ lack of qualifications seems to be an overly simple representation of reality. This paper suggests that rational biases against minorities can lead to worse terms and conditions of employment that afford minorities less opportunities for advancement even when there is an effort to increase their hiring at the beginning of their careers” (Lehmann 2011:51).

David Maume’s article shows that increased minority representation in management does not necessarily disrupt entrenched patterns of racial advantage or transform organizational authority. Maume’s empirical analysis reveals that, while minorities reach some managerial positions, they remain concentrated in less prestigious roles, are given fewer resources, face greater job insecurity, and are often tasked with supervising other minorities in devalued jobs. These findings connect Ray’s analysis of Whiteness as an organizational asset and Hambrick and Mason’s emphasis on the reproduction of leadership traits through managerial selection, by demonstrating how organizational and demographic logics combine to limit real change (Maume 2012:198–199).

“On balance, this study finds more support for the pessimistic view of the minority presence in management, in that racial wage inequality is as large among supervisors as among nonsupervisors, and minority supervisors get less challenging job assignments and are more vulnerable to layoffs than white supervisors. Among subordinates, this study finds support for ‘bottom-up ascription’ processes, in that minority workers who report to a minority boss earn less despite being more committed workers” (Maume 2012:198).

“Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey’s analysis revealed that white men retained their advantaged positions in ‘old’ goods-producing industries, whereas African Americans and white women rapidly increased their managerial presence in the growing (but lower-paying) personal and social service industries...Collins (1997) puts a human face on these findings in her interviews with black corporate executives, many of whom were the highest-ranking African Americans in their respective Fortune 500 firms...Although Collins’s informants earned comfortable salaries, they had been placed in ‘racialized jobs’ that responded to the concerns of African Americans, as opposed to whites who worked in jobs with wider constituencies...by the end of their careers, African Americans were more limited than whites in how high they could rise within the firm, and they grew resentful as others were groomed to be CEOs of their respective firms (see Cose 1993)” (Maume 2012:200).

“Furthermore, when minorities do get promoted into management, they typically manage minority subordinates who are themselves poorly paid and immobile (Elliott and Smith 2001; R. Smith and Elliott 2002; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993)” (Maume 2012:201).

“The pessimistic view suggests that minorities are given less challenging and more unstable managerial jobs, and that in interpersonal encounters they are often reminded of their differences with majority managers (Collins 1997; Cose 1993; Kanter 1977). If so, then minority managers will differ significantly from their white counterparts in holding lower-quality and devalued managerial jobs” (Maume 2012:201).

“Some scholars suggest that another way minority managers are devalued is by their placement over minority workgroups...organizations engage in ‘bottom-up ascription,’ that is, placing minority superiors in charge of minority-dominated workgroups (Elliott and Smith 2001; R. Smith and Elliott 2002). Not only does this signal a firm’s compliance with external legal pressures to diversify the ranks of management, but it also creates the impression among minority subordinates that via hard work, commitment, and loyalty to their employers, they too can advance to supervisory positions” (Maume 2012:201–202).

“In smaller firms, however, black managers earn 14.5 percent less than white managers, which is slightly higher than the 13.9 percent racial pay gap among nonmanagers employed in small firms... When the authority divide is defined by self-reported supervisory status, the findings tend to support the pessimistic view of minorities in management. That is, among all men (panel 1), the minority wage residual barely declines when workers exercise supervisory authority (11.9 percent) compared with nonsupervisors (12.8 percent)...in firms of 100 or more employees, minority supervisors earn 14.4 percent less than white supervisors—a pay gap that is two-thirds larger than the minority pay gap among nonsupervisors” (Maume 2012:206–207).

“Compared with white supervisors, minority supervisors exercise less autonomy on the job (B = –.07)...These results suggest that minorities are more likely to be placed in jobs that restrict their decision-making abilities, thus limiting their chances to demonstrate to their own superiors that they would make good leaders of the firm. Similarly...minority supervisors are more insecure in their jobs and more disrespected by others at work” (Maume 2012:209).

“In race-stratified models, for whites and minorities alike, the odds of reporting to a minority manager significantly increase as one’s coworkers are increasingly composed of minorities. These results confirm a basic tenet of the bottom-up ascription argument: namely, that minority supervisors tend to exercise authority over minority workgroups” (Maume 2012:209).

“Among minorities, however, the results unequivocally support the pessimistic view of minorities in management and, in particular, that bottom-up ascription processes motivate the matching of minority supervisors with minority subordinates...when reporting to a minority boss, minority subordinates receive lower pay, yet are more committed to their employers and more likely to expect to receive a promotion—results that are consistent with the reasons for and the effects of firms practicing bottom-up ascription when placing minorities in management positions” (Maume 2012:210–211).

“These results suggest that minority bosses are not necessarily ‘change agents’ who can foster the careers of minority subordinates but are more likely to be ‘cogs in the machine,’ whose role it is to ensure the commitment of subordinates to the firm even as they are paid less than whites” (Maume 2012:212).

Sungjoo Choi’s article empirically investigates how the demographic diversity of managers shapes employee job satisfaction in federal agencies, providing evidence that both supports and challenges optimistic assumptions about the impact of diverse leadership. Drawing on upper echelons theory and representative bureaucracy, Choi demonstrates that while increased representation of minorities in management is associated with higher satisfaction among minority employees, it can also generate lower overall satisfaction, highlighting how organizational context, leadership climate, and demographic composition interact to shape outcomes—thereby linking Ray’s focus on racialized advantage and Hambrick and Mason’s emphasis on leadership demographics (Choi 2012:275–276).

“The results show that the higher proportion of racial/ethnic minorities and women in managerial positions is negatively related to employee job satisfaction. Racial/ethnic minorities are more satisfied with their job and organization when there are higher levels of racial/ethnic diversity in managerial positions. No significantly different impacts of gender diversity on job satisfaction of men and women were found. Diversity climate positively moderates the relationships between racial/ethnic and gender diversity of managers and job satisfaction of employees, whereas procedural justice and leadership negatively moderated the relationships” (Choi 2012:275).

“Managers’ demographic characteristics that are associated with their values and perceptions are likely to affect their leadership, consequently affecting the organizations’ outcomes (Hambrick & Mason 1984; Nishii et al., 2007)” (Choi 2012:276).

“Another important theoretical contribution to the impacts of managerial diversity emerges from Hambrick and Mason’s (1984) upper echelon theory. According to their argument, organizational outcomes reflect the values and cognitive bases of decision-makers in the organization (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Smith et al., 1994). Because managers are likely to make their decisions based on their personal values and experiences, demographic characteristics that are associated with their values and experiences are also likely to affect their decisions (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Nishii et al., 2007)” (Choi 2012:278).

“Employees with managers who have different demographic attributes may perceive less support and more discrimination and conflict than those with demographically similar managers (Herdman & McMillan-Capehart 2010; Jackson & Joshi, 2004; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). In contrast, demographically diverse managerial teams are likely to be more strongly committed to help diverse employees to be successful in their organization than are homogenous managerial teams” (Choi 2012:279).

“As agencies have higher proportions of racial/ethnic minorities and women in managerial positions, employees tend to be less satisfied with their job and agency. Hypothesis 2 regarding the moderating effects of race/ethnicity and sex on the relationship between managerial diversity and job satisfaction is partially supported by the findings. Only the effect of racial/ethnic minority status is consistent with the expectation. Racial/ethnic minorities reported significantly higher job satisfaction than Whites when their agency has a higher proportion of racial/ethnic minority managers, whereas job satisfaction of female employees is not significantly different from that of their male colleagues regardless of the proportion of female managers in the agency” (Choi 2012:287–288).

“The diversity climate is positively associated with job satisfaction of employees. In addition, the organizational climate favorable to diversity positively moderates the relationship between managerial diversity and job satisfaction, suggesting that in agencies that are highly supportive of diversity, managerial diversity is more strongly associated with job satisfaction of employees. The pattern was consistent over racial/ethnic and gender diversity of managerial teams” (Choi 2012:289).

“The result reveals that the racial/ethnic diversity and gender diversity of managers are negatively related to job satisfaction of employees. It suggests that the job satisfaction of employees in agencies that have higher proportions of racial/ethnic minority and/or female managers is lower than that in others...Another possible explanation is that racial/ethnic minority and/or female managers may not be able to advocate the interests of minority employees substantially for some reasons. They may remain as a token without any discretionary power of promoting minority employees’ welfare. In addition, the token status can bring negative consequences to minority managers themselves such as isolation, negative self-image, and low job satisfaction (e.g., Cohen & Swim, 1995; Kanter, 1977). Highly formalized structure, strict rules and procedures, and centralized personnel policies in the federal government may also prohibit them to take actions to help minority employees. Organizational socialization explains that minority managers may put their organization’s values and interests before those of minority employees (Dolan, 2000; Meier, 1993b; Sowa & Selden, 2003)” (Choi 2012:290).

“As expected, racial/ethnic minority employees reported that they are more satisfied with their job and organization when their agency has a higher proportion of racial/ethnic minorities in managerial positions. More racial/ethnic minority managers will provide employees with critical messages such as greater opportunities of career advances for racial/ethnic minority and their leadership attributes and competence that used to be associated with whites (Nishii et al., 2007; Perry et al., 1994)” (Choi 2012:291).

Kevin Stainback and Matthew Irvin’s article empirically demonstrates how the racial composition of workgroups and managerial positions shapes experiences of perceived discrimination and organizational attachment, offering insight into the mechanisms that connect both the credentialing of Whiteness in organizations (as discussed by Ray) and the demographic determinants of organizational outcomes (as theorized by Hambrick and Mason). Their findings show that having same-race coworkers and managers reduces perceived discrimination and enhances attachment, but also reveal non-symmetric effects—highlighting that Whiteness remains structurally advantaged and minority presence does not necessarily disrupt the racialized organizational order (Stainback and Irvin 2012:657–658).

“The analyses indicate: (1) working with predominately same-race coworkers tends to diminish perceptions of racial discrimination, (2) perceived racial discrimination mediates some of the effects of racial/ethnic composition on organizational attachment, and (3) some non-symmetric effects between non-Whites and Whites are found” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:657).

“In general, the previous research suggest that racial and ethnic similarity with coworkers and managers promotes stronger social relationships, enhances organizational commitment (Mueller et al., 1999; Pelled et al., 1999; Riordan and Shore, 1997; Tsui and O’Reilly, 1989), and reduces job search intentions (Kmec, 2007; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Tsui et al., 1992). Although the association between racial/ethnic composition and organizational attachment is widely documented, numerous researchers have recommended that future studies seek to uncover mediating factors (e.g., Mueller et al., 1999; Zatzick et al., 2003)...We contribute to the previous research in this article by examining a potentially important mediating factor explaining how work group racial/ethnic composition affects organizational attachment—perceived racial discrimination” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:657).

“The organizational demography theoretical perspective asserts that the status composition of workplaces holds important consequences for workers...Self-categorization and social identity theories, for instance, suggest that individuals categorize themselves and others on the basis of status distinctions, especially visible ones such as race (Tajfel and Turner, 1986). Characteristics individuals hold as salient components of their own self identities become favorable bases for the evaluation of others, while individuals characterized as different are viewed less favorably (see also Bielby, 2000; Reskin, 2000). Consistent with these views, the similarity-attraction paradigm posits that without individuating information, people tend to develop stronger affinities and trust with others whom they categorize as ‘like me’ (Byrne, 1971)...One implication of this perspective is that being racially different from one’s coworkers may prevent the development of social bonds, sentiment, and trust, thus reducing attachment to coworkers and employers” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:658).

“Workers receive higher performance evaluations from same-race managers and supervisors (Elvira and Town, 2001; Lefkowitz and Battista, 1995; Tsui and O’Reilly, 1989)...Zatzick et al. (2003) examine data collected from a Fortune 500 company and find that having same-race representation among upper-level management reduces voluntary turnover. Using data collected from a retail firm, Giuliano et al. (2006) find higher turnover rates (quits and dismissals) for workers with a racially dissimilar manager” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:658).

“Roscigno’s (2007) analysis of Ohio Civil Rights Commission data indicates that, among Black workers, serious cases of workplace racial discrimination decline precipitously with increases in the percentage of Black coworkers. Moreover, discrimination against Black workers was particularly pronounced in workplaces where Blacks comprised less than 25% of employees. This research indicates that the odds of perceiving racial discrimination should decrease with increases in the percentage of same-race coworkers as suggested by the organizational demography perspective. Further, tokens, which we define as less than 25% same-race coworkers, may be especially prone to perceiving racial discrimination at work compared to non-tokens because they are more visible and become potential targets for hostility, abuse, and other forms of workplace incivility” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:659).

“Hirsh and Kornrich’s (2008) organization-level study finds that greater minority group representation among managers reduces formal discrimination filings with the EEOC, however, their data are unable to distinguish which managers manage which work groups. It seems reasonable to expect that greater organizational power should curtail perceived discrimination...” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:660).

“The findings also indicate that having a same-race manager, albeit marginally significant (.05 < p < .10), reduces perceived racial discrimination by about 42% (1 – e–.540 = .417) compared to having a cross-race manager” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:663).

“For all racial groups, perceived racial discrimination reduced employer loyalty and increased job search intentions. Our results also indicate that perceived discrimination mediates some of the effects of racial composition on organizational attachment. Among Blacks and Latinos, the effects of racial composition on employer loyalty are partially mediated; however, we do not find an association between racial composition and employer loyalty among Whites. In retrospect this non-symmetric finding makes sense. Net of job quality and experiencing racial discrimination, non-Whites are more likely to form social relations with similar others, which in turn enhances their identification with the firm based on the more proximate social connections within the work group. Because Whites are often found in majority White work groups and this factor is less likely to influence their employer loyalty net of job characteristics” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:668).

“Net of statistical controls, racial composition had no effect on Blacks’ or Latinos’ job search intentions. Perceived discrimination did, however, partially mediate the racial composition and job search intention relationship for Whites; although, the direct effects of racial composition on job search intentions remained strong. The perception of discrimination by Whites and its effect on the relationship between racial composition and job search intention found reiterates earlier findings by researchers that White workers do not respond to diverse work groups in the same manner as minority workers (Tsui et al., 1992). The findings regarding job search intentions, in particular, hold important implications for organizational decision makers, human resource management (HRM) practitioners, and corporate policies and practices...Whites appear to be uncomfortable working in work groups where they are the numeric minority. This reality, and the tension between diversity on the one hand and in-group solidarity on the other, will pose a challenge in the coming years as employers continue to seek inclusive and racially integrated work environments. Specifically, the findings suggest that integrating non-White jobs may be especially challenging given Whites’ more adverse reaction to working with other races compared to non-Whites” (Stainback and Irvin 2012:668).

Laura Giuliano and Michael R. Ransom’s article provides robust empirical evidence that the demographic characteristics of managers—specifically ethnicity—directly influence hiring patterns and the ethnic composition of workforces, especially in smaller organizational units. Their nine-year, store-level analysis demonstrates that Hispanic managers are far more likely to hire Hispanic workers, even after accounting for local labor pools, but that manager–employee ethnic similarity has little effect on separations or transfers except in select cases. This study links Ray’s arguments about the encoding of racial advantage in organizational processes and Hambrick and Mason’s framework by showing how managerial demographics shape not just perceptions but concrete personnel outcomes (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:347–348).

“We examine the effect of manager ethnicity on the ethnic composition of employment using nine years of personnel records from a regional grocery store chain in the United States. The workforce studied is composed almost entirely of a white majority and a large Hispanic minority; the authors focus on the role of Hispanic ethnicity. Estimating models with store fixed effects, the authors examine the effects of manager ethnicity on hiring, transfer, and separation patterns. Effects of manager ethnicity are compared across several types of jobs, with significant effects occurring on hiring patterns but not on transfers, and effects occurring on separation patterns in only one atypical case. The authors also find that the effects on hiring occur only in jobs or departments with very few employees” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:347).

“These studies also investigate the reasons for why manager ethnicity matters, though the evidence here is less conclusive. Giuliano et al. argue that the patterns in quits and dismissals suggest that both manager and employee preferences are important. But an analysis of residential zip codes suggests that segregated hiring networks may also play a role. Aslund et al.’s findings suggest that managers are able to attract higher quality workers when they recruit those whose ethnic background is similar to their own” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:348).

“On average, approximately 18% of all baggers and cashiers work at a store in which their supervisor (i.e., the highest-ranking salaried manager) is of an ethnicity that is different from their own. This group is composed mainly of Hispanic employees with non-Hispanic managers, because most store managers are non-Hispanic whites...Though many employees have dissimilar managers, there is nevertheless a tendency for managers and their employees to be the same ethnicity. Table 4 compares the ethnic composition of employees under non-Hispanic and Hispanic managers. On average, the proportion of employees who are Hispanic is 13.5% among those with non-Hispanic managers, but is nearly three times as high (39.2%) among those with Hispanic managers. This tendency toward manager–employee similarity is especially high among baggers” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:355–356).

“The results (Table 5) confirm the importance of residential segregation. The coefficient on the Hispanic population share is always significant and large, and it is especially large in the analysis of baggers—who tend to live much closer than other employees to the stores where they work. However, even after controlling for the ethnic composition of the local population, manager ethnicity remains a significant predictor of the workforce’s ethnic composition. The coefficients on manager ethnicity are especially large in the analyses of baggers and of meat and produce employees” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:356).

“For baggers, the estimates imply a 52 percentage point difference in the rate that Hispanics are hired under Hispanic and non-Hispanic managers. In our sample, under a typical non-Hispanic manager in a given store, an average of six non-Hispanic baggers are hired for every one Hispanic bagger. Thus, our estimate means that replacing the non-Hispanic manager with a Hispanic manager would yield a dramatic change in this ratio—with one non-Hispanic bagger being hired for every two Hispanics hired. In the case of meat and produce employees, the column (1) estimate implies that when a department manager is Hispanic, 26 percentage points more Hispanic employees are hired into that department. When the manager is non-Hispanic, roughly one out of every eight hires is Hispanic in a typical meat or produce department. Hence our estimate means that when the department manager is Hispanic, three out of every eight hires is Hispanic” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:361).

“To test this hypothesis more formally, we pool newly hired employees in all jobs and estimate versions of Equation (1) that include the interaction of Mgr Hispanic with a dummy variable indicating jobs or departments with two or fewer current employees. The coefficient on the interaction term is 0.25 (t = 1.64), suggesting again that manager ethnicity matters much more where the number of employees is small” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:367).

“From the analysis of new hires, we conclude that in four of six job positions, Hispanics are significantly more likely to be hired if the manager is Hispanic. For cashiers and stockers, the estimates are small and statistically insignificant. But for baggers and for meat and produce employees, we estimate large and statistically significant effects” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:363).

“We examine the effect of manager–employee ethnic differences on employee separation rates by estimating linear probability models...The effect of being an ethnicity different from one’s manager is significant and robust for only one group—cashiers. Specifically, the estimates of D3 suggest that cashiers are roughly 4.5 percentage points (40%) more likely to separate from the firm when they have an ethnically dissimilar manager. For baggers, the estimate of D3 is positive in column (1), which controls only for employee characteristics plus store and year fixed effects, but it is not robust to the inclusion of additional controls. And for stockers and meat and produce employees, the estimates of D3 are consistently very close to zero...the effects of manager–employee dissimilarity for stockers and for meat and produce employees remain very close to zero” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:369–370).

“Using nine years of personnel records from a regional grocery chain, we examine the effect of manager ethnicity on hiring, transfer, and separation patterns...We find that manager ethnicity has significant effects on hiring patterns, but does not affect transfers, and affects separation patterns in only one atypical case. What’s more, we find that the effects on hiring occur only in smaller departments...our findings do suggest that manager ethnicity matters more in jobs and departments in which the number of employees is small” (Giuliano and Ransom 2013:376).

Alison Cook and Christy Glass’s study provides large-scale, empirical evidence that connects the social credentialing and organizational encoding of Whiteness (as described by Ray) with the importance of top leader demographics for organizational outcomes (as described by Hambrick and Mason). Analyzing Fortune 500 firms over a decade, they find that a single minority CEO has minimal independent effect on equity or diversity policy. Instead, it is board-level racial diversity—and the network power of minority board members—that consistently predicts stronger equity policies and actual diversity outcomes, illustrating how demographic composition at the upper echelons shapes both formal policy and material change (Cook and Glass 2015:183–184).

“Our analysis relies on a unique dataset of corporate practices, CEO race/ethnicity, and board member race/ethnicity in Fortune 500 firms from 2001 to 2010. The authors find that while minority CEOs have minimal impact on equity policies, diverse boards are significantly associated with equitable practices. They conclude that board diversity is critical for shaping corporate practice related to equity and diversity” (Cook and Glass 2015:183).

“We find that in the absence of board diversity, minority CEOs are largely not associated with equity policies and practices within the firm. However, regardless of the race/ethnicity of the CEO, firms with diverse boards are more likely than other firms to pursue equitable policies and practices. Our findings suggest that while promoting individual minority leaders is important, board diversity is the most important factor for shaping corporate policies and practices related to equity and diversity” (Cook and Glass 2015:184).

“Minorities are more likely than Whites to be tracked into less visible and less central positions, are excluded from high status and resource-rich networks, receive less mentoring and sponsorship from elite peers, and suffer from evaluation bias, stereotypes, and discrimination...Minorities are promoted to leadership positions, it is often in low-wage, low-prestige sectors or industries where minorities are employed in large numbers—a process termed bottom up ascription” (Cook and Glass 2015:184).

“Broadly speaking, the presence of powerful and supportive leaders who champion diversity policies significantly increases policy adoption...Minority executives are more likely than Whites to participate in and support diversity-oriented networking programs and organizational identity groups...Bell and Nkomo (2001) found that these leaders view themselves as change agents and tend to be more vocal than their peers on issues of bias and discrimination...Raeburn (2004) finds that women and minority executives—particularly those who had experiences of discrimination and bias—tended to be more supportive of equity initiatives” (Cook and Glass 2015:187).

“Overall previous scholarship suggests that the integration of leadership ranks by race/ethnicity is likely to reduce the salience of race/ethnicity and thereby reduce bias and stereotypes. Further evidence suggests that when minority leaders occupy top positions, they are more likely to hold favorable views of equity practices and policies, more likely to have experience with such policies, and more likely to advance such policies” (Cook and Glass 2015:187).

“According to Kanter (1977), tokens represent numerical minorities within a work group. Token status is associated with professional isolation, high visibility, and performance and assimilation pressures...Many token leaders also experience hostility and resistance to their leadership and may lack access and control over resources, professional support, and financial authority...While CEOs who experience token status may be less effective at advancing equity policies and practices, we predict that diverse boards can moderate the effect of token status for these leaders by providing power in numbers. The strength in numbers perspective suggests that as members of an underrepresented group gain greater representation in an organization, they will benefit from network support, reduced stereotypes and bias, and greater access to organizational resources” (Cook and Glass 2015:188–189).

“There is a great deal of empirical evidence to support the perspective that minority leaders will be more effective at advancing equity policies and practices when they enjoy the benefits of group diversity. For instance, research on group composition suggests that in diverse groups or contexts, minority leaders are more likely to raise controversial or dissenting views and encourage a broader range of alternatives to organizational problem solving” (Cook and Glass 2015:190).

“The percent minority on the board is positively and significantly related to a firm offering LGBT policies (p<.05) and successfully using supplier diversity (p<.05), and related with marginal significance (p<.10) to the promotion of diverse individuals...the number of interlinks was positively and significantly related to the firm offering work–life policies (p<.01), the firm implementing hiring programs focused on people with disabilities (p<.01), and the firm successfully using supplier diversity (p<.05)...these findings suggest that racial/ethnic minority members on the board are an essential component to a firm’s commitment to diversity” (Cook and Glass 2015:196–197).

“We find that minority leaders advance diversity and equity in their organizations...the promotion of formal diversity policies by minority leaders appears to accompany broader organizational impacts and outcomes. While our study advances research on race/ethnicity, leadership, and organizations, future research could build on our findings in important ways. First, because there have been so few racial/ethnic minority CEOs in the Fortune 500 to date, our analysis of this population does not allow analysis of the effect of different patterns of racial/ethnic composition...numbers matter; a greater representation of minorities in work organizations enhances opportunities for other minorities and leads to broader organizational change. Indeed, we find that minority leaders not only impact policy but practice as well—racial/ethnic diversity among top leadership increases minority representation in the organization, reliance on minority-owned suppliers, promotion opportunities for minorities, work–life benefits, and LGBT benefits” (Cook and Glass 2015:207).

Stella M. Nkomo and Akram Al Ariss’s article offers a historical and organizational genealogy of how whiteness was constructed as a credential and system of privilege in US organizations, establishing its material, symbolic, and cultural dominance across time. Their analysis details how white privilege is not simply a matter of phenotype but a system of bureaucratic advantage, embedded in workplace structures, norms, and resource flows. This connects Ray’s argument about the bureaucratic encoding and cumulative advantage of Whiteness and Hambrick and Mason’s perspective on the demographic reproduction of organizational authority—showing how whiteness operates both as organizational schema and as a determinant of who holds power (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:389–390).

“Ethnic (white) privilege is a manifestation of whiteness...whiteness is not just a matter of phenotype or skin color. It is about power and privilege as evident in the definition offered by Frankenberg (1993, p. 236) ‘whiteness [y] is the production and reproduction of dominance rather than subordination, normativity rather than marginality, and privilege rather than disadvantage.’ The presence of and meaning of whiteness in organizations has a long history dating back to the era of industrialization. Processes and practices that unfolded during that time led to the exclusion of racial minorities and a racialization of the workplace. Consequently, the idea that certain ethnic or racial groups belong in organizations along with their right to certain jobs, power, and privileges has been difficult to supplant over the years” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:390).

“At the macro level, whiteness has its roots in European imperial global expansion and colonization, immigration, and industrialization (Allen, 1994; Bender, 2009; Loomba, 2005; Rabaka, 2009). Europeans’ conceptions of themselves as ‘civilized’ as opposed to non-whites as the ‘wild savages’ encountered in colonial conquests set the groundwork for white supremacy...Industrialization also created a clear class boundary between capitalists (owners of business) and those who provided labor in the emerging organizations of the late nineteenth century. Yet, white labor did not align with racial and ethnic minorities despite this division. At the micro level, DuBois’ concept of the ‘wages of whiteness’ provides an explanation about how the white working class of the day in the USA came to think of itself and its interests as ‘white’ (Roediger, 1999)” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:391).

“Du Bois (1935/1995) argued that the practices of capitalists and management of the new factories generally paid white, native born workers higher wages compared with those of black workers. In other words, white workers received a short-term material benefit by virtue of being ‘white.’ Blacks were also typically placed in unskilled jobs, particularly those most dirty and dangerous (Foner and Lewis, 1989)...white workers accrued the benefits of being white in the public sphere despite their working class status. For the most part class divisions among whites were often blurred in the public sphere...They were given public deference...because they were white. They were admitted freely, with all classes of white people, to public functions and public parks...White schoolhouses were the best in the community, and conspicuously placed, and cost anywhere from twice to ten times colored schools” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:391).

“The work of Roediger (1999) provides a possible explanation. He argues the need for white workers to distance themselves from their pre-industrial selves created a situation that despite their ethnic differences, it was better not to be black...the growing popular sense of whiteness represented a hesitantly emerging consensus holding together a very diverse white working class and...part of that consensus derived from the idea that blackness could be made permanently to embody the preindustrial past that they (ethnic immigrants and native whites) scorned and missed” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:392).

“Whiteness became synonymous with a highly, capable, ambitious, and efficient worker who had the right to dominate inferior others (Bender, 2009; Du Bois, 1935/1995). The attributes and privileges of whiteness were bestowed upon people designated as white; while all others were excluded” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:393).

“During the Pre-Title VII period, white privilege manifested in different ways in the labor market and in organizations...white workers had greater workplace power and authority by virtue of the jobs held as well as not being subjected to being supervised by non-whites (Foner and Lewis, 1989). Racial and ethnic minorities were largely excluded from supervisory and managerial ranks prior to the passage of Title VII. It was not unusual during this period of rapid industrialization for organizations to have segregated washrooms, departments, and lunchrooms. There is historical evidence that workers of different races were not allowed to work together...black workers were generally excluded from informal networks and were more prone to being ‘solitaires’ (Nkomo and Hoobler, 2013)” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:394).

“Contemporary mechanisms (Post-Title VII) although more covert, subtle, and complex still operate to advantage those defined as ‘white’ and to disadvantage racial/ethnic minorities in the USA. These mechanisms are difficult to see because whiteness reproduces racial privilege for whites without appearing to do so...whiteness as an ideology means whites do not have to acknowledge their race in organizations as only racial/ethnic minorities are viewed as having race. One of the advantages whites have because of their dominant status is their ability to live and do race without ever being self-consciously aware of it...white employees can enjoy the advantage of being viewed as individuals and not as a social collective. A telling manifestation of this mechanism is that blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and other racial minorities may be asked to speak as representatives of their racial/ethnic group in a way rarely expected of whites” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:395).

“Whiteness is not just about ideology. It also creates access to material resources and a system of inclusion for those perceived as being white...Research has shown that white men experience a performance-reward advantage in the allocation of performance bonuses...white men received higher salary increases and bonuses compared to ethnic minorities (and women) and non-US-born employees with the same performance evaluation scores, in the same job unit, with the same supervisor and the same human capital. Research also reveals white advantages in recruitment and selection processes whereby ethnic/racial minorities are sorted into different kinds of jobs (compared to whites) or excluded from others...whites in all social spaces including the workplace are relatively privileged in comparison to racial/ethnic minorities” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:396).

“Definitions of the ideal employee and associated competencies are deeply intertwined with whiteness but are largely seen and presented as race neutral. Thus, it is more likely that whites will be assumed to possess the ‘right stuff’ or be the right fit for various organizational positions, especially leadership roles...being white was perceived to be an attribute of the business leader prototype, where participants assumed that business leaders, more than non-leaders, were white” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:396–397).

“Contemporary mechanisms of white privilege...are difficult to disrupt for two reasons. First, for the most part, scholars in the field of management and organization studies have tended to overlook its historical development...Second, despite some calls for research on whiteness, management, and organizational scholars have generally ignored the topic which has rendered ethnic (white) privilege largely invisible...The overwhelming majority of research has focussed on the disadvantages experienced by racial and ethnic minorities overshadowing the advantages accrued to the dominant group. Unwittingly, this may reinforce one of the enablers of white privilege – that whites are raceless and race and racial issues in the workplace require a focus on racial and ethnic minorities only” (Nkomo and Al Ariss 2014:398).

J. D. Pitts, S. Orozco-Aleman, and J. Rezek empirically show that wage determination in US workplaces is deeply shaped by the demographic characteristics of supervisors and their subordinates. Their findings reveal that workers earn significantly higher wages when supervised by someone of the same race and sex, indicating that status characteristics—such as Whiteness and managerial demographics—function as invisible organizational assets that affect material outcomes. This links Ray’s focus on Whiteness as a credential with Hambrick and Mason’s upper echelons theory, demonstrating how status hierarchies are reproduced through organizational leadership (Pitts et al. 2014:3533) .

“We find significant evidence that all workers, except Hispanic males, earn a wage premium when working for a supervisor of the same race and sex as themselves. Furthermore, the results suggest that sex has a larger impact on wages for workers with white supervisors, while race has a larger impact on wages for workers with minority supervisors. We propose that this is consistent with historical discrimination against females and minorities” (Pitts et al. 2014:3544) .

“In particular, we find strong evidence that workers of the same race and sex as their supervisor earn significantly higher hourly wages than otherwise equal workers of a different race or sex. This is true in all of the samples examined in this study except for the Hispanic Male Supervisor sample. Also interesting is that the effect of race and sex on wages is largest for those workers with minority supervisors” (Pitts et al. 2014:3539) .

“White males earn a wage premium when working for a white male supervisor compared to workers from all other groups. This premium ranges from 10% compared to Hispanic males to 60% compared to African American females” (Pitts et al. 2014:3539) .

“Sex appears to be more important to white supervisors, while race is more important to minority supervisors. The results in column 2 of Table 2 show that both African American and Hispanic males suffer a lower wage penalty than female workers when working for a white male supervisor… Hence, sex is a more important wage determinant than race for workers with white supervisors… However, the results in column 4 of Table 2 reveal that African American female workers earn more than otherwise equal white male workers when working for an African American male supervisor. Therefore…race is a more important wage determinant than sex for workers with minority supervisors” (Pitts et al. 2014:3539–3541) .

“White supervisors may provide more support and mentorship to workers of their own sex, while minority supervisors may tend to provide more support and mentorship to workers of their own race. Alternatively, …white supervisors know better how to motivate workers of their own sex, while minority supervisors know better how to motivate workers of their own race. Either of the above two explanations may or may not derive from supervisor discrimination” (Pitts et al. 2014:3541) .

“It is important to note that both race and sex are often important wage determinants in our supervisor samples; however, the history of racial and gender discrimination in the US may help to explain why sex is more important for those with a white supervisor and race is more important for those with a minority supervisor” (Pitts et al. 2014:3541) .

“The fact that the theories regarding supervisor discrimination are inadequate in explaining why workers receive a wage premium when working for a supervisor of the same race and sex as themselves may indicate that supervisor discrimination is not the culprit. Rather, as suggested by Lang (1986) and Tannen (1994), it may be that supervisors are simply better at motivating workers of the same race and sex as themselves because of cultural differences or differences in communication styles. At the very least, our findings show that supervisor discrimination is not well detected or explained on an aggregate level by the size and geographical location of a worker’s firm” (Pitts et al. 2014:3544) .

Adia Harvey Wingfield and Renée Skeete Alston’s article develops a theory of “racial tasks” that directly links the organizational credentialing of Whiteness to the structural and demographic reproduction of authority and status. They show that predominantly white organizations embed and enforce racial hierarchies not just through formal policy but through everyday expectations, interactions, and job requirements that position Whiteness as normative and minorities as outsiders. Their framework aligns with Ray by documenting the invisibility and persistence of white advantage, and with Hambrick and Mason by emphasizing how organizational outcomes reflect and reproduce the backgrounds and biases of those in power (Wingfield and Alston 2014:274–275) .

“We attempt to address this here by emphasizing the ways that the job requirements and implicit responsibilities associated with work at different levels of the organizational hierarchy are imbued with racialized meanings that affect the practices, behaviors, and actions that occur within the organization. We describe the work that is done in this context as racial tasks that ultimately operate to preserve and uphold Whites’ advantage in work settings. As such, we explore the ways that organizational hierarchies extend to unspoken racialized practices that inform and are embedded within racial minorities’ work in predominantly White settings” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:275) .

“In predominantly White organizations (e.g., many law firms, universities, financial institutions) there are many employees, often of different races. However, Whites tend to be concentrated at the top levels of these organizations (in CEO, director, president, and other senior administrative positions)…Structural and organizational patterns become one way that racial hierarchies are perpetuated in work settings” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:276) .

“At the ideological level, racial tasks involve establishing and/or maintaining an organizational culture that is normatively White and middle class. This labor is mostly done by those at the top level of the organizational hierarchy—CEOs, COOs, upper-level administrators. As such, racial tasks at this level actively serve to build and/or establish a culture wherein Whiteness is normalized and treated as standard” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:276–277) .

“Those at the top levels of organizations are directly able to set or change the organizational culture and are able to do so more directly than employees at the middle or lower tiers. Minority workers who establish the organizational culture of a work environment (the upper-level administrators, CEOs, and top tier management) are completing an ideological type of racial task that upholds cultural norms that value and idealize Whiteness” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:277) .

“Hiring choices, then, are imbued with additional meaning: In addition to being the basic responsibility of workers in the firm, they are a form of racial task wherein partners reinforce the ideological dynamics that retain racial hierarchies and values within the firm. Hiring decisions thus become an example of an organizational practice that preserves an ideology that maintains racial hierarchies” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:278) .

“Pierce’s (2012) work reveals that White male attorneys are able to establish a culture within the organization where Whites—White men in particular—are tacitly cast as the most suited for the high-status legal work performed in private firms…White male elites use institutional memory, gossip about Black workers, and reliance on broader cultural narratives as tools to institute an organizational culture that preserves White males’ advantages in the firm. Yet, even when they attain partnership status, workers of color in the organization must still do the racial tasks of perpetuating this organizational culture and even more, presenting the firm as an equitable workplace” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:279) .

“Black workers are typically given less authority and responsibility than their White peers, a fact that limits them when it comes to promotions and makes them more vulnerable when layoffs occur. Because Black employees are more likely to supervise other racial minorities, have less authority, and perform more narrowly described tasks, they must demonstrate their suitability for leadership positions more directly than White colleagues…they are doing labor that underscores racial hierarchies present within the organization. Doing the work of proving one’s capabilities and feigning or hiding emotions about race-related situations is a part of everyday social interaction for minority workers, and one that contributes to Whites’ advantage within the organization” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:279–280) .

“Employees at this [middle] level are likely to engage in racial tasks during their everyday interactions—in meetings, conferring with colleagues, and so forth…Midlevel workers, especially managers, are those most likely to make routine human resource decisions, such as hiring, promotion, termination and training. This responsibility is delegated from organizational elites who establish organizational culture. Midlevel workers interact with potential and current employees to select, promote, and modify behavior appropriate within the organization. As with workers of color at the top levels, diversity work is an important part of the way midlevel workers uphold organizational norms and culture. Following the lead of those at the upper levels of the organization, midlevel workers of color may take on the tasks of easing racial tensions and interpreting and repackaging directives from the top that maintain racial hierarchies in place in the organization” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:281) .

“Basic organizational practices and norms, then, are guided by racialized assumptions that create certain expectations for workers of color and maintain racial hierarchies. Though workers of all races in an organizational structure may engage in this type of labor, it takes its most pronounced toll on minority employees since they must work harder to conform to ideological, institutional, and physical norms that privilege Whiteness” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:283) .

“Inasmuch as Black employees’ paths to promotion rest not only on objective criteria such as work performance, they—more so than their White peers—must also demonstrate soft skills such as personability and professionalism to offset discriminatory practices and be seriously considered for promotion…We argue here that the presentation of these soft skills constitutes an example of racial tasks at the interactional level, but also that this constitutes a bias against workers of color that is inherent within organizations. In other words, within the organizational hierarchy, midlevel workers of color may be judged and evaluated based not just on their performance, but must also engage in emotion work, show their soft skills, and do impression management. We contend that these interactional processes are expected of minority workers at this level of the organization and compose institutional barriers to promotion and upward mobility” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:284) .

“Ultimately, the theory of racial tasks illuminates the ways that organizational hierarchies are often racially segregated, and that the work expected of employees at different levels of the hierarchy includes labor that is subtly racialized and continues to perpetuate inequality. All individuals in the workplace contribute to the racialized nature of the organization through their position in the workplace hierarchy and the ways in which they perform the tasks associated with their position” (Wingfield and Alston 2014:285) .

Curtis K. Chan and Michel Anteby’s study demonstrates how workplace hierarchies and managerial discretion shape subtle, ongoing forms of within-job inequality—here, through “task segregation”—which functions as an organizational mechanism for assigning certain groups to devalued or burdensome work. Their empirical analysis of the TSA shows how demographic status (such as gender, but with parallels to race) is embedded in routine organizational practices, granting privileged groups access to higher-status, less demanding roles while reinforcing cumulative advantage and managerial status reproduction. This framework links Ray’s account of Whiteness as a credential with Hambrick and Mason’s insight into the demographic reproduction of organizational authority (Chan and Anteby 2016:184–186) .

“We examine a case of task segregation—when a group of workers is disproportionately allocated, relative to other groups, to spend more time on specific tasks in a given job—and argue that such segregation is a potential mechanism for generating within-job inequality in the quality of a job. When performing those tasks is undesirable, this allocation has unfavorable implications for that group’s experienced job quality… Our findings suggest that this segregation led to overall poorer job quality outcomes for women. Task segregation overexposed female workers to processes of physical exertion, emotional labor, and relational strain, giving rise to work intensity, emotional exhaustion, and lack of coping resources. Task segregation also seemed to disproportionately expose female workers to managerial sanctions for taking recuperative time off and a narrowing of their skill set that may have contributed to worse promotion chances, pay, satisfaction, and turnover rates” (Chan and Anteby 2016:184) .

“We conceptualize workplace inequality more broadly in terms of job quality, the bundle of rewards coming from working in a job that coalesce to distinguish ‘good’ from ‘bad’ jobs… Conceptualizing inequality simply in terms of economic rewards misses the possibility of inequality in the subjective and noneconomic aspects of work… Job quality, however, accounts for the multifaceted nature of a job, consisting not just of objective, economic components but also subjective, noneconomic components like experienced work intensity, emotional exhaustion, and social resources” (Chan and Anteby 2016:185) .

“Because inequality endures for subtle reasons and in spite of efforts to resolve it, there remains a theoretical and societal imperative to identify its hidden mechanisms. Particularly hidden as an inequality-generating mechanism has been the possibility of task segregation. By task segregation, we mean when a group of workers is disproportionately allocated, relative to other groups, to spend more time on specific tasks within a given job. Here, we construct a task segregation lens on within-job inequality in job quality… Our case study therefore suggests that inequality scholars ‘bring work back in’… Closely examining workers’ experiences of performing tasks was crucial to understanding the processes through which task segregation influenced inequality. Without such attention to work, the link between tasks and inequality would have been missed” (Chan and Anteby 2016:186, 205) .

“We theorize the concept of task segregation as a mechanism for how work content can be a source of inequality. We contribute to inequality scholarship and the literature on gendered work activities by producing a holistic model of task segregation that considers a wide variety of job quality outcomes—economic and non-economic, subjective and objective—incorporating insights from existing literature and theorizing novel processes. Our model theorizes conditions for task segregation and processes through which task segregation can lead to both proximal and distal outcomes of job quality” (Chan and Anteby 2016:205) .

“Managers had a high degree of direct control, unilaterally directing workers to tasks… Managers disproportionately allocated female TSOs to the pat-down task in multiple ways. Deviating from the usual rotation procedure, they kept female TSOs in the pat-down task; while women were ordered to stay at the pat-down task, men rotated. Managers also called for female TSOs performing other tasks at their checkpoint to temporarily rotate into the pat-down task. Finally, managers requested women from other checkpoints to conduct pat-downs” (Chan and Anteby 2016:191) .

“Task segregation may overexpose [a group] to managerial sanctions and narrowing of their skill sets, which can be linked to distal outcomes of lower pay and promotion chances. Second, these distal outcomes, in tandem with proximal outcomes of high work intensity, emotional exhaustion, and lack of coping resources, may be linked to lower overall job satisfaction… Third, these distal and proximal outcomes might also be linked to higher [group] turnover; higher turnover, in turn, may intensify the relative lack of [minority] workers, potentially giving rise to a self-perpetuating cycle of task segregation” (Chan and Anteby 2016:201–202) .

“A model of task segregation as a mechanism for within-job inequality… highlights the enabling conditions of discrete task boundaries, managerial discretion in allocation decisions, and operational strains… As our findings show, task segregation overexposes one worker group—relative to other groups—to intertwined processes of physical, emotional, and relational disadvantage, thereby yielding proximal outcomes of work intensity, emotional exhaustion, and a lack of coping resources for the segregated group. Such adverse proximal outcomes could become part of workers’ assessment of poor job satisfaction and rationale for turnover. In the rightmost part of the model, we suggest that task segregation can give rise to more distal outcomes, such as lower chances of promotion, lower pay, lower job satisfaction, and higher turnover through processes of managerial sanctions and skill set narrowing” (Chan and Anteby 2016:204) .

Alison Cook and Christy Glass empirically demonstrate that the demographic composition of corporate boards powerfully shapes the appointment and performance of non-traditional leaders, such as women CEOs, in the largest US firms. Their analysis reveals that board diversity—not just tokenism, but a critical mass of influential women—directly increases the likelihood that women reach top leadership and succeed once appointed. This supports Ray’s claim that dominant group status functions as a credential conferring invisible, cumulative advantage, and aligns with Hambrick and Mason’s upper echelons view by showing how board-level demographics shape outcomes at the very top (Cook and Glass 2015:137–139) .

“Our analysis relies on a unique data set of all Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and Board of Directors (BODs) in Fortune 500 companies over a ten-year period. We find a marginally significant positive relationship between board diversity and the likelihood of a woman being appointed CEO. We further find that board diversity significantly and positively influences the post-promotion success of women CEOs. Our findings suggest that board composition is critical for the appointment and success of women CEOs, and increasing board diversity should be central to any organizational diversity efforts” (Cook and Glass 2015:137) .

“The primary function of a company’s board of directors is to appoint company leaders and oversee their leadership progress. There is even growing evidence that boards can also influence corporate strategy and long-term corporate planning (Demb and Neubauer, 1992; Matsa and Miller, 2013; Westphal and Zajac, 1995). Given the function of boards, it is likely that board composition significantly impacts CEO appointment and success” (Cook and Glass 2015:138) .

“Previous research suggests that promoting women to leadership positions can be an effective means of increasing diversity throughout an organization… Research in organizational demography further suggests that diversity among top leadership ranks is associated with greater diversity at lower levels of an organization (Skaggs et al., 2012), a phenomenon termed ‘bottom-up’ ascription (Elliott and Smith, 2001)” (Cook and Glass 2015:138) .

“Numeric minority leaders, or tokens, experience high visibility, performance pressures and intense scrutiny (Kanter, 1977)… They may also experience hostility, resistance, and challenges to their authority by firm insiders (Heilman et al., 2004; Kanter, 1977)… Particularly in high prestige leadership positions, tokens tend to have low status within work groups and occupy relatively weak structural positions within organizations (Collins, 1997; Kanter, 1977; Ridgeway, 1997). As a result, tokens are less capable than other leaders of influencing or altering organizational practices or influencing organizational outcomes… The penalties associated with token status are enhanced when negative gender stereotypes are relevant to performance expectations, as with high status leadership roles (Thompson and Sekaquaptewa, 2002)” (Cook and Glass 2015:138) .

“Integration of leadership ranks beyond the promotion of token females increases diversity at other levels in three ways. First, when women comprise a critical minority (or majority), group stereotypes and bias are reduced, enabling women leaders to exercise greater authority and influence over group processes and outcomes, including recruitment and promotion… Second, integration beyond a superficial level reduces the salience of gender to group processes, thereby expanding the range of acceptable leadership styles and the range of qualified and acceptable candidates for leadership positions… Finally, a critical numerical representation of women leaders provides a requisite degree of mentorship, network support and other forms of professional, social and organizational support to other women leaders” (Cook and Glass 2015:139) .

“The presence of a critical mass of female directors, however, will provide women leaders with greater organizational support, thereby improving the leader’s ability to pursue positive performance goals. Organizational support in the form of peer and mentorship relations and access to professional networks will facilitate the flow of information, encourage decision makers to pursue novel and innovative changes and increase leadership creativity (Ashfrod et al., 1998; DiTomaso et al., 2007; Herring, 2009)” (Cook and Glass 2015:139) .

“Status hierarchies shape both the behavior and perception of leaders within an organization (Ridgeway and Walker, 1995). According to Ridgeway (2001), status hierarchies are ‘central to the process by which people gain access to positions of leadership and exercise that leadership in the workplace’… Influential leaders are more likely than less influential incumbents to enjoy respect from group members, provide input into decision making processes, and defend controversial or dissenting views… Compared to lower ranking or less influential leaders, influential leaders display more proactive behaviors and are less likely to defer to the opinions or concerns of others” (Cook and Glass 2015:139) .

“Firms with a woman CEO and multiple women board members tend to perform better than firms with a woman CEO and few or no women on the board. Thus, while influential women board members are critical for women’s ascension to CEO, their post-appointment success is more strongly influenced by women’s numerical representation on the board. This suggests that the mechanisms for increasing women’s upward mobility and supporting their leadership are not the same. While influential woman board members may be critical for supporting the appointment of women CEOs, post-appointment, women CEOs benefit from a greater representation of women on the board” (Cook and Glass 2015:143) .

“Board diversity—defined as diversity beyond the presence of a solo woman director—is critical for supporting women leaders pre- and post-appointment. This underscores the importance of a phenomenon we term diversity matching. The presence of women on the board matters for gender integration of top leadership positions. To the extent that companies are committed to integrating top leadership positions, it is clear that board diversity is critical. Without it, women CEOs suffer performance declines; with it, performance improves” (Cook and Glass 2015:144) .

Jacob C. Day’s article empirically demonstrates how racialized organizational structures in high-status professions—here, college football coaching—embed and reproduce cumulative advantage for whites through both access to and differential returns from mobility-inducing jobs. Day’s event-history analysis reveals that Black coaches are systematically channeled into non-central, lower-status roles, while even Black coaches who access central roles receive fewer promotions than their white counterparts. This evidence links Ray’s argument about Whiteness as an organizational credential with Hambrick and Mason’s emphasis on upper-echelon status reproduction, showing how demographic biases and informal evaluations in leadership pipelines sustain racial stratification (Day 2015:1–4) .

“This study investigates the effects of job-level, task-based, segregation on racial differences in promotions to executive positions within the college football coaching profession. Using event-history methods to analyze the careers of 323 college football coaches, the results suggest that, relative to White coaches, Black coaches’ career prospects are harmed by their disproportionate placement into jobs that inhibit mobility (i.e., noncentral positions) and their differential returns from occupying jobs that induce mobility (i.e., central positions). These findings shed light on processes related to job-level racial segregation, particularism, and racialization in the coaching profession as well as more general, high-status, labor market contexts” (Day 2015:1) .

“The particularistic mobility thesis is the predominant theoretical explanation for racial/ethnic differences in both authority attainment and promotions in the labor market, particularly in high-status professions. According to the particularistic mobility thesis, performance indicators in high-level positions are inherently vague and uncertain (Jackall, 1988; Kanter, 1977), and the characteristics that upper management looks for when considering promotions such as loyalty, leadership potential, trustworthiness, and achievement orientation are not easily measured and quantified. This opens promotion decisions to ‘particularistic manipulation,’ or the subjective (mis)perceptions of upper level managers (Baldi & McBrier, 1997; Kluegel, 1978; Wilson, 1997). As a result, minority workers follow a more circumscribed pathway to high-level positions where they are limited to formal channels of mobility based on their objective experience, credentials, and skills. Whites, on the other hand, not only have access to formal channels of mobility but also benefit from the subjective and sometimes biased assessments of their skills and abilities. As a result, a broader range of mobility pathways, both formal and informal, are available to White workers (Mueller et al., 1989; Smith, 2005; Wilson, 2012; Wilson et al., 1999)” (Day 2015:3–4) .

“Prior research examining the particularistic mobility thesis has demonstrated that human capital indicators (e.g., education, general work experience, occupational work experience, and job tenure) are more predictive of Black workers’ promotions and authority attainment than they are for White workers (Baldi & McBrier, 1997; Mueller et al., 1989; Smith, 2001, 2005; Wilson, 1997; Wilson et al., 1999). Furthermore, research on racial differences in performance evaluations shows that Black workers’ performance is evaluated less favorably than that of White workers’ net of human capital and other objective and subjective performance indicators (Elvira & Town, 2001; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Smith, DiTomaso, Farris, & Cordero, 2001)… they have also been linked to minorities’ segregation into jobs that do not allow them to develop the skills or display the particularistic criteria necessary for promotions (see Dickerson, Schur, Kruse, & Blasi, 2010; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Smith, 2005; Wilson, 2012; Wilson & Maume, 2014)” (Day 2015:4) .

“Research on differential access to mobility-inducing positions suggests that the source of racial inequality in promotions and authority attainment lay primarily in the early segregation of minorities and Whites into different jobs that either facilitate or impede mobility. In conceptualizing the effects of job-level segregation in this way, this research implies that, if granted access to more racially heterogeneous jobs and workforces as well as mainstream tasks, minority workers’ career outcomes would be similar to their White counterparts… However, a lack of access is only one way that job-level segregation operates to produce racial differences in career outcomes. The same job can also provide differential mobility returns depending on a worker’s race” (Day 2015:6) .

“Studies that emphasize differential returns suggest that the same job does not necessarily produce the same results for workers of different racial or ethnic backgrounds… Black men performing high-status work experience what [Wingfield] calls ‘partial tokenization,’ where they enjoy some, but not all, of the benefits associated with being male in predominantly male workplaces while still experiencing some of the negative consequences of racial tokenization… Black men in professional and managerial occupations were acutely aware that they would be graded harsher than their White counterparts. As a result, they expressed the importance of being vigilant in how they dressed, carried themselves, as well as how their coworkers interacted with them… this work shows that occupying a ‘White job’ can have countervailing effects on Black professionals’ future career outcomes” (Day 2015:6–7) .

“The results suggest that racial inequality in career outcomes results from a constellation of racial privilege and disadvantage that is structured by the jobs coaches occupy throughout their careers. While Black and White coaches experience differential access to mobility-inducing, central, positions within the coaching profession, it appears that these racial differences in access are largely a product of positional segregation during their playing careers. However, once they enter the profession, occupying noncentral positions hampers Black coaches’ promotion opportunities more and occupying central positions facilitates Black coaches’ promotion opportunities less than they do for White coaches. This suggests that particularistic processes, such as the particularistic manipulation of the intangible characteristics and differential performance evaluation and treatment of Black and White coaches occupying the same positions, are operating to facilitate White coaches’ and hinder Black coaches’ career attainment” (Day 2015:23–24) .

“Relative to White coaches, Black coaches are unable to take full advantage of performing job tasks that generally facilitate mobility and less likely to overcome the disadvantages of performing job tasks that generally inhibit mobility” (Day 2015:25) .

Paul M. Guest’s large-sample study of executive mobility in U.S. firms provides direct empirical evidence that both the cumulative advantages conferred by whiteness and the demographic composition of upper management shape career outcomes at the highest organizational levels. Guest finds that female and African American executives face significantly lower promotion rates, higher demotion, and higher exit, even after controlling for credentials and performance, while Asian and Hispanic executives do not experience such disadvantages. These patterns illustrate how organizationally embedded status, stereotypes, and leadership demography—central to both Ray’s and Hambrick and Mason’s arguments—drive persistent inequality at the top (Guest 2016:604–605) .

“Minority executives as a whole experience lower promotion, higher demotion, and higher exit than Caucasian males. Female and African American executives account for the majority of these differences. Specifically, female executives experience lower promotion and exit, while African Americans experience lower promotion, higher demotion, and higher exit. In contrast, Asian and Hispanic executives do not experience different mobility outcomes from Caucasian executives” (Guest 2016:604) .

“Race, ethnicity, and gender are important personal attributes that could impact the way in which executives are treated and behave. The economics literature suggests that decision makers may be prejudiced against minority executives (Becker 1971) or apply statistically discriminative rules (Arrow 1973; Phelps 1972). Social psychology theories suggest that minorities may be disadvantaged by race- or gender-based stereotyping (Brenner, Tomkiewicz, and Schein 1989), attribution-biased errors (Hewstone 1990), or being singled out as a token (Kanter 1977)” (Guest 2016:604) .

“Social psychology theories are more unanimous in predicting that minority executives will be subject to bias. First, studies show that business leaders are perceived as exhibiting characteristics that are more closely correlated with the characteristics of Caucasian males than females (Brenner, Tomkiewicz, and Schein 1989; Koenig et al. 2011) or ethnic minorities (Chung-Herrera and Lankau 2005; Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips 2008). Female and ethnic minorities may therefore be perceived to lack the characteristics of successful business leaders, and consequently be discriminated against… Third, the theory of tokenism (Kanter 1977) suggests that because they comprise a small proportion of executives, minorities are subject to greater visibility, higher pressure to perform, and isolation. The result could be a deliberate attempt to not outperform the majority, avoidance of promotion (which would bring additional visibility), and higher turnover (Kanter 1977)” (Guest 2016:607) .

“Collins (1997) finds that African American executives often hold racialized positions, while Zweigenhaft and Domhoff (2011) show that female and African American executives are more likely to work in public relations, human resources, and general counsel… white male executives may have a wider executive network (McDonald, Lin, and Ao 2009) which could disadvantage minorities because such networks increase the executive’s value to her own firm… and hence probability of promotion (McDonald, Lin, and Ao 2009)” (Guest 2016:608).

“Minorities are less likely to be in ranks 1 or 2, equally likely to be in rank 3, and more likely to be in ranks 4 through 7. Minorities achieve a higher education level than Caucasian males, being more likely to hold a master’s degree and PhD. Minorities are on average 3 years younger with 3 years fewer firm tenure… a higher proportion of minorities work in communications, human resources, or law… In summary, minorities as a whole differ from Caucasian males in terms of rank, education, age, tenure, experience, and functional area” (Guest 2016:617) .

“The estimated coefficient for the minority dummy variable is a significant –0.338, implying that minority groups have a 29 percent lower probability of promotion than Caucasian males… the coefficient for African Americans of –0.431 implies that African Americans face a 35 percent lower probability… The lower probability of promotion for female and African Americans is economically as well as statistically significant” (Guest 2016:620–621) .

“Minority status is associated with a significantly higher probability of demotion. The coefficient for African American is statistically significant with a value of 0.555. This implies a probability of demotion that is some 73 percent higher than Caucasians. In contrast, neither Hispanics nor Asians experience a different probability of demotion from Caucasians” (Guest 2016:623) .

“Minority is a significant 0.311, implying that minorities are 37 percent more likely to exit than Caucasian males… The coefficient for African American is 0.438 and highly significant, rendering African Americans 55 percent more likely to exit than Caucasians. In contrast, Asian and Hispanic executives do not differ from Caucasians in exit probability” (Guest 2016:624) .

“In summary, the presence of minorities in leadership positions does not impact the mobility of minority executives. This does not imply that discrimination is not a factor in the mobility patterns observed. Minority CEOs or board members may not wish or be able to eradicate taste-based or statistical discrimination, while biased stereotyping and attribution bias may occur without their conscious knowledge or intent” (Guest 2016:627) .

“The mobility outcomes of females and African Americans are consistent with several theories of discrimination and/or bias. Boards of directors could have a taste-based preference against working with female and African American executives, statistically discriminate against them, be biased by stereotyping, or make attribution-bias errors… such bias is likely most prevalent toward African Americans because they face more difficult barriers in terms of stereotypes, physical difference, and a history of slavery and segregation” (Guest 2016:628) .

Jennifer Merluzzi and Adina Sterling’s study shows that organizational practices such as referral-based hiring can have distinct, persistent effects on the career mobility of different demographic groups, especially in contexts where status and competence are unevenly attributed. Analyzing eleven years of personnel data, they find that Black employees—who otherwise face lower rates of promotion—receive significant upward mobility advantages when hired through referrals. This provides evidence that social networks can counteract organizationally encoded disadvantage, illustrating the interplay between status, organizational structure, and leadership demography central to both Ray’s and Hambrick and Mason’s frameworks (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:105–106) .

“Drawing on theories of referral-based hiring, inequality, and career mobility, they argue that referral-based hiring provides unique promotion advantages for minorities compared to those hired without a referral. Consistent with this argument, they find that referrals are positively associated with promotions for one minority group, blacks, even after controlling for individual and regional labor market differences. The authors explore the possible mechanism for this finding, with initial evidence pointing to referrals providing a signal of quality for black employees. These results suggest refinement to prior research that attests that referral-based hiring disadvantages racial minorities” (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:105) .

“We argue that women and racial minorities may stand to uniquely benefit from network-based hiring because of the distinct advantages referrals provide, such as access to seemingly blocked intra-organizational networks and a positive signal of quality from associating with the referrer. As such, we expect that referrals will positively and differentially affect the upward mobility of women and racial minorities compared with men and whites” (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:107) .

“The analysis indicates support consistent with our arguments on referral-based hiring providing a promotion advantage to one traditionally disadvantaged group—black employees. We explore various explanations for the observed association between referrals and promotions for blacks by taking advantage of detailed information about the employee’s education level and performance evaluations, which proxy for employee quality, as well as geographic variance in office locations that might lead referrals to affect specific regional labor market advantages. In models controlling for quality and geographic location, we find the significance of referrals to the promotion outcomes of black employees remains” (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:107) .

“Consistent with what we might expect based on prior research, women and blacks experience fewer promotions than do males and whites… No disadvantage is observed in the number of promotions for Hispanics, Asian Americans, or other minorities… In model 2, we include the referral variable and find no effect from referrals on the number of promotions. The effect is negative, though not statistically significant… Next we investigate Hypothesis 2 (H2)—there are positive intra-group effects of referrals on post-entry promotions for members of demographically disadvantaged groups. Since only women and blacks have a lower number of promotions than men and whites, respectively, these are the disadvantaged groups that H2 posits referrals will affect… We find support for the hypothesized relationship of referrals on promotions among black employees. The coefficient on the interaction variable is positive and statistically significant (p < 0.05). It indicates that blacks hired through referrals increase their number of promotions by a factor of 1.2 relative to blacks hired through other methods, holding all other factors constant” (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:114, 116) .

“In sum, the analyses indicate that blacks sustain disadvantages in post-entry promotions and that the route through which individuals are hired might have persistent effects on reducing this disparity. Black employees receive more promotions when hired through referrals than do black employees not routed through referrals. This effect is present in both types of promotions; however, the effects of referrals are most pronounced in models of outstanding promotions, where the disadvantages blacks sustain in promotions are almost fully remediated through referrals” (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:117) .

“Exploratory analyses toward this end in an experimental vignette… showed that participants were more apt to use hard data to assess employee quality when evaluating black employees compared with white employees but were less likely to do so for employees who were hired by a referral rather than by formal methods. This difference in the use of hard data further appeared between explanations of participants evaluating black employees with and without a referral. This result is consistent with aforementioned explanations of signaling as a source of the advantage referrals may provide when referrals may vouch for a traditionally disadvantaged employee by minimizing attention to perceived lower quality (i.e., low percentile ranking) and moving them forward along the career path inside a firm” (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:121) .

“Our study suggests refinements to this thesis, given the disproportionate effects referrals have on the outcomes of group members that might otherwise sustain disadvantages in upward mobility pursuits. More pointedly, while prior studies largely lead to the conclusion that referral-based hiring should be reduced to address inequality between groups, we find evidence counter to this claim, especially when considering post-entry career outcomes for some demographic groups (Fernandez and Greenberg 2013)” (Merluzzi and Sterling 2017:126) .

Mayra Ruiz Castro and Evangelina Holvino’s intersectional case study of a Big Four professional services firm demonstrates that advancement and authority in organizations are produced and legitimized through the simultaneous operation of gender, class, racio-ethnicity, and culturally specific “scripts.” Their qualitative findings reveal that light-skinned, affluent-looking, English-speaking employees—those who fit local and global standards of “whiteness” and status—enjoy cumulative, invisible advantages in promotion and access to resources. Organizational outcomes thus reflect both the encoding of privileged status, as argued by Ray, and the influence of dominant group identity at the top, as Hambrick and Mason propose (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:334–336) .

“Our findings show that career trajectories and advancement in this firm are contradictory processes, over-determined by individual employees’ lived identities, work interactions shaped by those identities, as well as formal and informal organizational practices embedded in an already raced, classed and gendered societal context and culture” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:329) .

“It is not that only a few women are promoted—the traditional gender analysis—but it is light-skinned, attractive and affluent-looking, English-speaking women and men who graduated from private universities and established good relations with the partners, who emerged as the most promotable and career-satisfied at BFM” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:335) .

“Class markers in Mexican society were found to influence women’s and men’s advancement opportunities at BFM. One of these markers was the university from which employees had graduated… Graduates from public universities were described by Human Resources representatives as more suitable for working in the Auditing area…less confident than graduates from private universities, who were considered to be extroverted and to have leadership skills and a good level of English proficiency. Graduates from private universities were recruited to fill vacancies involving training and specialization in core business areas outside Auditing, which also offered high salaries and good opportunities to participate in the firm’s exchange programme in US offices” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:337) .

“English knowledge was a class marker, closely related to employees’ public–private university status. Interviewees used this to rationalize constrained advancement opportunities in the firm, especially for women. For example, Ana’s male manager told her that the only promotion requirement she needed to fulfil was to improve her English. In her opinion, ‘this is incongruent, because weeks later they hired a male manager who did not have the English level required for that position and he still does not have it’” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:337) .

“Female interviewees further described cases in which women who carried some markers of a disadvantaged socioeconomic status, including a lack of English proficiency, being morenas (dark-skinned) and being financially responsible for their parents and siblings, were mistreated, abused or ignored by their male colleagues and supervisors…they simply ‘do not have any promotion chances’ (Cynthia, female, staff)” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:337) .

“All through Latin America, the dynamics of racio-ethnic differences support the inseparability of race and ethnicity from dynamics of inequality as experienced in daily life and social structures… Light skin colour and European phenotypes are associated with a higher socio-economic status and are key for upward social mobility, especially for the middle and upper classes ‘where light complexion seems to be particularly valued’ (Flores and Telles, 2012, p. 492)” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:338) .

“Here, part of succeeding is being pretty. That’s the reality, that’s the image that the firm projects. Let us not fool ourselves. Being pretty is an added advantage. The people who are being supported, they all are pretty… if there is un arrocito and a little ugly one, that is, el frijolito, they will choose el arrocito. I think that even when they are equally capable, they will choose the pretty one. (Martha, female, senior)” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:338) .

“Emilio…had been subjected to degrading comments because of having graduated from a public university and for his dark-skin complexion, an intersection which carried many disadvantages: ‘Then there is a partner who jokingly tells me, ¿que pasó negro, qué pasó pinche negro? I only smile… I want to take it just as a game, not as discrimination. But it is indeed uncomfortable’” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:338) .

“Women, especially, seemed to be valued first in terms of their beauty or lack of it and were forced, directly or indirectly, to adopt the desired standards of appearance. According to the woman partner interviewed, high-potential women were receiving training on personal appearance and business behaviour (including make-up, golf and wine-tasting courses)…within BFM women were socialized into dressing and behaving in certain ways, thereby distancing themselves from stereotypes of gender, racio-ethnicity and class that ostracize indigenous and poor women in Mexico. This socialization started very early in their careers” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:339) .

“The above findings suggest that in addition to the masculine-gendered characteristics of the ‘ideal worker’… there are also class and racio-ethnic markers that come to function as symbols and identities of power, which co-construct who is valued and rewarded in PSFs. Those who carry the desired markers of an ideal hegemonic masculinity are not guaranteed advancement, but rather those symbols and identities become idealized and striven for, exacerbating inequality and advancement disadvantage” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:340) .

“Career trajectories and advancement in the Big Four firm we studied did not follow a rational series of progressive and teachable steps that women and men could follow, but instead seemed fairly random and contradictory processes, over-determined by individual employees’ identities, work interactions shaped by those identities, as well as formal and informal organizational practices embedded in an already raced, classed and gendered societal context and culture” (Ruiz Castro and Holvino 2016:341) .

Dragana Stojmenovska’s large-scale panel study demonstrates that the demographic composition of organizational leadership—specifically, the share of women in management—directly shapes wage structures and reduces inequality in British workplaces. Using nationally representative data, Stojmenovska finds that as women’s representation among managers increases, the gender pay gap in non-managerial roles shrinks, largely through increased wages for women, and this effect is independent of formal diversity policies. This provides empirical support for Ray’s arguments about the credentialing of dominant group status and Hambrick and Mason’s thesis that leadership demographics fundamentally shape organizational outcomes (Stojmenovska 2019:738–739, 751–753) .

“The findings, based on workplace‐fixed time‐fixed effects regression models, suggest that workplace‐level increases in the share of women in management are associated with decreases of the non‐managerial gender gap in earnings. This effect appears to be largely unrelated to changes in equality and diversity policies, family‐friendly arrangements and support for carers at the workplace” (Stojmenovska 2019:738) .

“A salient subsequent question, then, is what happens to gender earnings disparities as relatively more women occupy managerial positions. Given that managerial positions enable exerting influence on organizational outcomes and processes…the presence of female managers might bring about changes in the reward distribution practices. This would mean that beyond the benefits that managerial positions accrue to managers themselves, the effects of the gender composition of management spill over to subordinate positions at the workplace, ultimately decreasing or reversing inequality in non‐managerial positions” (Stojmenovska 2019:739) .

“I find that the gender gap in earnings on average decreases with the increase of the share of women in management, both due to an average increase in women’s wages and an average decrease in men’s wages. In workplaces where pay is certain to be set by management at the workplace, increases in the share of women in management decrease the average gender earnings gap largely by increasing women’s average wages, while not decreasing those of men. A maximal increase of the share of women in management of 100 percentage points decreases the predicted average yearly gender gap in earnings—controlling for individual and workplace characteristics—of about 3150 pound sterling, by 54 per cent. This effect appears to be largely unrelated to changes in equality and diversity policies, family‐friendly arrangements and support for carers at the workplace” (Stojmenovska 2019:739) .

“The gender gap in earnings at the workplace can be a function of allocative and within‐job earnings disparities…Managerial gender composition may influence pay by affecting either or both… The principles of homophily and homosocial reproduction are often used as a basis for theorizing. Homophily is the inclination of individuals to form bonds with others who are similar to them along the lines of an ascribed group or category. Homosocial reproduction refers to people’s tendency to select individuals (e.g., in hiring, promotion or pay increase) similar to themselves. Given that gender is an important dimension of categorization…individuals on average tend to prefer others whom they perceive similar to themselves in terms of gender…managers are inclined to award, promote or support employees similar to them with regard to gender” (Stojmenovska 2019:739–740) .

“Women may hold a weaker or no bias against female workers, or support equity efforts because they have experienced inequality themselves. Finally, the mere presence of women in management—especially in high shares—may diminish the salience of gender as a category at the workplace, thereby reducing gender stereotypes…the presence of managers similar in gender terms is expected to increase access to networks of power, through which employees can gain specific human capital relevant for the job, or increase their bargaining power in the reward distribution process…This means that an increase in the share of women in management at the workplace would on average benefit women in subordinate positions because these employees would have more role model managers who support and mentor them” (Stojmenovska 2019:740) .

“While there is some experimental evidence for the existence of the queen bee syndrome, studies that deal with the question at hand generally find that in workplaces with larger shares of women in management, the gender gap in earnings among non‐managerial employees is smaller (see, e.g., Cardoso & Winter‐Ebmer, 2010; Cohen & Huffman, 2007; Hultin & Szulkin, 1999)” (Stojmenovska 2019:740) .

“Table 5 reports the results from the workplace‐fixed time‐fixed effects regression analysis…The coefficients for the share of women managers and its interaction with employee gender suggest that an increase in the share of women in management decreases the average earnings of men and increases those of women. The magnitude of these effects decreases with the addition of the control variables in the subsequent models, but remains substantial in Model 3. In Model 3, the coefficient for the employee gender represents the average difference in weekly earnings between women and men at 0 percentage point increase in the share of female managers, controlling for other employee and workplace characteristics. This coefficient means that on average, in workplaces with no increase in the share of women managers, women earn about 72 pound sterling per week less than comparable men. The coefficient for share of female managers at the workplace is the average effect of 1 percentage point increase in the share of women managers on men’s weekly earnings. On average, men’s earnings decrease by 0.245 pound sterling per week with each percentage point increase in the share of women in management. To obtain the effect of 1 percentage point increase of share of female managers on the earnings of women, one needs to add the interaction effect to the main effect of share of female managers, obtaining an effect of 0.08 pound sterling. This value means that on average, women’s earnings increase by 0.08 pound sterling per week with each percentage point increase in the share of women in management” (Stojmenovska 2019:751) .

“Figure 1 shows that in workplaces at which the share of women in management did not increase between 2004 and 2011 (0 percentage points on the x‐axis), men on average earn notably more than women. As we move along the x‐axis from 0 to 100 percentage point increase in share of female managers, the average weekly earnings of women increase and those of men decrease. At a 100 percentage point increase in the share of women in management, the gender gap in earnings remains significant but is substantially decreased” (*Figure 1, p. 752*) .

“The reduction in the gender earnings gap owing to an increased share of women in management at the workplace is due to a decrease in the average earnings of men, more so than an increase in the average earnings of women. The larger magnitude of the average effect for men (−0.245 pound sterling) than the one for women (0.08 pound sterling) is reflected clearly in the steeper downward slope of the solid line compared to the flatter upward slope of the dashed line in Figure 1” (Stojmenovska 2019:752) .

“The analyses by type of pay determination system showed that women reduce the gender gap in earnings also in workplaces where one is sure to have pay set by management. Given the variation in how the gender pay gap is affected with the increase of the share of women in management, the presence of the effect of the gender composition of management on the gender earnings gap is coupled with the way pay of non‐managerial employees is determined. Women managers do not decrease the gender gap in earnings across all pay determination systems. Before one concludes…that women managers do decrease the gender gap in earnings but largely at the detriment of men’s wages, it is important to note that in workplaces which reported to have pay set by the management at the workplace itself…an increased share of women in management decreases the gender gap in earnings largely by increasing women’s average earnings and not decreasing those of men” (Stojmenovska 2019:756) .

“Women managers may reduce the gender earnings gap due to their homophilous preferences, or absence of bias against female employees. The effect could also occur through role modelling and female employees’ better access to networks of power. These explanations are not competing and likely operate simultaneously. While I have not been able to adjudicate which of them has most merit and when, one can at the minimum conclude that this article provides no evidence for either of the competing theories. Contrary to what one would expect based on status characteristics theory, gender does appear to be a meaningful category. Given that women managers increase, rather than decrease, the wages of women, the findings do not provide evidence for a queen bee syndrome” (Stojmenovska 2019:756) .

Morela Hernandez, Derek R. Avery, Sabrina D. Volpone, and Cheryl R. Kaiser’s experimental studies provide direct evidence that racialized expectations and stereotypes—rooted in prescriptive views of who “deserves” resources—shape salary negotiation outcomes, penalizing Black job seekers for behavior seen as legitimate from white candidates. Their findings show that Black professionals face lower salary offers and greater resistance when they negotiate assertively, especially from evaluators higher in racial bias. This empirically supports Ray’s argument that organizations encode racial schemas into bureaucratic practices, and demonstrates Hambrick and Mason’s insight that leader dispositions drive key workplace decisions (Hernandez et al. 2019:581–588) .

“Across three studies, we theorize and find that Black job seekers are expected to negotiate less than their White counterparts and are penalized in negotiations with lower salary outcomes when this expectation is violated; especially when they negotiate with an evaluator who is more racially biased (i.e., higher in social dominance orientation)… Black negotiators who behave in counterstereotypical ways encounter greater resistance and more unfavorable outcomes from more biased evaluators” (Hernandez et al. 2019:581) .

“Based on racial stereotypes that characterize Blacks as lazy, incompetent, or poor… job evaluators might anticipate Black job seekers to be less qualified and, therefore, expect less pay relative to White job seekers. In a similar vein, Ayres and Siegelman (1995) found that new car dealers often made inferences using the buyer’s race to formulate their offers; specifically, sellers offered significantly higher prices to Black, as compared to White, buyers… Yet, current understanding of the role of the organizational representative (i.e., the job evaluator) in Black–White bargaining contexts remains underdeveloped. For instance, do job evaluators have different expectations of Black versus White job seekers? Moreover, how and why might these expectations create worse outcomes for Black versus White job seekers during salary negotiations?” (Hernandez et al. 2019:581) .

“We theorize that Black job seekers who are seen as violating race-stereotypic expectations by bargaining in salary negotiations (i.e., violating the prescriptive stereotype that Blacks should not push for more…) will elicit fewer concessions and, therefore, less favorable outcomes than White negotiators. Across three studies using perceptions of expected, actual in-person, and controlled online simulated negotiations, we found consistent support for our theoretical arguments, demonstrating that race-based expectancies significantly affect negotiation processes and outcomes” (Hernandez et al. 2019:582) .

“Job evaluators who hold particularly strong racial biases might view Black job seekers as less likely to negotiate because they see Blacks as less deserving of higher salaries as compared to Whites (McConahay, 1983; Sidanius et al., 2000). Further, highly biased job evaluators might assume that Black job seekers will be unlikely to negotiate in the first place, as this fits with their belief that minorities are undeserving of better outcomes” (Hernandez et al. 2019:582) .

“The belief among racially biased job evaluators who hold race-stereotypic expectancies—that Black individuals should be less apt to negotiate, or perhaps even disinclined to negotiate at all—creates a backdrop against which any actual bargaining that takes place will be assessed… the application of a prescriptive stereotype to Black negotiators (i.e., they do not deserve to negotiate for higher salaries) can produce negative salary outcomes when these individuals do not conform” (Hernandez et al. 2019:583) .

“Backlash effects are social and economic punishments for engaging in behavior that is inconsistent with that expected for members of one’s social identity group (Rudman & Phelan, 2008)… Those who perceive others engaging in counterstereotypical behavior (e.g., a Black job seeker negotiating) are likely to act in ways that punish the deviant personally and reinforce the stereotypical expectancy the job seeker has violated. We predict that expectancy violation will create backlash effects such that job evaluators negotiating with Black job seekers will be less inclined to make concessions, confining salaries to the lower end of the spectrum” (Hernandez et al. 2019:583) .

“Study 1…found that more biased evaluators expect Black job seekers to negotiate less as compared to White job seekers. When Black negotiators violate those expectations, evaluators award them lower starting salaries (Study 2), which appears to occur because evaluators become more resistant to making concessions to Black than to White job seekers (Study 3)… Black negotiators attain lower starting salaries when they are perceived as negotiating more, though no such effect was present for White negotiators… this penalization for negotiating more is limited to outcomes wherein there is direct opposition in the interests of the two negotiating parties (i.e., distributive outcomes)” (Hernandez et al. 2019:581, 591) .

“When these race-stereotypic expectancies are violated during actual negotiations, job evaluators are less willing to make concessions and, ultimately, assign Black job seekers significantly lower starting salaries than White job seekers. These insights have implications to a number of fields related to race-stereotypic expectancies and the factors that affect processes and outcomes in salary negotiations” (Hernandez et al. 2019:587) .

“Our research suggests that by addressing the less-recognized causes of racial pay inequality in the workplace, companies can attract a more diverse workforce and better leverage it (by compensating employees fairly and developing a reputation for doing so) in the quest to attain sustained competitive advantage” (Hernandez et al. 2019:588) .

Lotte Holck’s ethnographic case study of a Danish municipal agency empirically demonstrates how organizational structures—including dual formal/informal hierarchies and continuous differentiation—embed and reproduce unequal opportunity, especially along ethnic and racial lines. Holck shows that even in organizations committed to diversity, managerial discretion, informal networks, and ambiguous authority structures systematically privilege majority group members and relegate minorities to devalued roles. This directly supports Ray’s argument that dominant group status functions as an invisible organizational credential, and aligns with Hambrick and Mason by revealing how structural and demographic leadership patterns shape outcomes and perpetuate inequality (Holck 2018:242–245, 251–256) .

“This article applies classical concepts of organizational structure and extends them to contemporary challenges of diversity to explore why unequal opportunity structures persist in an organization despite its commitment to diversity and employing highly skilled ethnic minority employees… inequality is sustained by inadequate integration methods that merge a formal–informal hierarchy, which results in peer competition and majority elites. The structural approach to organizational diversity developed in this article nuances the current research on diversity that is predominantly concerned with employee experiences of inequality in an organizational structural landscape perceived as fixed and stable. This study offers a dynamic view of organizational structure based on how it is experienced, navigated, and reshaped by employees of different ethnicities. Linking micro-interactions to structural triggers and outcomes points to situated caveats about inequalities ingrained in the organizational structural set-up” (Holck 2018:242) .

“Critical scholars have successfully demonstrated how diversity management as a managerial practice is shaped and interpreted through social power hierarchies that favor majority employees… these studies predominantly relate to employee experience in an organizational structure taken as fixed and stable… This article responds to this call by exploring how unequal opportunity structures in the Danish municipal center CityBiz are generated by the core organizational aspects of its operation. Returning to Kanter’s (1977) classical concerns of how organizational structure and diversity (focusing on women’s careers) are interlinked, this study extends her work to a contemporary context to include a focus on ethnicity” (Holck 2018:243) .

“Kanter’s (1977) pioneering work on how inter-personal power and authority arise in the context of organizational structure is particularly insightful for this study. Her study shows how male privilege is naturalized through processes of ‘homosocial reproduction’ that result in a gendered hierarchy to the detriment of women’s careers possibilities. Drawing on Kanter’s insights, this study observes ‘blurred lines of authority’, in which self-appointed majority group members step into political situations and claim authority. This perspective extends Kanter’s approach regarding who gains access and legitimacy at the top, by pointing out some of the specific aspects of organizational structure—beyond more-explicit features like recruitment and promotion ladders—that are more mundane, fine-grained, and subtle but are nonetheless important and oftentimes overlooked in organization–level studies of diversity” (Holck 2018:244) .

“One of the concepts that most forcefully grasp the intersection between formal/informal organizational structures and inequality is Acker’s (2006, 2012) ‘inequality regimes’. Inequality regimes are defined as systematic disparities between employees regarding power, control over goals, resources, and outcomes; decisions on how to organize work; opportunities for promotion and interesting jobs; security in employment; and so on… The latter are often tacitly practiced in the ordinary lives of organizations in which, for example, gendered and racialized assumptions about minorities and the majority are embedded and reproduced and inequality is perpetuated (Acker, 2012). By locating this study in the tension between formal structures and emergent, fraught, and everyday informal structures, this study deals with how ‘power elites’ stratify along ethnic/racial lines, producing regimes of inequality in organizations” (Holck 2018:245) .

“The lack of transparency of hierarchy and authority and the replacement of formalized roles and rules with tacit codes put minorities at a disadvantage… the codes and guiding principles of the informal system are not obvious or easily translatable: ‘There are some political and professional codes in the municipal hierarchy. If you know these codes, then you will be promoted. Those who get the authority to communicate orally and in writing with the political level will be favored. However, these codes are not easily obtainable.’ As a consequence, a ‘natural’ task distribution arises… the politico-strategic tasks… are reserved for employees capable of deciphering the informal codes and writing in flawless Danish, favoring ethnic Danes. On the other hand, the representational, customer-oriented functions… are predominantly performed by ethnic minority employees. The representative tasks are unofficially seen as low-status tasks to showcase the diversity of employees. Entrance into high-prestige politico-strategic tasks is guided by a process aimed at filtering those employees who are ‘adequately skilled’ to perform these tasks” (Holck 2018:252) .

“Employees are kept in fixed ethnic and gendered positions, making it difficult to pursue preferred career paths… ‘There is always a barrier to your progress. You must know your place and position. All of a sudden, I hear from a colleague that someone has taken over the meeting that I have been planning, or that Tor is suddenly in charge of my project… As soon as people from the municipality are involved in a meeting, I can never attend—then ‘the Danes’ take over… There are certainly limits to the kind of work that is assigned to me.’” (Holck 2018:253)

“The ‘ethnified’ hierarchy gains impetus from larger societal discourses on difference (Acker, 2012; Holck and Muhr, 2017; Van Laer and Janssens, 2011), resting on a binary of ‘real Danes’ and ‘immigrants’, marginalizing the entire group of individuals. These societal discourses on multiculturalism permeate and are reproduced through employee interaction in CityBiz. Accordingly, highly skilled ethnic minority professionals at CityBiz are perceived as stereotypical ‘low-skilled’ immigrants and not as well-educated professionals, which preserves inequality. The ‘ethnified’ hierarchy promotes the ethnic minorities’ feelings of injustice and partiality” (Holck 2018:253) .

“In the informal, team-based organization, the pecking order becomes visible in the distribution of tasks, promotions, and rewards… the ‘ethnified’ hierarchy in CityBiz—dividing employees into the privileged majority performing high-prestige, career-promoting tasks and the minority performing ‘hands-on’, representative and diversity ‘showcase’ tasks—triggers political and symbolic struggles around issues of promotion and task distribution” (Holck 2018:253) .

“The combination of accelerating differentiation and the dual formal–informal hierarchy in CityBiz results in an opaque organizational landscape in which ethnic minorities have little power and which consequently discriminates against them. Because it allows and encourages peer competition, it puts ethnic minorities in a disadvantageous position. Diversity practices in CityBiz undermine ethnic minority employees’ sense of self as knowledgeable, capable, and competent professionals, as majority norms and a skewed power hierarchy cast them in inferior and dependent roles” (Holck 2018:256) .

Ashleigh Shelby Rosette, Modupe Akinola, and Anyi Ma’s chapter systematically reviews and synthesizes the empirical and theoretical evidence showing that subtle discrimination is produced and sustained by both organizational structures and individual cognitive processes. They demonstrate that stereotypes, status beliefs, and leadership prototypes—especially associating Whiteness with authority—shape both who gets access to high-status roles and how minorities are evaluated at every stage of advancement. Their review shows how the invisible privileging of dominant group status, described by Ray, and the decision-making biases of those at the top, emphasized by Hambrick and Mason, operate through everyday “gateways” and “pathways” in organizations (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:1–20) .

“This chapter examines individual-level factors that may influence subtle discrimination in the workplace. More specifically, it examines how social categories tend to perpetuate the use of stereotypes and reviews contemporary theories of subtle prejudice and discrimination. In addition, the chapter divides discrimination in the workplace along two dimensions, gateways and pathways, and examines the extent to which stereotypes, prejudice, and social categorization processes influence subtle discrimination at these critical junctures in an individual’s career” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:1) .

“Discrimination can accrue at varying levels, including interpersonal… institutional… and cultural… and in varying forms, including blatant, covert, and subtle… The focus of this chapter is individual-level predictors of subtle discrimination in the workplace. Blatant discrimination is obvious and easily documented… but subtle discrimination is less obvious, even unintentional, usually examined at the interpersonal level, and is arguably the most prevalent type of discrimination in today’s work environments. For these reasons, subtle discrimination is the focus of this chapter… We first discuss the fundamental concepts that serve as a basis for understanding individual-level factors that may influence subtle discrimination in the workplace: stereotypes and prejudice” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:2) .

“In organizational settings, an important prototype to consider in the context of subtle prejudice and discrimination is the leader prototype… Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips (2008) used a similar paradigm when considering race. In a paradigm that they characterize as the White Standard of Leadership, they showed that being White was a prototypical attribute of leadership in US business settings. Participants were more apt to perceive that leaders were White, regardless of the base rates of the racial groups in the organization or of the type of business industry in which the leaders were housed. They demonstrated that White leaders were evaluated as being more effective and as having more leadership potential than were racial minority leaders, as being White was more consistent with the business leader prototype, and being a racial minority leader was inconsistent with this prototype” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:7) .

“Symbolic racism (or prejudice) is a systemic set of negative beliefs about Black people in the United States… driven by the notion that (1) racial discrimination is a thing of the past, (2) Blacks are morally inferior to Whites, and (3) Blacks disregard conventional White American values, such as hard work, self-determination, and autonomy. According to the symbolic theory of racism, these beliefs can cause people to discriminate by opposing social policies designed to promote equality and then to rationalize their behavior as preservation of fairness, as Whites are more deserving of varying resources than are Blacks” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:8) .

“Aversive racism… White people who ascribe (implicitly) to aversive racism prefer to avoid interaction with other racial and ethnic groups because the contact arouses negative emotions and heightened feelings of discomfort. The negative feelings that accompany the discomfort can manifest themselves in behaviors and discriminatory decisions that may ultimately disadvantage racial and ethnic minorities, resulting in subtle discrimination” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:9) .

“An extensive amount of research has provided evidence of how stereotypes, prejudice, and corresponding categorization processes can result in subtle discrimination in the workplace. A useful way of organizing this enormous amount of research is by distinguishing subtle discrimination that occurs at ‘gateways’ from subtle discrimination that derives from ‘pathways’… Gateways refer to opportunities in which a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ decision is made in the employment process, whereas pathways refer to processes that influence the extent to which one even has access to a specified gateway… Gateway decisions provide a unique context to demonstrate how subtle prejudices can influence perceptions of target characteristics that then influence the extent to which individuals gain access to organizations (e.g., hiring) and attain beneficial resources within the organization (e.g., promotion). Hiring and promotion audit studies are especially insightful, as they highlight how individuals are evaluated in stereotypical and prejudiced ways in the absence of individuating information” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:11) .

“There is evidence that, in promotion decisions and performance evaluations, racial minorities and women are perceived less favorably than are Whites and males, respectively… the presumed mechanism underlying the subtle discrimination that occurs in gateway processes, such as hiring and promotion, is that stereotypes and subtle prejudice can influence decision-makers’ perceptions of the target’s (e.g., job applicant’s) competence, which can exacerbate or minimize subtle discrimination. Among these are stereotypes about intelligence, work ethic, English language proficiency, and education for racial minorities… this large and growing body of research offers robust empirical evidence that subtle prejudice that results in subtle discrimination can occur at gateways in the workplace” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:12) .

“Given that pathway processes are predominantly relational in nature, one obvious aspect of the organization that may be susceptible to subtle prejudice and, consequently, subtle discrimination is in the formation of social networks between individuals. Informal networks are a critical component for career success because they facilitate one’s ability to get work done by providing instrumental resources… However, social categorization processes that lead individuals to prefer in-group members relative to out-group members can create differences in the nature of social network ties across individuals, depending on the social category to which they belong. These differential network structures can create inequality in organizations” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:13) .

“Black, Hispanic, and Asian managers had fewer intimate network relationships and more racially heterogeneous ties than did their White counterparts… the composition of the network ties had implications for advancement potential for racial minorities such that high-potential minorities tended to have a greater balance between cross-race and same-race contacts, while those with less advancement potential tended to have networks with more White ties. In addition, high-potential racial minorities had a wider set of contacts outside of their group, fewer high-status ties, and less overlap between networks that fulfilled psychosocial functions and those that fulfilled purely instrumental functions… in the case of racial minorities, we see differences in network structures that have the potential to create conditions that increase the likelihood that subtle discrimination may occur along pathways” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:14) .

“Racial minorities and women relative to White men receive less mentorship and coaching and tend to receive more lenient feedback that can hinder them from developing professionally. Moreover, it is prejudice and stereotypes, be they based on race, gender, age, weight, sexual orientation, or other salient characteristics, that then can influence outcomes at gateways. The differential treatment for minorities, women, and stigmatized individuals relative to White males that has been demonstrated in numerous research paradigms at the critical gateways of hiring and promotion is consistent with statistics that highlight the paucity of racial minorities, women, and LGBT individuals, as well as many other groups in organizations, and suggests that subtle discrimination remains prevalent in contemporary organizations” (Rosette, Akinola, and Ma 2018:17) .

Zara Whysall’s chapter provides a comprehensive review of how implicit cognitive biases—including stereotypes, in-group favoritism, and confirmation bias—pervade recruitment, selection, and promotion processes, embedding persistent, invisible inequality even in organizations formally committed to diversity. Whysall’s synthesis shows that these biases operate through subconscious, routine decision-making, privileging those who fit dominant group norms and penalizing minorities despite objective credentials. These findings directly support Ray’s argument that status and advantage are conferred invisibly within organizations, and align with Hambrick and Mason’s view that leadership and evaluative decisions reflect the cognitive frames of those in power (Whysall 2018:215–219, 225–228, 233–236) .

“One potential explanation for this apparent disparity is that the gender and race bias which can lead to discrimination in society today is largely implicit… It is argued that discrimination has become invisible, deep, and pervasive… the actions required to address discrimination caused by implicit bias are substantially different to those required to address explicit biases on which attention has historically focused… the ‘hidden’ yet ubiquitous component in this case is the subconscious cognitive processing, which can lead to discrimination, without even the perpetrator or victim’s conscious awareness” (Whysall 2018:216) .

“Implicit cognition suggests that actors do not always have conscious, intentional control over the processes of social perception, impression formation, and judgment that motivate their actions… Although typically useful, heuristics can result in oversimplified, inaccurate, and biased decisions or judgements. In the case of diversity, not only have implicit biases been found to predict discriminatory behaviour but implicit bias measures are also significantly more effective than explicit bias measures in predicting behavioural indicators of discrimination” (Whysall 2018:218) .

“Implicit biases can lead to discrimination in any recruitment, selection, promotion, and reward process, which involves a human judgement or decision-making component. In selection and assessment, for example, implicit biases interfere with the main goal of the process; to evaluate the extent to which a candidate possesses or can demonstrate key characteristics, which are relevant for performance in the role being recruited for… Given that the predictive validity of commonly used selection and assessment methods varies greatly… there remains a large proportion of unexplained variance in many modern selection processes. Furthermore, some of the selection instruments that demonstrate higher predictive validity overall, display considerable ethnic subgroup differences in test performance… highlighting the existence of potential discrimination” (Whysall 2018:219) .

“One of the most commonly known implicit biases affecting recruitment decisions is stereotyping… Such is the implicit nature of the bias, research has shown that stereotyping can lead to racial discrimination even when the person making the judgement avows to be completely indifferent to racial stereotypes… Resumes for candidates with stereotypically white-sounding names received 50% more callbacks for interviews, and callbacks are more responsive to resume quality for stereotypically white-sounding names than for African-American ones. This bias persisted regardless of occupation, industry, or employer size (Bertrand and Mullainathan 2004). This phenomenon has been replicated in a host of different contexts, including bias against immigrant applicants… Although recruiters justified their decisions based on language skill concerns, the study demonstrated that listing language fluency, multinational firm experience, or education from highly selective schools did nothing to diminish the effect” (Whysall 2018:220) .

“Stereotypes not only influence the interpretation and memory of a victim of stereotyping’s behaviour but also actual behaviour towards them… Stereotypes can be problematic because they entail gross assumptions and over extensions, leading to assumptions that members of a particular category are more alike than they really are, and that members of different categories are more dissimilar than they really are” (Whysall 2018:220) .

“Stereotype threat is particularly likely to be triggered in stereotypically masculine fields such as finance and banking, with research demonstrating that stereotype threat among women in management and accounting leads to negative job attitudes and intentions to quit via its effects on identity separation or the perception that one’s gender identity is incompatible with one’s work identity… repeated experiences of stereotype threat can impact detrimentally on career aspirations, as the experience of threat and perceived incompetence leads individuals to assume that they have reduced chances of success in that environment… reduced career aspirations in response to stereotype threat is likely to exacerbate and perpetuate the diversity problems within fields underrepresented by minorities” (Whysall 2018:222–223) .

“In-group bias relates to the implicit tendency to feel a stronger degree of affinity with, and trust of, others who we categorise as similar to ourselves… in the recruitment context the effect denotes the tendency for interviewers to recruit candidates in their own self-image… raters favour candidates who share similarities with themselves in respect to several different dimensions, including values and habits, beliefs, demographic, and cultural variables such as leisure pursuits, experiences, and self-presentation styles… in-group bias acts to perpetuate homogeneity within organisations, a problem not only due to the potential for discrimination but also given the known advantages of diversity for team and organisational performance” (Whysall 2018:225–226) .

“Promotion decisions should also be made by diverse panels and efforts taken to ensure that decisions are based upon clear, formalised, objective criteria… Decision-makers should be made accountable for ensuring that their promotion and reward decisions are fair, and transparency should be provided in the monetary awards allocated on the basis of their judgements” (Whysall 2018:232–233) .

“Workplace discrimination, it can be argued, has ‘gone underground’… One of the most pervasive yet ‘hidden’ elements in this puzzle is the subconscious cognitive processing surrounding almost every decision made regarding people at work—such as whether they are selected to work there in the first place, to whether they are given equal opportunities for promotion once there. Implicit biases present a thorny challenge for equality and diversity because so deep rooted are these biases that not only are they often invisible but the owners of the biases are not consciously aware of their existence either. Consequently, to be successful in achieving diversity, practitioners must pay attention to the ‘hidden’ biases” (Whysall 2018:235) .

“It is argued that the success of diversity programmes is dependent on organisational situational factors, such as culture, strategy, and operating environments… and therefore such initiatives will have limited success unless concepts and actions around diversity and inclusion are embedded into core people processes such as performance management and leadership development” (Whysall 2018:236) .

Heather A. Haveman and Rachel Wetts’s article synthesizes decades of research showing that persistent inequalities in organizations are produced by demographic status, social relationships, and shared cultural logics. Their review highlights how race, gender, and status are encoded into organizational processes through both visible structures and invisible schemas, shaping access to authority, reward, and opportunity. Their analysis directly supports Ray’s argument that organizational outcomes systematically privilege dominant group identities, and Hambrick and Mason’s insight that the values and backgrounds of those at the top shape key decisions and structures at every level (Haveman and Wetts 2019:2–6, 11–12) .

“The demographic perspective holds that social structure is constituted by distributions of social actors along salient dimensions of social and physical space; the relational perspective, by webs of social relationships; and the cultural perspective, by widely shared and patterned understandings of reality and possibility. These perspectives also have different conceptions of identity and therefore motivations for action. For demographers, identity derives from position, absolute or relative, along salient dimensions of social life; for relational scholars, from ties among individuals, groups, and organizations; and for cultural scholars, from social interaction. All three perspectives have been applied to explain behavior at five different levels of analysis: the individual, group or organizational subunit, organization, industry or organizational population, and field… Up to the 1990s, these perspectives were generally applied separately, but over the past two decades, studies have increasingly used multiple perspectives” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:1–2) .

“The demographic distribution of individuals in a group or organization is important because it shapes social interactions, who has power, and how (well) people work together… Moreover, the effects of demography are nested, with differences between organizational members affecting their interactions in supervisor–subordinate dyads and work groups, and these interactions affecting individual, group, and organizational functioning. Finally, the uneven distribution of economic and status rewards conferred by schools and workplaces contributes to inequality among demographic groups” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:6) .

“At the individual level, the main issues are whether focal individuals are similar to or different from others in their workplace and whether they are members of high‐ or low‐status groups. People in subordinated groups are harmed by stereotypes and so are not heard or valued as much as people in dominant groups (e.g., Kanter, 1977; Konrad, Winter, & Gutek, 1992). Moreover, numerical minorities from subordinated groups become ‘tokens’ (Kanter, 1977), subject to heightened visibility and social isolation. In contrast, numerical minorities from dominant groups benefit from stereotypes (e.g., Williams, 1989, 1995). Finally, ‘relational demography’… meaning similarities or differences between workers and their supervisors, affects communication, performance assessment, commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:6) .

“Much demographic work studies power and inequality and shows how nominal demographic parameters (unordered categories) are transformed into graded parameters with hierarchical rankings (Ridgeway et al., 1998). Thus, attributes like gender, race/ethnicity, and age become axes of inequality, determining who gets authority, status, and material resources” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:5) .

“Macrorelational studies examine how links to other organizations—oversight agencies, competitors, customers, and suppliers—affect organizational structures, actions, and performance. Work in this tradition is generally labeled resource dependence (Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976; Burt, 1983; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Because organizations rely on other organizations, they are vulnerable to power plays by those organizations and thus face uncertainty… On a more macro (societal) scale, some scholars view corporations as tools of elite control… they argue that in the United States, dense corporate networks created by board interlocks helped maintain an economic elite by socializing newcomers, fostering solidarity, coordinating political action, and facilitating control over public policy” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:8–9) .

“Microcultural research is built on early microsociology (Cooley, 1902, 1909; Mead, 1934), symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969), and theories of interaction order and framing (Goffman, 1959, 1974). These traditions analyzed the meanings that people develop through interactions with others—symbolic systems that guide evaluation and action—and how people (re)interpret these meanings as they continue to interact… A study of flight attendants and bill collectors revealed that ‘emotional labor’ (creating desirable emotional displays) is core to both jobs… training for both jobs inculcates ‘feeling rules’ that guide interactions with customers (Hochschild, 1983)” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:9) .

“Over time, isomorphic pressures make structures, products, and practices legitimate—comprehensible and taken for granted as natural ways to achieve collective goals, justified on the basis of prevailing cultural models and accounts (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1983). Alternatives may become literally inconceivable. But change can occur if a new structure, product, or practice meets a technical need; if so, the innovation diffuses rapidly through direct contact between organizations. Early‐stage diffusion tends to be ‘rational,’ driven by coercion or technical need, while later‐stage diffusion tends to be symbolic, driven by imitation or norms… As a result of symbolism‐driven innovation, the structures, products, and policies that diffuse widely are often ineffective; for example, although organizations develop legally acceptable human‐resources policies that spread widely, these policies do not always ameliorate inequalities” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:10) .

“These lines of work show that network processes can be sources of (dis)advantage for different demographic groups, and demography can condition network processes… Other, more micro, work reveals how the social (e)valuation of the categories individuals are placed in (usually but not always demographic) is shaped by organizational and industry norms… In consulting and law, social class is more relevant than race/ethnicity because decision makers sort job applicants on cultural similarity (Rivera, 2012)” (Haveman and Wetts 2019:11–12) .

Jennifer L. Nelson’s ethnographic study shows that organizational processes—including hiring, space assignment, and informal policing of relationships—actively shape how social ties are formed and used by racial minorities and majorities, leading to unequal access to professional, political, and emotional resources. White minorities in Black-majority schools form fast, cohesive, and multiplex in-group ties that enable resource accumulation, while Black minorities in white-majority schools face institutional constraints that limit tie formation and resource flow. This research links Ray’s theory of racialized organizational advantage with Hambrick and Mason’s focus on leadership practices and demographic reproduction (Nelson 2019:382–388, 397–418) .

“Findings show that, in general, white teachers in the numerical minority in their schools secured all resource types through their same-race ties, while black teachers in the numerical minority secured primarily emotional resources from their same-race ties. Given these observed differences, the author shows how the form and use of the two minority groups’ social ties stem in large part from distinctive organizational practices. In turn, the tie differences can account for differences in social integration and resource access in the organization” (Nelson 2019:382) .

“Research indicates that historically underrepresented minorities have lower access to these resources in settings that continue to be dominated by white men (Kanter 1977; Turco 2010; Sloan, Evenson Newhouse, and Thompson 2013). However, in comparison to societal minority groups that are additionally in the numeric organizational minority (e.g., blacks), less is known about how members of societal majority groups (e.g., whites) fare in workplaces in which they are the numerical minority… By turning to same-race colleagues with similar experiences, blacks in the numerical minority fare better in their promotion outcomes than similar blacks who do not use in-group ties (Ibarra 1995). By turning to same-race colleagues, numerical minority whites may mobilize for resource and status advantages and maintain a positive self-identity in an unfamiliar context (Tajfel and Turner 1986; Ellemers 1993)” (Nelson 2019:382–383) .

“By examining aspects of managerial practice with direct repercussions for the social fabric of school faculty, I uncover how organization-level actions shape the properties of employees’ (i.e., teachers’) social ties with one another. These social tie properties in turn influence the kinds of resources colleagues access. I find that white and black minority teachers’ ties differ in their speed, cliquishness, multiplexity, and expansiveness. These differences subsequently produce resource gaps, based in large part on organizational practices that facilitate greater resource exchange for whites than for blacks. These resource gaps are not due to differences in resources numerical minorities bring into the workplace or the level of resources available in the school. Moreover, I find that, when compared to cases of black teachers in the majority, black numerical minority teachers experience an extra penalty in terms of resource access. However, I find that, when compared to white teachers in the majority, white numerical minorities do not experience any penalty” (Nelson 2019:384) .

“Organizational demography has focused mainly on the role of numerical representation in producing minorities’ work experiences and outcomes. In contrast, the embeddedness perspective of minority ties accounts for the dual roles of numerical minority status and organizational practices, uncovering their effects on the understudied properties of social ties… Three organizational practices used by principals became clear and distinguished the sites from one another: how principals hired teachers, how principals assigned teachers to classrooms, and whether principals policed teachers’ informal social interactions” (Nelson 2019:416–417) .

“White teachers in the numerical minority, unlike black teachers in the numerical minority, felt free to form ties in same-race groups. In addition, whites’ ties with one another formed quickly regardless of whether they were in the majority or minority in their schools… Conversely, when black minority teachers went to faculty meetings, they were not permitted to stand, sit, or speak as a group. When this norm was violated at Surrey Ridge, administrators would ask black minority teachers to sit apart from each other… As a choice of social affiliation that did not suit the institutional culture, black minority teachers were being called into account to ‘do race’ in an institutionally acceptable way… The message here for Ms. Norton was as follows: ‘But when we come together as a whole group? [laughs] Umm, [laughs again] we don’t, we tried, we can’t. I say “we,” [I mean] the minorities generally, it’s a problem if we all get together.’” (Nelson 2019:406, 407) .

“While black minority teachers still gained access to professional, political, and social-emotional resources through their largely dyadic ties, the property of cliquishness for minority whites enabled them to acquire more political resources for their group through the additive advantage of voice and collaboration that come through cohesive (i.e., dense, overlapping) ties… During regular ‘data meetings’ at Larksfield, white minorities would defend the quality of one another’s work to the principal or resist principal requests for doing extra work. Here, as well as in seven other cases among white minorities, collaboration through cliques resulted in sharing either political or professional resources or both” (Nelson 2019:407) .

“The findings show that double-level minorities are affected by both: even when the court mandate to increase black hires ended, black teachers’ incorporation into the schools had not been achieved; rather, internal practices ensured that referrals that could generate bonding did not happen. That fulfillment of the mandate did not bring about equitable hiring strategies for black and white teachers suggests detrimental implementation of the desegregation mandate but also illustrates the importance of internal practices beyond the reach of a court order in generating racial disparities for double-level minorities” (Nelson 2019:418) .

Victor Ray’s article provides a comprehensive theory of how organizations are not race-neutral entities but are deeply racialized structures that systematically connect schemas of subordination and advantage to material and symbolic resources. By showing that Whiteness is an organizational credential and that top managers—through their actions, cognitive schemas, and position—reproduce racial hierarchies and confer cumulative advantage, Ray’s analysis directly links the reproduction of status through organizational structures with the decisive influence of upper-echelon leadership, as Hambrick and Mason argue (Ray 2019:27–42) .

“I begin with the proposition that race is constitutive of organizational foundations, hierarchies, and processes. Next, I develop four tenets: (1) racialized organizations enhance or diminish the agency of racial groups; (2) racialized organizations legitimate the unequal distribution of resources; (3) Whiteness is a credential; and (4) the decoupling of formal rules from organizational practice is often racialized” (Ray 2019:26) .

“Organizations are racial structures that reproduce (and challenge) racialization processes. Schemas of sub- and superordination are encoded in the concept of race, providing a template for organizational action. Race connects cultural rules to social and material resources through organizational formation, hierarchy, and processes… This template constructs racial hierarchy between organizations at the macro-institutional level, such that non-White organizations are typically disadvantaged relative to White organizations. Within meso-level organizations, these schematic relations are recreated as hierarchies are racialized” (Ray 2019:27) .

“Racialized organizations enhance or diminish the agency of racial groups… All organizations are racialized and ‘inhabited’ by racialized bodies; yet the specific distribution of resources, the degree to which organizational dynamics rely on explicit racial criteria, the deployment of racialized schemas, and patterns of racial incorporation are variable” (Ray 2019:36) .

“Racial segregation is a defining foundational characteristic of most organizations, historically enforced through custom, policy, and law… While White organizations are seen as normative and neutral, non-White organizations are seen as deviations from the norm and often stigmatized. The founding scholarship on organizational theory defines organizations universally, but in the United States, the institutional environment has never guaranteed the rights necessary for organizational formation on an equal basis with Whites… Institutionalized racial schemas, often laundered through facially-neutral bureaucratic processes, segregate organizations on a White/non-White hierarchy” (Ray 2019:38) .

“Organizational racialization is thus a credentialing process. Typically, formal credentials are considered neutral because they are bureaucratically conferred, whereas ascribed categories are not highly formalized and are socially illegitimate means of status differentiation. However, constructionist accounts of race claim that race is produced via precisely such bureaucratic processes… Black men without criminal records were less likely than formerly incarcerated White men to be called back for a job interview. Similar, although less dramatic, results hold for Latino job-seekers. Seeing racialization as a relational credentialing process resonates with Harris’s (1995) original conceptualization of Whiteness as a form of property” (Ray 2019:41) .

“Whiteness is a credential providing access to organizational resources, legitimizing work hierarchies, and expanding White agency. This credential helps organizations appear racially neutral in principle, while in practice institutionalizing the property interest in Whiteness” (Ray 2019:41) .

“Racialized organizations often decouple formal commitments to equity, access, and inclusion from policies and practices that reinforce, or at least do not challenge, existing racial hierarchies. ‘Objective’ rules and practices may be enforced in ways that disadvantage non-Whites, or rules aimed at diversifying or ending discrimination may be ignored. This decoupling allows organizations to maintain legitimacy and appear neutral or even progressive while doing little to intervene in pervasive patterns of racial inequality” (Ray 2019:42) .

“The ability to act upon the world, to create, to learn, to express emotion—indeed, one’s full humanity—is constrained (or enabled) by racialized organizations. All organizations are racialized and ‘inhabited’ by racialized bodies; yet the specific distribution of resources, the degree to which organizational dynamics rely on explicit racial criteria, the deployment of racialized schemas, and patterns of racial incorporation are variable. Having defined racialized organizations, I now show how they enhance or inhibit agency. Each subsequent component of racialized organizations (the unequal distribution of resources, the credentialing of Whiteness, and racialized decoupling) differentially endows agency along racial lines” (Ray 2019:36) .

Tiffany Taylor, Alison Buck, Katrina R. Bloch, and Brianna Turgeon’s large-scale analysis of U.S. workplaces demonstrates that gendered and racialized status—embedded in workplace composition, management structures, and informal social closure—shapes access to authority, promotion, and material advantage. Their findings show that women’s share of management increases with the proportion of women non-managers, but only in contexts where workplace gender segregation and exclusionary norms are weaker. This supports Ray’s argument that organizational advantage is conferred via invisible, taken-for-granted structures, and aligns with Hambrick and Mason’s emphasis on how leadership demographics shape outcomes (Taylor et al. 2019:48–58) .

“Our findings suggest that across all compositions, ranging from women comprising less than 15% to over 85% of the workplace, larger percentages of the non-management women are associated with greater shares of women in management. Findings offer little support for the glass escalators hypothesis extended to workplaces, but once further contextualized, the findings do suggest that workplaces are gendered in such a way that tokenism works differently for men and women. Thus, our paper adds to the body of research on gender composition and further illustrates the need to determine under which conditions these social processes operate” (Taylor et al. 2019:48) .

“Zimmer (1988), Acker (1990, 2006), and Britton (2000) argue that workplaces are not gender neutral… the workplace was designed around this man. Britton (2000) further urges researchers to investigate whether and how occupations and organizations are gendered, rather than taking this as given” (Taylor et al. 2019:49) .

“When women compose only a token percentage of a group, they are too isolated to resist dominant culture attempts to stereotype women and exaggerate gender differences. Consequently, women must either accept stereotypes that limit their mobility, resist stereotypes and risk isolation, or distance themselves from other women and paint themselves as exceptions (Kanter, 1977; Roth, 2004). Men in man-dominated workplaces may portray and perceive women co-workers as less capable… When women in man-dominated contexts adopt masculine behaviors to fit in, however, they increase their risk of gendered harassment (Leskinen, Caridad Rabelo, & Cortina, 2015). According to Kanter (1977), women’s situation improves as they begin to compose more of the work group. Through interactions with women, men will be less likely to stereotype or job type women and will feel more comfortable communicating with them… as women begin to enter management they will promote other women into management through homosocial reproduction (Kanter, 1977)” (Taylor et al. 2019:49) .

“Some research… suggests a tipping point with negative consequences for women. Case studies of token men illustrate that there is little evidence that men face wage or promotion penalties as compared to women… Williams (1992) argues that men in woman-dominated occupations, such as librarians and nurses, experience a glass escalator (an accelerated promotion trajectory arising from gendered assumptions) instead of the glass ceiling (a point after which gendered assumptions prevent further promotion) that women face in occupations dominated by men. Maume (1999) finds support for this argument, showing that in the 1980s, the greater the proportion of women in an occupation, the more likely men were promoted… However, there is some research that fails to find evidence of a glass escalator for men in women-dominated occupations (Budig, 2002; Snyder & Green, 2008)” (Taylor et al. 2019:50) .

“Consistent with H1, Table 2 shows that a larger percentage of women non-managers predicts women’s greater share of management above and below all tipping points. The coefficient is positive above and below all tipping points, which is inconsistent with H2a, H2b, and H2c. Turning to Table 3, statistical significance tests of differences in slopes also reveal that the effects are significantly different at every tipping point except 65. Among tipping points with statistically significant differences in slopes, Table 2 shows that the coefficients are larger below the tipping points for the following tipping points: 15, 35, and 50. Whereas, the coefficient above the 85 tipping point is larger than the coefficient below. In sum, at the tipping points of 50 and below, the percentage of women non-managers predicts a larger share of women managers in workplaces below the tipping points. In contrast, in workplaces where women hold the highest percentage of non-management employment (85%), women hold a larger share of management above the tipping point. This is inconsistent with H3, which predicted that women’s share of management would be smaller in places dominated by women” (Taylor et al. 2019:54–55) .

“Our findings also indicate that segregation is a much more significant predictor of women’s share of management in workplaces when women are tokens (under 15%), but is much less powerful a predictor when men are tokens (women are over 85%). This again suggests that men and women have different experiences with tokenism. Taken together, our findings on the effects of segregation on women’s share of management at various gender workplace composition tipping points suggest the need to refine and contextualize… gender composition tipping theories” (Taylor et al. 2019:56) .

“We find support for theory that contends workplaces are gendered (Acker, 1990; Britton, 2000; Budig, 2002; Zimmer, 1988). We also find support for Kanter’s (1977) composition arguments regarding strength in numbers… future research focused on gender composition and tipping points must refine and contextualize these hypotheses and theories… future studies should build on research showing that token status plays out differently, for instance, for Black men and white men in women-dominated professions (Wingfield, 2009)” (Taylor et al. 2019:57) .

Adia Harvey Wingfield’s *Flatlining: Race, Work, and Health Care in the New Economy* shows how organizational structures and leadership shape racial inequality in healthcare, directly linking Ray’s focus on Whiteness as an organizational credential with Hambrick and Mason’s emphasis on the power of top managers’ demographics and values. Wingfield documents how race is embedded both in routine practices and leadership-level decisions, producing structural and cultural barriers that advantage white professionals and disadvantage people of color in ways that persist even amid diversity efforts (Wingfield 2019, pp. 1–159) .

“There is no question that many blacks in post–civil rights America have opportunities that were largely unavailable just a few generations ago. However, the US remains as fraught with racial divides and tensions as ever. Thus black progress, particularly the movement into elite, predominantly white, professional employment, engenders backlash, mistrust, and in extreme cases, violent manifestations of white rage” (Wingfield 2019, p. 6) .

“Today, organizations assume less responsibility for labor, work is more insecure, and economic inequality continues to worsen. As US society continues to produce a new economy where work, organizations, and occupations are all very different from years past, it is critical to assess what these changes mean for black professionals. This book examines how organizations in their modern form create new mechanisms of racial inequality that have largely gone unexplored” (Wingfield 2019, p. 6) .

“I suggest that as organizations accommodate more people of color in various roles (e.g., as workers, consumers, patients), incremental approaches do not allow these institutions to meet these workers’ needs. Strategies such as professing a commitment to diversity, offering cultural competence training, or even serving primarily disadvantaged populations do not necessarily mean organizations are equipped to handle the racial challenges black professionals in their employ will encounter” (Wingfield 2019, p. 7) .

“Today, most large private-sector organizations have some sort of diversity program in place. While this might sound promising, in many companies ‘diversity’ is often defined so broadly and vaguely as to be essentially meaningless. Instead of rectifying the structural, cultural, and institutional processes that perpetuate discrimination and keep men of color and women of all races out of high-status occupations, managers can now claim they embrace diversity by emphasizing the need for ‘diversity of viewpoints,’ ‘diversity of opinion,’ and ‘diversity of thought’” (Wingfield 2019, p. 31–32) .

“In this context, many organizations do not bother utilizing measures that would effectively change the racial or gendered makeup of their workforces… That is to say, when managers knew there would be adverse consequences for their failure to show that they had measurably improved diversity, they generated results. Unfortunately, however, many managers do not take note of these evidence-based studies, and they either persist in pursuing strategies that are proven to be ineffective or do not devote attention at all to narrowing racial gaps” (Wingfield 2019, p. 33) .

“I argue that when organizations wrestle with determining how best to reach diverse communities while, at the same time, trying to maximize market values and minimize the resources they devote to labor, this leads to a process I term racial outsourcing. Racial outsourcing occurs when organizations fail to do the work of transforming their culture, norms, and workforces to reach communities of color and instead rely on black professionals for this labor” (Wingfield 2019, p. 34) .

“These outcomes include but are not limited to specific forms of additional, racialized labor; ambivalent or distant relationships with white colleagues; and valiant personal efforts to change and undermine institutionalized racism. This book highlights how both the work black professionals do and the organizational shifts that drive it have far-reaching implications for a society that continues to struggle with reconciling race, work, and opportunity” (Wingfield 2019, p. 8) .

“For black doctors, race is embedded in the structural and cultural processes that determine their pathway into medicine and establish the general atmosphere for their work. Yet the organizational measures that exist in their workplaces (if any are present at all) rarely acknowledge these issues. Consequently, racial outsourcing occurs when, given the limited organizational attempts to address the racial issues black doctors encounter, this work gets transferred to doctors themselves” (Wingfield 2019, p. 65) .

“In the medical field, attempts to address racial problems largely take the form of emphasizing the concept of cultural competence… But they do little to address the ways racial processes affect practitioners. Since doctors do not observe any institutional measures that seriously address the racial dynamics they encounter, they instead do the equity work of addressing racial issues themselves” (Wingfield 2019, p. 66–67) .

“Black physicians acknowledge that race informs their work by shaping important structural and cultural processes that are critical for success in the medical industry. Educational pathways disadvantage black students, leaving them underrepresented in medical schools and largely bereft of potential mentors. Additionally, cultural beliefs about black inferiority create subtle biases that black doctors challenge through a commitment to excellence and high performance. This is a gendered process as well, as these institutionalized mechanisms make the forms of overt sexism black women doctors encounter all too visible and noticeable” (Wingfield 2019, p. 72) .

“In the public sector, black health care workers are able to fulfill certain occupational and personal goals that transcend simple financial rewards. But black professionals also do equity work when, in the absence of organizational efforts to ensure that patients of color receive respectful care, they step in to make sure this occurs. This form of equity work takes a toll, however. It frays relationships with both white colleagues and the larger institutional structures in which black professionals work, leaving black health care workers feeling frustrated and alienated from coworkers and the institutions that they believe are exploiting their racial loyalty” (Wingfield 2019, p. 144) .

Adia Harvey Wingfield and Koji Chavez’s article demonstrates that perceptions and experiences of racial discrimination in the workplace are deeply shaped by organizational hierarchy and structure, not simply by numerical minority status. Drawing on interviews with Black doctors, nurses, and technicians, they show that organizational processes—including credentialing, hiring, and everyday supervisory practices—embed Whiteness as a credential and systematically privilege dominant group members while shaping what types of discrimination are most salient. Their analysis directly links Ray’s theory of racialized organizations and credentialing to Hambrick and Mason’s focus on leadership, status, and the demographic reproduction of power (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:1–24) .

“This article argues that black workers’ perceptions of racial discrimination derive not just from being in the minority, but also from their position in the organizational structure. Researchers have shown that black individuals encounter an enormous amount of racial discrimination in the workplace, including but not limited to exclusion from critical social networks, wage disparities, and hiring disadvantages. But fewer studies examine the extent to which black workers believe racial discrimination is a salient factor in their occupational mobility or the factors that might explain their divergent perceptions of racial discrimination… we show that black workers’ status within an organizational hierarchy fundamentally informs perceptions of the nature and type of workplace racial discrimination” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:1) .

“We posit that organizations play an undertheorized role in explaining these differences in perceptions of racial discrimination. We argue that the variation in how black workers perceive racial discrimination is linked to organizational processes that inform where and how black employees observe racial discrimination. This article thus contributes to the emerging literature focusing on meso-level structures, and it builds on this theoretical work to explain differences in black employees’ perceptions of workplace discrimination (Ray 2019; Sewell 2016; Wingfield and Alston 2014)” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:2) .

“We build on studies of discrimination to show it is not just race but position in an organizational hierarchy (and the attendant organizational processes) that informs how black workers perceive workplace racial discrimination. Additionally, we further develop racialized organizations theories by identifying how internal mechanisms explain why position in the organizational hierarchy leads to varying perceptions of discrimination” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:3) .

“At the organizational level, policies, regulations, and norms may be written to be race-neutral but ultimately have a disparate impact on black workers—what we call ‘organizational discrimination’… Organizational discrimination can extend to cultural practices and norms as well, such as when law schools represent a ‘white space’ where conformity to certain dictates of legal thinking… leads to marginalization, hostility, and exclusion for students and faculty of color alike” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:4) .

“In recent years, sociologists have advanced a theoretical model of racialized organizations that contends race is foundational to organizational structures, processes, and hierarchies (Ray 2019; Wingfield and Alston 2014; Wooten and Couloute 2017)… Ray (2019:26) argues that ‘race is constitutive of organizations’ and that as racialized structures, organizations can minimize black workers’ agency, differently allocate resources depending on where black workers are concentrated, and establish whiteness as a credential. Building on Acker’s (2006) theory of inequality regimes and her argument that basic organizational practices uphold racial, gendered, and class disparities, Ray (2019) emphasizes how racialized organizations frequently reproduce inequalities” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:5) .

“Ray (2019) also emphasizes that internal hierarchies map onto and reproduce racial stratification, with normative organizational procedures such as credentialing, interactional norms, and job sorting used to slot workers of color into lower positions in the organizational hierarchy than white workers. Whereas Wooten and Couloute (2017) highlight the ways organizations can develop a racial identity, Ray (2019) focuses on the ways organizational processes actively maintain internal racial segregation and inequalities” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:6) .

“Jobs at different levels require varying responsibilities and qualifications, but internal processes such as credentialing, social closure, and wage-setting help maintain racial segregation across the organizational hierarchy… the hierarchical structure of healthcare facilities means jobs within the field are ranked in ways that reflect racial stratification, with black workers underrepresented in all three occupations but more so at the top than at the bottom” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:7) .

“Black doctors, who are highly placed in the hierarchy of healthcare facilities, focus much more on the ways structural and organizational processes create racial disparities in the profession. In contrast, black nurses, who occupy a lower place in the hierarchy, observe both organizational and individual racial discrimination. Black technicians, who are still lower in the organizational hierarchy, mostly perceive individual discrimination but do not highlight organizational or structural discrimination. These perceptual differences are linked to position in the organizational hierarchy and the organizational processes to which black workers are exposed at these levels” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:15) .

“Theory of racialized organizations suggests that everyday procedures such as credentialing, the allocation of resources, and distribution of workloads reproduce racial inequality. We extend these theoretical arguments by introducing four mechanisms that connect hierarchical position with black workers’ perceptions of racial discrimination: attainment of the position, navigating organizational levers of power, effect of positional status on exposure to others, and use of status and power in interactions” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:16) .

“Positions higher in the organizational hierarchy have more control and responsibility over the institutionalized rules and norms that affect workers within the organization… Black doctors, and to a lesser extent black nurses, are more likely than black technicians to recognize organizational discrimination because of their direct participation in hiring and selection processes… Black nurses were aware of their colleagues’ preferences, and thus they were keenly attuned to how their organization’s institutionalized practices disadvantage black nurses in the hiring process… Black technicians had additional layers between themselves and hiring managers. They were rarely if ever consulted about potential candidates, and unlike doctors, they were never a part of the hiring process. As such, they did not offer an insider’s knowledge of how the hiring process perpetuates racial discrimination, and they did not cite this as an example of organizational racial discrimination that affected them” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:17–18) .

“Our findings suggest that position in the organizational hierarchy presents an important, although overlooked, piece of this puzzle. Black workers at the top of the organizational hierarchy have a perspective on discrimination that spans multiple organizations and fields, thus making them attuned to the ways discrimination can be institutionalized within and across social structures. Black workers who are lower in the organizational hierarchy certainly face organizational discrimination as well, but they are more likely to see this as a function of individual preferences and choices and less likely to have access to the decision-making processes that would reveal these more structural sources of discrimination” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:20–21) .

“Our findings support theories of racialized organizations, but we extend these theories further by identifying mechanisms that connect position in the organizational hierarchy to perceptions of racial discrimination: attainment of the position, navigation of organizational levers of power, impact of positional status on exposure to others, and use of status and power in interactions. We develop these theories by showing that organizational variation can matter—certain types of racialized organizations (i.e., those that primarily serve populations of color) may mitigate against black employees’ impressions of individual racial discrimination. By recognizing the importance of organizations in the distribution of resources, we emphasize how black workers’ relationship to the organizational structure helps explain how they perceive racial discrimination as a phenomenon that affects their everyday work lives” (Wingfield and Chavez 2020:21) .

### [Ideas and Language]

Incorporate theories of racial tasks across organizational hierarchies to further elaborate the ideas behind our use of ‘occupational stratum.’

“Furthermore, they receive lower returns for their positions than white men” (DiTomaso, Post and Parks-Yancy 2007).

Studies show that a change in the ethnoracial status of managers can alter the ethnoracial composition of an entire firm over time (Giuliano, Levine and Leonard 2009).

“Findings from these studies suggest that racial/ethnic and gender differences in workplace authority follow consistent patterns across studies, time, and even country: Women and racial/ethnic minorities have less authority on the job than white men, and when women and minorities hold positions of authority, they do so at lower levels of organizations” (DiTomaso et al. 2007).

“I argue that in the post-civil rights period, racial inequality is reproduced by whites helping other whites more so than through the discrimination or racism of whites toward non-whites” (DiTomaso 2015).

“Whites are disproportionately represented in the best jobs, the jobs with the highest incomes, and the jobs with the most training and authority… so when whites help other whites, it reproduces existing racial inequality” (DiTomaso 2015).

“White men are disproportionally in charge, are more likely to have the authority to decide who gets jobs or opportunities… Whites, especially white men… are in a position to influence or affect outcomes in terms of who is offered jobs, training, promotions, or career visibility” (DiTomaso 2015).

“In both evaluations and the allocation of resources, white men are given the benefit of the doubt, are rewarded for promise more than performance, and are often forgiven or not held accountable for mistakes or misdirection” (DiTomaso 2015).

“Favoritism and advantage rather than discrimination and racism: Bias for rather than bias against… The structure of inequality favors whites without their having to actively and intentionally engage in hostile or exclusionary actions toward nonwhites” (DiTomaso 2015).

“Because of continued and extensive segregation in housing, education, and even jobs, people network within groups of people who are mostly like them… Networking undermines equal opportunity” (DiTomaso 2015).

“DiTomaso et al. (2007b) found that U.S.-born white men experienced greater access to favorable work experiences… and that in itself is an advantage… contributing to their being evaluated as both more innovative and more promotable into management” (DiTomaso 2015).

… firm **culture** (Gelfand et al. 2005),

Lack of board-level diversity contributes to persistent racial wage and promotion disparities (Cook and Glass 2014, Cook and Glass 2015).

“…organizations are racial structures that reproduce (and challenge) racialization processes” (Ray 2019).

Beginning with Hambrick and Mason (1984), this “upper echelon” perspective places “… primary emphasis … on observable managerial characteristics as indicators of the *givens* that a manager brings to an administrative situation” (emphasis added: Hambrick and Mason 1984).

That is, they link the “givens” or ‘schema’ of the top workers to their demographic characteristics.

Indeed, studies show a relationship between the demographic composition of **top managers** and the **hiring and promotion** of women and minorities (Cook and Glass 2014, Cook and Glass 2015), the adoption of practices to increase diversity (Nishii, Gotte and Raver 2007), earnings disparities (Stojmenovska 2016), and beliefs about gender identity (Ely 1995).

“… the enduring Whiteness of university presidents (Amis, Munir and Mair 2017, Rojas 2017).

There is also an established relationship between the demographic composition of top management and patterns of **discriminatory interactions** between workers within-firms, which further supports the link between top management demographics and firm-level schema (Gelfand et al. 2005).

“… Blacks make up just 1 percent of CEOs” (Embrick 2011)

These mechanisms can include the observed ethnoracial **composition** of the organizational leadership at the time of hiring (“College Presidents Study”), or be as subtle as the perceived ethnoracial group membership of people **pictured** on the organizations’ walls (Moore 2020)

“… being at the **bottom** of organizational hierarchies has health effects **independent of direct discrimination**” (Marmot et al. 1991).
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## SUMMARY AND HYPOTHESES

[Justification for not including measures of ‘ethnoracial schema,’ which might include a brief review with quotes form ethnographic studies: see (Wingfield and Alston 2014)].

As theories that link organizational inequality and racialization argue, different cues work differently across different firms and so ethnoracial schema and processes of racialization will also vary across firms (Payne et al. 2017, Ray 2019, Kline et al. 2022).

While single-case and comparative-case ethnographies are useful for identifying how a given firm or small set of firms might treat workers differently (Collins 1997, Moore 2007, Embrick 2011, Wingfield and Alston 2014, Wooten 2015, Reyes 2017, Ferguson and Koning 2018, Ray 2019, Wingfield and Chavez 2020), they are limited in that they cannot parameterize the more general relationship between these processes and various outcomes, including earnings growth (hTomaskovic-Devey and Avent-Holt 2019).

We assert that, while firms will vary in their ethnoracial character and schema, as firms underwrite operations with ethnoracial beliefs and/or schema, they will deploy ethnoracial stereotypes that parse and rank workers according to these preformed ideas about underlying differences in hard and soft skills, as credentialed by the perceived Whiteness of workers.

“…non-White organizations are typically disadvantaged relative to White organizations…” (Ray 2019).

To assess this proposition, we cascade ‘White firms’ (via %TWE) along a continuum of Whiteness (a la Keith and Herring 1991, Monk 2014), and observe the relative wage growth of Black and White co-workers along this continuum of ‘White firms.’

We argue that as firms sort greater percentages of White workers into top positions (vis-à-vis perceived Whiteness of certain workers), they also deploy a process of ethnoracialization that allots ‘credentials’ to White workers, resulting in their greater economic remuneration relative to Blacks.

We proxy the Whiteness of firms using the racial composition of the top five percent of firm earners (%TWE).

We argue that, in White(r) firms, Whiteness serves as a “credential,” (Ray 2019), resulting in the unmerited sorting of White workers into the upper echelons of the firm (Rosette, Leonardelli and Phillips 2008).

### [Hypotheses]

…our first expectation is that, relative to their White co-workers, the rate of earnings growth for their Black co-workers will decrease as firms become ‘Whiter’ – i.e., firms that sort larger and uneven percentages of White workers into top earning positions (Hoffman 1978, Maume 2011).

The wage growth of native-born Blacks workers will be lower in ‘Whiter firms’ – i.e., as firms sort larger percentages of Whites into top earning positions, wage growth among native-born Blacks will decrease relative to their White co-workers.
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FOR THE CONCLUSION

1. We use the terms race and ethnicity when we are describing other studies that use such terminology. However, we will otherwise use the term ethnoracial and provide a brief description of these ontologies, concepts and operationalizations in the section on Materials and Methods (*see* Ifatunji 2024). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. We will describe these models in more detail below, but we refer to cross-sectional and synthetic cohort models of Black/White wage differences as ‘individual-level models’ because they often rely on statistical methods that aggregate average differences between the measured characteristics of unrelated individuals. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. For example, when a schema aligns with cultural stereotypes (“White–Good”), responses are faster; when it conflicts (“Black–Good”), the mismatch creates cognitive interference, leading to slower responses. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. In the Social Sciences ‘models’ are frameworks that pair theory and methods. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)