

9 | *1964 was not that long ago: A story of gateways and pathways*

DOLLY CHUGH AND ARTHUR P. BRIEF

How long ago was 1964? A long time ago, some would say. The Beatles had just arrived in America, the World Trade Center design was underway, and Nelson Mandela was sentenced to his eventual 27-year imprisonment. The world of 1964 seems very distant from the world of today.

In that year, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act became law in the United States, outlawing discrimination in employment in any business on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Black or white, male or female, the gateway to opportunity opened.

Yet, stunning levels of segregation still exist in the workplace (Tomaskovic-Devey *et al.*, 2006). In the United States, male–female and black–white segregation lessened between 1966 and 1980, but after 1980, only male–female segregation continued to significantly decline. Black–white segregation has essentially remained the same since 1980, and may have worsened in some sectors since 1995.

In fact, in order for sex-neutral employment distribution (i.e., true desegregation) to exist, more than half of all workers would have to switch jobs; for race-neutral (black–white) employment distribution to exist, more than half of all African-Americans would need to switch jobs (Tomaskovic-Devey *et al.*, 2006). Both race and gender segregation remains significant, more than 30 years after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

This puzzling state of affairs can be explained, we propose, by distinguishing between the *gateway* to opportunity and diversity in the workplace, and the *pathway* to success and effectiveness in the workplace. From the individual perspective, the gateway is about things like getting hired, getting appointed, and getting admitted; it is about getting in the door. The pathway is about getting heard, getting credit, and getting second chances; it is about getting a fair shot once in the door. From an organizational perspective, the gateway is about hiring processes while the pathway is about the formal and informal

forms of recognition and advancement, about moving up and being groomed to do so, within an organization.

The focus of the first generation of legislation, enforcement, and research was largely, and logically, on the gateway. A clear, but inaccessible pathway is useless, after all. The focus of the second generation, in which we are currently immersed, has shifted to the pathway, as the disconnect between ensuring equal access and ensuring equal opportunity for success has become salient.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which is charged with enforcing the Civil Rights Act, notes this shift in their 2004 report to the public: "In EEOC's early days, the agency dealt primarily with issues that were related to race and hiring, gender and hiring – getting a foot in the door. Later, the glass ceiling was at the forefront – that invisible barrier that seemed to prevent women and people of color from rising through the ranks. While these issues have not gone away, no longer are they the sole focus of our mission." ("Performance and Accountability Report FY 2004," 2005) The report goes on to discuss forms of harassment once in the employer's door, both overt and subtle, as a newly emerging focus of the organization, illustrating the growing importance of the pathway.

This shift to an emphasis on the pathway is also reflected clearly in this volume, in which all of the chapters focus exclusively or largely on the pathway, and none focus exclusively on the gateway. Two chapters in this volume examine the state of the pathway from a mostly individual, cognitive orientation. Lee and Fiske use social psychological insights about the "tripartite foundation of intergroup relations" of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination to illuminate "what happens after the recruitment", that is, after the gateway and on the pathway (Lee and Fiske, this volume). Ellemers and Barreto point to the difficulties faced by targets of bias in assessing whether they are, or are not, being treated fairly, highlighting the challenges of targets who wonder if their pathways have been blocked (Ellemers and Barreto, this volume).

Three chapters assess the pathway from a dyadic or group perspective, focusing on the interpersonal processes that contribute or detract from a smooth, level, open pathway. Ely and Roberts reframed the prevailing "difference paradigm" as a "relational paradigm", arguing that relationships flourish across diverse group members

so long as the members submit to outward focused goals (Ely and Roberts, this volume). Jehn, Greer, and Rupert delve into what happens to performance after a diverse workforce has been created, and the specific role of conflict in that relationship between diversity and performance (Jehn, Greer and Rupert, this volume). Polzer and Caruso explore how identity negotiation is affected by status differences in the workplace, emphasizing how group members establish a working consensus of “who is who” (Polzer and Caruso, this volume).

And, finally, two chapters call for a clearer message from social scientists to practitioners, whose actions to date are typically guided by legislation or litigation at the gateway, and by anecdote or trend along the pathway. Kulik and Roberson take a much-needed look at the effectiveness of diversity interventions, examining those influencing decisions at the gateway (recruitment, diversity training) and along the pathway (diversity training again, mentoring) (Kulik and Roberson, this volume).

Bielby argues that both context (social, institutional, and organizational) and psychological processes are implicated in workplace discrimination, illuminating the multiple levels of the gateway/pathway framework (Bielby, this volume). The placement and size of a gateway, and the incline and shape of a pathway, will be determined largely by the contextual factors studied by sociologists. At the same time, the decision making at the gateway, and the micro-behaviors along the pathway, will be determined largely by the mental processes studied by psychologists. The questions to be asked, posits Bielby, are along the lines of “how will this policy facilitate or minimize stereotyping processes?” (Bielby, this volume).

“Gateway behaviors”, such as interviewing, hiring, admitting, and appointing, are easily measured and generally non-spontaneous, and probably more egalitarian than they used to be. Once through the gateway, however, individuals still face the possibility of bias in the workplace along the pathway to success and further opportunity. In contrast to gateway behaviors, “pathway behaviors” are those that are generally more spontaneous and less measurable. Pathway behaviors include the many non-formalized, seemingly minor ways in which an individual’s chances for success are improved or worsened. For example, is the employee interrupted during meetings? Do others ask the employee to lunch? How long does it take before others respond to the

employee's emails? What attributions do others make when the employee arrives a few minutes late for a meeting? What sort of eye contact is given to the individuals? Where do others sit relative to the individual in meetings?

All of these behaviors are subtle, and may, in fact, be unlikely to be recognized consciously by either party. But ample evidence exists that these subtle behaviors are surprisingly influential (Word, Zanna, and Cooper, 1974). Despite the decrease in blatant bias at the gateway, it is possible that pathway bias remains strong, and poses a contemporary obstacle to an effective and diverse work force. The study of pathway behaviors may clarify why dramatic improvements in opportunity have not led to dramatic improvements in equality. We offer the gateway and pathway framework as a useful way of conceptualizing how, when, and where diversity is successfully achieved in the workplace. Next, we use this framework as a means of articulating research questions still unanswered, and requiring answers, if a diverse workplace is to be achieved.

A research agenda for the coming decade

In this section, we outline our proposed research priorities for the coming decade. How did we determine that these three topics require more urgent and more focused attention than many of the other useful topics of study? We used two simple criteria:

- *Heat to light*: To what extent will insights on this topic resolve fundamental intellectual debates that currently have the potential to advance (i.e., light) rather than polarize (e.g., heat) the field?
- *Journals to organizations*: To what extent will insights on this topic fundamentally influence the decisions of practitioners?

With these criteria in mind, we propose the following three directions:

- (1) Behavioral consequences of implicit bias
- (2) Role of context
- (3) Strategies and solutions

The remainder of this section will elaborate on each of these three directions, briefly summarizing current work on the topic and offering ideas on specific course of study.

*Behavioral consequences of implicit bias**Do milliseconds matter? (Chugh, 2004)*

Each chapter in this volume notes the demise of blatant biases and the rise of subtle, ambiguous forms of bias (Bielby; Kulik and Roberson; Jehn, Greer, and Rupert; Ely and Roberts; Polzer and Caruso; Lee and Fiske, this volume). We begin with an overview of the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of research on implicit bias. Then, we turn to the specific topic of behavioral consequences, outlining work done and to be done.

Subtle bias has been conceptualized in a variety of forms [e.g., modern racism (McConahay, 1983), aversive racism (Gaertner and Dovidio, 1986), everyday discrimination (Brief *et al.*, 2000), implicit bias (Greenwald and Banaji, 1995)]. For our purposes here, all of these conceptualizations and methods are relevant to understanding a form of bias that is not intentional, blatant, controllable, and/or reportable: We will use the concept “implicit bias” (Banaji and Greenwald, 1995) as an umbrella term.

Tackling implicit biases has been made more possible due to major methodological advances in the past decade. Today, the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz, 1998) is a dominant (but not the only) method in use (for an excellent overview, see Kihlstrom, 2004). The original IAT paper by Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz (1998) has been cited at least 541 times in published works since its publication a decade ago. The IAT is, of course, only a measure of the construct of implicit bias, and while our focus is on implicit bias, not the IAT, we will take a moment to summarize the basic features of the measure, given its current prevalence in the field.

The IAT is a response latency measure, often administered by computer. Subjects categorize words or pictures as quickly as they can into one of four categories. Two of the categories require a keyboard response from the right hand and two of the categories require a keyboard response from the left hand. The challenge is to remember which categories are which, while still performing each categorization in less than a second. For example, in the “race IAT” (a measure of implicit race attitudes), the categories are black, white, good, and bad. Subjects categorize stimuli (e.g., black faces, white faces, good words such as love, and bad words such as war) into one of these four categories. The

task is presented in two different versions: (1) white paired with good and black paired with bad, and (2) white paired with bad and black paired with good. The difference in the test-taker's average response time for the two versions (sometimes described as the congruent and incongruent versions, respectively) represents a measure of implicit race bias. The majority of white American subjects who take the race IAT are faster in the congruent version of the task than the incongruent version, implying that they hold an implicit race attitude favoring whites over blacks.

An educational website (<http://implicit.harvard.edu>) was established in 1998, allowing the general public to take self-administered IATs on a wide range of topics in less than ten minutes followed by an individualized score. To date, 4.5 million tests have been taken (Nosek *et al.*, 2006).

The psychometric properties of the IAT have been the subject of intense scrutiny and the source of growing confidence amongst psychologists (for an ongoing list of many associated papers, see http://faculty.washington.edu/agg/iat_validity.htm). The most recurring and charged psychometric debate amongst psychologists is regarding *what* the IAT measures, and whether it is more a measure of the person or of the culture surrounding the person. The perspective that the IAT is a measure of the culture has been articulated by Karpinski and Hilton (2001), Olson and Fazio (2004), and Arkes and Tetlock (2004), and challenged by Nosek and Hansen (2004) and Banaji, Nosek, and Greenwald (2004).

If implicit bias exists, and if it can be measured, then the time has come to assess its implications. To what extent does implicit bias influence workplace behaviors? Under what conditions? With what consequence? For whom? Are the behavioral implications of implicit bias pervasive and problematic, or largely undetectable and irrelevant?

How does implicit bias affect diversity at the gateway, versus along the pathway? If one assumes gateway behaviors to be mostly deliberative and pathway behaviors to be mostly spontaneous, do the potential roles of explicit (or blatant) and implicit bias start to diverge? Explicit bias, with its intentionality and awareness, would seem to have a starring role in many gateway behaviors because those behaviors seem to rest on conscious choices (e.g., hiring). Implicit bias, with its automaticity and immediacy, would seem to have a starring role in many pathway behaviors because of their seemingly spontaneous and

uncalculated nature. Can this framework help us understand the progress made, and the struggles remaining, in the workplace?

In fact, the connection between spontaneous behaviors and implicit bias is becoming increasingly clear. A meta-analysis of 61 studies (Uhlmann, 2003) revealed that the IAT was especially predictive in socially sensitive domains (like those involving social categories) and behaviors which are difficult to control (like non-verbal behaviors), behaviors that we would describe as pathway behaviors. Importantly for this discussion, the IAT was more predictive than self-report measures of stereotyping and prejudice. And, the importance of nonverbal behaviors, however subtle, is significant (Deitch *et al.*, 2003). A self-fulfilling prophecy can occur when a target decodes subtly negative nonverbal cues from a bias holder, and subsequently, behaves suboptimally (Word *et al.*, 1974).

For an example of the impact of implicit bias on pathway behaviors, consider the work of McConnell and Leibold (2001). They found that the race IAT predicted white subjects' smiling, speaking time, extemporaneous social comments, and general friendliness, as well as speech errors and speech hesitation, towards a white experimenter (as compared to a black experimenter). That is, higher levels of implicit bias predicted less favorable treatment of the black experimenter.

In another study (Hugenberg and Bodenhausen, 2003), white participants saw faces morph from one facial expression to another (e.g., from unambiguous hostility to unambiguous happiness). Some faces were black and some faces were white. Participants indicated when they noticed the onset of a hostile expression during the morphing process, and also completed the race IAT and an explicit measure of race attitudes. The IAT was correlated with participants' perceptions of hostility on black faces, meaning that higher levels of bias were associated with hostile expressions on a black being perceived sooner and lingering longer than on a white face. The IAT did not predict performance on white faces, however, nor did the explicit measure predict performance on either face.

Pathway behaviors obviously need not be non-verbal. They include the many informal channels of information and influence within an organization. To illustrate, consider the following thought experiment involving two identical individuals, named W and B, equal in all ways except race. If W is in the loop, sought out as an expert, and taken seriously when arguing a point, while B is not, will W and B experience

dramatically different performance and satisfaction outcomes? Presumably, they will. That is, the sharing of information, the seeking of expertise, and the treatment of advice are all pathway behaviors which have consequences for both job satisfaction and job performance.

The relationship between implicit bias and gateway behaviors, what Ziegert and Hanges (2005) refer to as “macrolevel behavior”, is likely more complex than between these biases and pathway behaviors. They note that “although research has documented that implicit measures correlate with other attitudes and predict microlevel behavior, there is currently little evidence indicating that such implicit attitudes are useful for predicting more macrolevel behavior, such as discriminatory hiring decisions” (Ziegert and Hanges, 2005). For example, an interaction between corporate climate and implicit bias may be required for discriminatory gateway behavior to occur, as they found, and motivation to control prejudice may moderate the relationship between explicit and implicit attitudes.

Another important category of behaviors to study are those with practical consequence for the bias holder, both gateway and pathway. Stereotypes likely offer both benefits and costs to the holder. Stereotypes are often described as cognitively efficient mental processes (Axelrod and Hamilton, 1981). Additional benefits may exist beyond the individual’s need for efficiency. For example, Watkins *et al.* (2006) ask “Does it Pay to Be a Sexist?”. In this field study, they find modern sexists (Swim, *et al.*, 1995) were more likely to seek advice from men, and also, more likely to be promoted, than non-modern sexists. These effects were true for both male and female modern sexists, suggesting that women who acted in ways contrary to their group’s long-term interests received better individual outcomes. Are there strategies that promote *both* the self and the group that we can recommend to targets?

But, what are the costs of stereotypes to the holder? When are mistakes made and with what consequence? This “stereotype tax” (Chugh, 2004) represents the potential dark side of cognitive efficiency. By more fully understanding the benefits and costs of stereotypes, we potentially provide individuals with pragmatic motivation to debias their own behavior, in addition to the obvious moral motivation. We are not envisioning the impossible task of “computing” whether stereotypes are a net-benefit or net-cost, nor are we imagining any sort of abdication, even were it possible, of cognitively efficient mental processes.

However, we believe that more can be understood and taught about the types of mistakes that can be made, and the costs associated with them. Bias has a price. When and how much? Consider the elegant and persuasive work of Richeson and Shelton (2003) as one example. White study participants took an IAT, and then interacted with either a white or black confederate in what they believed was a second experiment. Then, they completed yet another seemingly unrelated executive function task, the color naming Stroop task, where subjects are asked to name the color in which a word is printed, a seemingly easy task (Stroop, 1935a). However, the task is made more difficult by the fact that the word in print is the name of a color. So, for example, the word “red” may appear in green font, and the subject is expected to say “green” when naming the color of the font. To perform this task, subjects must employ executive function, the mental processes associated with handling two competing responses (e.g., green and red) and allowing the “correct” response to dominate.

Returning to the Richeson and Shelton (2003) design, subjects were either interacting with a black confederate or a white confederate, and then were asked to perform this test of executive function. The hypothesis was that IAT scores would predict Stroop (Stroop, 1935a, 1935b) task performance (more bias, lower performance) for subjects whose executive function resources had been depleted; that is, subjects in the black confederate condition. This is exactly what occurred. Participants whose implicit biases were activated by the black confederate interaction depleted their executive function resources prior to the Stroop task, and thus, performed worse on the task, with their performance predicted by their IAT scores. For subjects who interacted with a white confederate, their performance on the Stroop task was not related to their IAT score.

Implicit bias was predictive (beyond an explicit bias measure) of executive function after interracial interactions, but not after same-race interactions. The implication is that biased individuals working in a diverse work environment will experience worse cognitive performance. This implication is worth repeating, so as to avoid confusion. The implication is not that all individuals working in a diverse work environment will experience worse performance, only that the bias of the individuals will correlate to the performance. An unbiased person in a diverse workplace would presumably have the same performance as a random person in a nondiverse workplace. This stereotype tax is a

real liability for biased individuals, as workplaces are simultaneously increasingly diverse and increasingly demanding of executive function.

Assessing advice may entail another possible stereotype tax (Chugh, 2006). One would expect the recipient of advice to be motivated to avoid bad advice and take good advice, as mistakes in either direction might be costly. Yet, when given advice of equal quality by white males, black males, Hispanic males, or white females, advice-takers showed a preference for white male advice over advice from other sources (Chugh, 2006). In a related study in which the advisors were white males or white females, advice-takers placed greater weight on male advice than on female advice (Chugh, 2006). Because the advice-takers had been given an incentive to answer the questions correctly, and because all of the advice was actually correct, participants who were randomly assigned female advisors earned 69 cents for every dollar earned by participants who were randomly assigned male advisors. In both studies, participants denied that race or gender played a role in their decision-making. What remains unanswered in these preliminary studies is the role of implicit bias in this behavior. Thus, there is clear evidence suggesting it is worthwhile to pursue research on the stereotype tax. Research should address not only when it is levied in the workplace, but also the ways it may be paid in forms other than poor performance and advice ignoring.

Context matters

"It is time (to) look outside the organizations . . . to understand better what is happening inside them." (Brief *et al.*, 2005)

Scott observed that "employees come to the organization with heavy cultural and social baggage obtained from interactions in other social contexts" (Scott, 1995). Building on this point, Brief, Butz, and Dietch (2004) remarked that, "it would be naïve to assume that even if this baggage could be unloaded in the workplace that it would not be repacked the same way at home". "Organizations," they argue, "(are) reflections of their environments".

Specifically, the racial composition of organizations is influenced by the organization's environment in ways that are not well-reflected in the psychological literature. They discuss four specific environmental influences worthy of, but lacking sufficient, study: (1) the social

structure surrounding an organization; (2) the black population share of the community in which the organization is located; (3) the customer base of an organization; and (4) the legal environment of an organization. Here, we first reiterate this essential point – that context matters – through more detail on these four specific examples, and then, seek to broaden the scope of what is meant by context to include one additional dimension: (5) individual psychological context of an organization's employees.

Social structure

People tend to infer stereotypes from social structure, from the roles they see members of groups performing in society (Eagly, 1987). By acting on those stereotypes, organizational decision makers may create a vicious cycle contributing to the reproduction of the existing occupational structure. Evidence speaking directly to the possibility that such a cycle exists is needed. For example, is it, in fact, the case that a nurse administrator who observes few black nurses and many black nursing aides, infers a negative stereotype of blacks to explain those observations (e.g., blacks lack the intelligence or motivation to become nurses), and perhaps unconsciously, makes hiring decisions influenced by that stereotype.

Black population share

Attitudes about race and gender do vary between individuals, and are not evenly distributed across communities. Taylor's (1998) review of the evidence suggested that as the proportion of the black population increases in a community, the level of prejudice among whites in the community increases. This finding suggests an ironic possibility: as the percentage of blacks in a community rises, one might forecast an increase in the hiring of blacks by organizations in that community, but at the same time, an increase in prejudicial attitudes within an organization, thus, potentially dampening the projected diversification. Or, under these circumstances, gateway problems especially may be minimized and pathway problems exacerbated.

Moreover, realistic group conflict theory predicts that competition between groups for limited resources leads to conflict. With this basis, Brief, *et al.* (2005), hypothesized that “‘baggage’ develops for

employees when they are living in diverse communities in which tensions arise from competition over scarce resources (page 831)". Accordingly, they found that the closer whites lived to blacks, the more negative the relationship between diversity and the quality of work relationships in their organizations. They also found that inter-ethnic conflict in participants' communities (between Latinos and Anglos) predicted prospective, white job applicants' reactions to a diverse organization. Do Brief *et al.*'s findings hold for other outgroups (e.g., religious minorities)? Can other theoretical approaches [e.g., social identity theory, (Tajfel, 1981)] provide a richer explanation? However approached, the impact of communities on organizational processes and diverse outcomes warrant further attention.

Customer base

A commonly-expressed "business case for diversification" rests on a logic of race matching which posits that because the demographics in the customer population are changing, the demographics of the workforce should reflect this change to maximize organizational effectiveness. Modern racists tend to view blacks as "pushing too hard, too fast and into places they are not wanted" (McConahay, 1986), but do not necessarily discriminate against black under all conditions. Indeed, Brief, *et al.* (2000) found that modern racists (McConahay, 1986) did not discriminate, unless they were provided with a business justification to do so.

The implications of this logic are worthy of additional study, as evidence suggests that this same logic for diversification might be used as a rationale for excluding minorities and women. For example, would race matching (and gender matching) be applied when the customer base is comprised of affluent blacks (e.g., wealthy African Americans, such as Oprah Winfrey), and the related employment opportunity (e.g., high net worth financial advisor at a leading bank) is extremely scarce and high-status; will the business case to match prevail or would some rationale supporting a rich black customer – white financial advisor win out?

The legal environment of an organization

The 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the enforcement of the legislation by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, has led a wide range of

formal policies and procedures within many organizations. The degree of efficacy of these structures remains a question of study. Because organizations “take substantive action or merely comply symbolically” (Bielby, 2000), further research is required to determine the consequences of symbolism. That is, can and if so when can, symbolic organizational actions suffice for substantive ones, or is it always the case that substance trumps symbolism.

Individual psychological context of the organization's employees

Maintaining our emphasis on implicit bias, we highlight the need to understand how exposure to stimuli outside of the workplace affects attitudes brought into the workplace. As a starting point, we consider two important forces in many employees' home life: popular media and marriage.

Popular media: Imagine this scenario. Manager X leads a work team and makes decisions regarding his team members' task assignments, performance levels, and work relationships. On a typical day, he leaves work fairly stressed, and after a quick check of the traffic report on the radio, he drives home listening to a popular radio station. At home, he and his wife catch up and prepare dinner while the kids enjoy a popular DVD in the kitchen. After dinner, he and his wife clean up and put the kids to bed. Then, they watch a popular television program. Finally, they get ready for bed, catching the headlines of the 11:00 local news as they drift to sleep. The next morning, Manager X gets up early to head to work, where he has his usual array of personnel issues to resolve.

Based on this recap of Manager X's time away from work, there is little to suggest that his home life would have much impact on his decision-making at work. But, consider whether the same might be said when more detail is provided.

Manager X leads a diverse work team and makes daily decisions regarding his black, white, and Hispanic team members' task assignments, performance levels, and work relationships. On a typical age day, he leaves work fairly stressed, and after a quick check of the traffic report on the radio, he drives home listening to a popular radio station, which features “gangsta rap” as part of its regular rotation. At home, he and his wife catch up and prepare dinner while the kids enjoy a popular Disney DVD in the kitchen, featuring light-skinned beauties as the

good guys and dark-skinned uglies as the bad guys. After dinner, he and his wife clean up and put the kids to bed. Then, they watch a popular television program, "Law and Order", which opens with a close-up of a bloodied victim of a random, and violent crime. Finally, they get ready for bed, catching the headlines of the 11:00 local news as they drift to sleep, most of which features alleged criminals who are black.¹ The next morning, Manager X gets up early to head to work, where he has his usual array of personnel issues to resolve, including a conflict between a white and black salesperson over fair allocation of a commission.

What are the organizational implications of this hypothetical, but hardly unusual, home life? In the time that Manager X was not at work, he was privvy to a slew of racially-charged images. But as soon as he arrived at work, he committed himself to maintaining his egalitarian values as he made decisions in a deadline environment, based on minimal information and ambiguous anecdotes. To what extent will the negative stereotype-tinged images embedded in his home life leak into his work life? Rained on by these images on a regular basis, is it psychologically plausible to expect no impact on his subsequent biases and perhaps, even his behavior? Are his implicit attitudes fixed or malleable in this context? While these questions require additional study, what we know so far about implicit mental processes suggests that malleability is likely (for an excellent meta-analysis, see Blair (2002) and leakage into behavior is possible (again, for an excellent meta-analysis, see Poehlman (2004)).

The question for organizational researchers is whether well-meaning egalitarians in managerial positions unintentionally take on burdens outside of work that significantly lower their odds of behaving in a truly egalitarian way. As researchers, we can contribute to society's, and Manager X's, understanding of how heavy (or light) a burden this truly is.

¹ For example, Gilliam and Iyengar (2000) argue that local television news relies on a "script" with two consistent themes: (1) crime is violent and (2) perpetrators of crime are non-white males. They assess the impact of this crime script on viewers' attitudes, both black and whites. White viewers exposed to the racial element of the crime script were supportive of punitive responses to crime and expressed more negative attitudes about African-Americans; black viewers did not show this effect.

Marriage: Many people have chosen to live in a household characterized by traditional marriage roles, in which the wife is the primary caregiver, household manager, and community liaison and the husband is the primary breadwinner. This division of labor may coexist even if both the husband and wife work outside the home. In some cases, these roles are not the result of an explicit negotiation between husband and wife, but tend to emerge organically. The result is a division of labor in which the woman performs the domestic duties, which ease the household burdens placed on the husband at home, and the husband performs the status-defining duties outside the home. She washes his laundry, makes his dinner, and he asks her to follow up on various clerical issues on his behalf, including a mistake on his cell phone bill and a missing shirt from the dry cleaners. Her efforts ensure the smooth running of the home, and enable him to focus on his responsibilities and ambitions at work. In organizational language, she is in a staff role and he is in a line role. Neither minds nor questions this division of labor. It just evolved this way and it seems to work.

We wonder whether a domestic traditionalist can also be an organizational egalitarian? How do the assumptions about division of labor and roles at home influence the assumptions about division of labor and roles at work? Work by Cejka and Eagly (1999) demonstrates that, to the extent that occupations are female dominated, feminine personality or physical attributes were thought more essential for success; to the extent that occupations were male dominated, masculine personality or physical attributes were thought more essential. In other words, the gender distribution within the job seemed to define the gender stereotypes associated with the job. If the assumption is that being female qualifies one for a staff role at home, and being male qualifies one for a line role at home, to what extent are these assumptions similar or different in the workplace? What are the organizational implications of a traditional marriage?²

² We certainly believe that the choices made within a marriage are first and foremost, the business of those within the marriage, and additionally, rarely so unidimensional so as to be fully grasped by those outside the marriage. So, to be absolutely clear, we are not proposing an agenda for the marriages of others. We are, however, reasoning that gender-based choices in the home may have implications for how gender is perceived in the workplace.

Solutions and strategies

“At best, ‘best practices’ are best guesses” (Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly (2005))

Both academics and practitioners face a sizable challenge in recommending and implementing organizational approaches to diversity as lay views, trendy notions, and legal defensiveness dominate the planning of diversity approaches. Kulik and Roberson used keywords such as “diversity” and “employee” in performing a literature search, and came up with more than 2,000 hits (Kulik and Roberson, Chapter 8 in this volume). However, only 20% of the hits related to peer-reviewed research, highlighting the dearth of empiricism in the diversity field. Their chapter compiles “needle in the haystack” academic findings in an attempt to bring rigor and empiricism to bear on organizational diversity initiatives. Because so little clarity exists on this topic, we begin with a brief summary of their findings, and then also review another important contributions in this area by Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly (2005). On the surface, it appears that the two papers offer contradictory prescription, so we will also attempt to reconcile this possible contradiction. Finally, we will argue that this area of diversity research is in dire need of additional attention, and suggest some possible future directions.

Kulik and Roberson state that success “hinges on the organization’s ability to implement the right diversity initiative to address the right problem at the right time” and on implementing an overall diversity strategy (Kulik and Roberson, this volume). Specifically, they examine three common diversity initiatives: diversity recruitment, diversity training, and formal mentoring programs. Diversity recruitment is best suited at addressing attraction issues; skill-based diversity training is best suited for addressing a lack of support for diversity within the organization; formal mentoring programs are best for addressing retention problems. Also of note, they find little support for awareness building diversity training programs, but do find evidence supporting skill-building diversity training programs, particularly those designed to help employees respond to displays of prejudice. The implication of this contingency-based recommendation is that the diagnosis of the organization’s situation is a necessary, first step.

Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly (2005) also undertake the much-needed task assessing the success of commonly used approaches to promoting

diversity. Using data provided by medium to full-sized private sector companies to the EEO, they find three general approaches to promoting diversity in management (beginning at first-level supervisor ranks): (1) establishing organizational responsibility (which includes, but is not limited to, Kulik and Roberson's recruitment initiatives); (2) moderating managerial bias (which includes all forms of training, as opposed to delineations made in the chapter 8), and (3) reducing social isolation of women and blacks (which sounds similar to Kulik and Roberson's mentoring initiatives). They reach a less contingent conclusion than Kulik and Roberson, recommending that while managerial bias and social isolation are likely important causes of the problem, organizational responsibility – through affirmative action plans, diversity staff, and diversity committees – is the most effective solution to the problem (Kulik and Roberson, this volume).

While it appears that a contradiction may exist between the Kulik and Roberson and Kalev *et al.* findings, we see important common ground. First, Kulik and Roberson stress the importance of an integrated diversity strategy, and Kalev *et al.* stress the value of ensuring clear organizational responsibility for diversity issues. Both of these findings emphasize organizational-level approaches, simply differing in the emphasis placed on integrated strategic thinking (design) versus accountability (implementation).

We also see useful connections between these recommendations and the gateway/pathway framework we proposed earlier in this chapter. The Kalev *et al.* conclusion seems most focused on the gateway, and we wonder if the importance of efforts directed at the pathway might be lost in the measures captured by EEOC data. Perhaps awareness training and isolation reduction have more impact on the types of micro-behaviors displayed, but are not easily measured on the pathway.

Attempts to reduce the isolation of minorities and to facilitate networking take into account the role targets of discrimination (potential and actual) can play in facilitating a diverse workplace. What can targets do to help or harm themselves? What is the impact on the self of these strategies?

Ellemers and Barreto take this perspective in their chapter, identifying psychological mechanisms that are harmful to targets (Ellemers and Barreto, this volume). For example, stereotype threat (Steele and Aronson, 1995) occurs when members of negatively stereotyped groups internalize and even confirm the stereotype of their group. The

necessary conditions for stereotype threat include a situation where there is a negative group stereotype concerning their performance in a domain, self-relevance of the domain, awareness of the negative group stereotype (note that belief in the stereotype is not necessary – mere knowledge of the stereotype is sufficient), and belief that the task undertaken reveals ability in the domain (Steele, 1997, 1998). These conditions can easily be imagined in organizational, including interview, settings. And, the subtlety of these conditions captures the elusive ways in which the pathway can prove uphill for negatively stereotyped individuals in organizations. Shockingly, little organizational work on stereotype threat exists, to our knowledge (Roberson *et al.*, 2003). Understanding how women and blacks are affected by stereotype threat, and developing strategies for them to overcome that threat, is an area of high potential for research.

Another rich area for research on strategies and solution comes with the rise of implicit bias. Implicit bias creates a detection challenge for targets in accurately perceiving discriminatory behaviors. Remember, behaviors driven by implicit biases tend to be subtle rather than overt in nature. And, potential misunderstandings can occur between those who detect and those who do not detect discriminatory behaviors, cultures, or policies, leading to the accusation that so-and-so “just doesn’t get it”. This asymmetry relates back to our discussion about the behavioral implications of implicit bias. For example, in a study by Dovidio, Kawakami, and Gaertner (2002) whites’ implicit bias (not measured with the IAT) predicted non-verbal behavior towards blacks (pathway), while their self-reported racial attitudes predicted their more controlled behaviors (gateway). However, the whites’ self-reported attitudes also predicted how they assessed their own friendliness, but their implicit attitudes predicted how blacks and independent observers perceived the whites’ friendliness levels.

Such asymmetry in perspective may contribute tremendously to conflicts and misunderstandings in organizations, where interdependent parties may both be well-intended but deeply divided regarding their perception of the organizational climate for minorities. What should minorities do in these situations? Is accurate detection an asset or a liability? What tools can we offer minorities facing this perceptual asymmetry? Chapter 8 discusses all of these questions, and considers the impact of an individual discrimination target’s behaviors on the group as a whole (Ellemers and Barreto, this volume).

Unspoken in the chapter is the assumption that the individual target has some responsibility to the group as a whole. Tennis champion and civil rights activist Arthur Ashe wrote, "Living with AIDS is not the greatest burden I've had in my life. Being black is" (Ashe and Rampersad, 1993). The week before he died of AIDS, Ashe said, "AIDS killed my body, but racism is harder to bear. It kills the soul." Ashe goes on to talk about the obligation he felt to his group, and the burden such an obligation sometimes posed. This burden is significant and stressful (Deitch *et al.*, 2003). What tools and strategies can be recommended for coping with, or deciding whether to cope with, this burden?

Conclusion

Perhaps 1964 was not that long ago.

"Can't Buy Me Love" (which topped the charts that year) still comes on the radio, and we still sing along. "Rudolph, The Red-Nosed Reindeer" (which premiered that year) still appears every Christmas season on television. Shea Stadium (which opened that year) is still home to the Mets and their perpetually heartbroken fans.

Until 1964, the unfathomable was legal *and* commonplace in America. It was legal to advertise "white men only" when hiring. It was typical to read articles in women's magazines explaining that "a good wife always knows her place". Until 1964, all things being unequal, many jobs were unapologetically unavailable for a stunning majority of Americans. To get to the professional workplace, one needed access to a gateway of opportunity, and that gateway was only open if you were a white, Christian male. Thus, "good jobs" were not options if you happened to be black or female.

Have things changed? Economists Marianne Bertrand and Sendhil Mullainathan (2005) were interested in whether employers discriminated based on race when simply evaluating a resumé, and to study this, they submitted experimentally designed, but presumably real, resúmes in response to real help-wanted ads for service and clerical positions in Boston and Chicago. In this highly-controlled field experiment, the researchers randomly assigned either "black-sounding" (e.g. Lakisha, Tyrone) or "white-sounding" (e.g. Emily, Greg) names to equivalent resúmes. They were prepared for a null effect or a perhaps a reverse discrimination effect, or perhaps a discrimination effect, but

in any case, they did not expect the effect to be huge, and thus, they submitted 5,000 resumes to ensure statistical power.

They were wrong; the effect was huge. Applicants with white-sounding names were 50 percent more likely to be called for interviews than those with black-sounding names. Interviews were requested for 10.1% of applicants with white-sounding names and only 6.7% of those with black-sounding names. There was no null effect and there was no reverse discrimination. Instead, whites stood a far better chance of employment than blacks, not unlike 1964.

How do we make sense of this robust effect? Is this explicit gateway discrimination, plain and simple, or something more complicated? Is this a finding we would have expected in 1965 or 2005? Would our explanation for the finding vary based on when it occurred? Has the story changed?

Perhaps, the story today is of biases implicit more than explicit, of business justifications more than hostile prejudice, and of gateways only partially open and pathways only partially clear. The story, and our work, is not done.

References

- Arkes, H. R., and Tetlock, P. E. (2004). Attributions of Implicit Prejudice, or “Would Jesse Jackson ‘Fail’ the Implicit Association Test?” *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(4), 257–278.
- Ashe, A., and Rampersad, A. (1993). *Days of Grace*. New York: Random House.
- Axelrod, R., and Hamilton, W. D. (1981). The evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 211(4489), 1390–1396.
- Banaji, M. R., and Greenwald, A. G. (1995). Implicit gender stereotyping in judgments of fame. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 68(2), 181–198.
- Banaji, M. R., Nosek, B. A., and Greenwald, A. G. (2004). No place for nostalgia in science: A response to Arkes and Tetlock. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(4), 279–310.
- Bertrand, M., and Mullainathan, S. (2005). Do People Mean What They Say? Implications For Subjective Survey Data.
- Bielby, W. T. (2000). Minimizing workplace gender and racial bias, *JSTOR*, 29 120–129.
- Blair, I. V. (2002). The malleability of automatic stereotypes and prejudice. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 6(3), 242–261.

- Brief, A. P., Butz, R. M., and Deitch, E. A. (2004). Organizations as reflections of their environments: *The case of race composition* (pp. 199–148).
- Brief, A. P., Dietz, J., Cohen, R. R., Pugh, S., and Vaslow, J. B. (2000). Just doing business: Modern racism and obedience to authority as explanations for employment discrimination. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 81(1), 72–97.
- Brief, A. P., Umphress, E. E., Dietz, J., Burrows, J. W., Butz, R. M., and Scholten, L. (2005). Community matters: Realistic group conflict theory and the impact of diversity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 830–844.
- Cejka, M. A., and Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender-stereotypic Images of Occupations Correspond to the Sex Segregation of Employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(4) 413–423.
- Chugh, D. (2004). Why milliseconds matter: Societal and managerial implications of implicit social cognition. *Social Justice Research*, 17(2), 203–222.
- Chugh, D. (2006). *Whose Advice is it Anyway? An Exploration of Bias and Implicit Social Cognition in the Use of Advice*. Dissertation.
- Deitch, E. A., Barsky, A., Butz, R. M., Chan, S., Brief, A. P., and Bradley, J. (2003). Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Social Relations*, 56(11) 1299–1324.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., and Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 82(1), 62–68.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social-Role Interpretation*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gaertner, S. L., and Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio and S. L. Gaertner (eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism* (pp. 61–89). Orlando: Academic Press.
- Gilliam, F. D. and Iyengar, S. (2000). The influence of local television news on the viewing public. *American Journal of Political Science*, 44(3); 560–573.
- Greenwald, A. G., and Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4–27.
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., and Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464–1480.
- Hugenberg, K., and Bodenhausen, G. V. (2003). Facing prejudice: Implicit prejudice and the perception of facial threat. *Psychological Science*, 14(6), 640–643.

- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., and Kelly, E. A. (2005). *Best Practices or Best Guesses? Diversity Management and the Remediation of Inequality*: Working Paper. Department of Sociology, Harvard University.
- Karpinski, A., and Hilton, J. L. (2001). Attitudes and the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 81(5), 774–788.
- Kihlstrom, J. F. (2004). Implicit Methods in Social Psychology. In C. Sansone, C. C. Morf and A. T. Panter (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Methods in Social Psychology*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- McConahay, J. B. (1983). Modern racism and modern discrimination: The effects of race, racial attitudes, and context on simulated hiring decisions. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9(4), 551–558.
- (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio and S. L. Gaertner (eds.), *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*. (pp. 91–125). San Diego: Academic Press.
- McConnell, A. R., and Leibold, J. M. (2001). Relations among the Implicit Association Test, discriminatory behavior, and explicit measures of racial attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(5), 435–442.
- Nosek, B. A., and Hansen, J. (in press). The associations in our heads belong to us: Measuring the multifaceted attitude construct in implicit social cognition. *Cognition and Emotion*.
- Nosek, B. A., Smyth, F. L., Hansen, J. J., Devos, T., Lindner, N. M., Ranganath, K. A., et al. (2006). Pervasiveness and Correlates of Implicit Attitudes and Stereotypes. *Unpublished manuscript*.
- Olson, M. A., and Fazio, R. H. (2004). Reducing the Influence of Extrapersonal Associations on the Implicit Association Test: Personalizing the IAT. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(5), 653–667.
- Performance and Accountability Report FY 2004. (2005). *Management's Discussion and Analysis*.
- Poehlman, T. A., Uhlmann, E., Greenwald, A. G., and Banaji, M. R. (2004). Understanding and Using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of Predictive Validity: (manuscript under review).
- Richeson, J. A., and Shelton, J. (2003). When prejudice does not pay: Effects of interracial contact on executive function. *Psychological Science*, 14(3), 287–290.
- Roberson, L., Deitch, E. A., Brief, A. P., and Block, C. J. (2003). Stereotype threat and feedback seeking in the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 62(1), 176–188.
- Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and Organizations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Steele, C. M. (1998). Stereotyping and its threat are real. *American Psychologist*, 53(6), 680–681.

- Steele, C. M., and Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797–811.
- Stroop, J. R. (1935a). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions: George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Stroop, J. R. (1935b). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions: George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., and Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199–214.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, M. C. (1998). How White Attitudes Vary with the Racial Composition of Local Populations: Numbers Count. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 512–535.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Zimmer, C., Stainback, K., Robinson, C., Taylor, T., and McTague, T. (2006). Documenting Desegregation: Segregation in American Workplaces by Race, Ethnicity, and Sex, 1966–2003. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 565–588.
- Uhlmann, E. (2003). IAT Behavioral Validation Studies, Working List. Yale University.
- Watkins, M. B., Kaplan, S., Brief, A. P., Shull, A., Dietz, J., Mansfield, M. T., and R. Cohen (2006). Does it pay to be a sexist? The relationship between modern sexism and career outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 524–537.
- Word, C. O., Zanna, M. P., and Cooper, J. (1974). The nonverbal mediation of self-fulfilling prophecies in interracial interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10(2), 109–120.
- Ziegert, J. C., and Hanges, P. J. (2005). Employment Discrimination: The Role of Implicit Attitudes, Motivation, and a Climate for Racial Bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 553–562.